U.S. Congress, Congressional Record

Appendix

Thalidomide Story Told to Congress Group in May

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, during the past month the American people have been outraged by the simple, obvious, human tragedy resulting from thalidomide. It was the public outcry which forced the Congress to take action on the drug bill.

I had the privilege of introducing the drug bill on April 12, 1961, jointly with Senator KEFAUVER. On May 17, 18, 23, and 24, 1962, the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am chairman, held extensive hearings on this vital legislation. The thalidomide disaster in Europe and the fact that thalidomide had been distributed within the United States for investigational purposes, and would soon bring forth numerous tragedies in American homes, was first disclosed during the course of the Judiciary Committee's public hearings. These hearings escaped the press and public notice.

However, an enterprising reporter, Dick Kirkpatrick, recently wrote an interesting article on this matter which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer on August 12, 1962.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert this article:

THALIDOMIDE STORY TOLD TO CONGRESS GROUP IN MAY—DISCLOSURE ESCAPED NOTICE

(By Dick Kirkpatrick)

WASHINGTON, August 11.—The story of thalidomide, which burst out on the front pages of the Nation's newspapers only a few weeks ago, first was disclosed last May in open congressional subcommittee hearings but escaped notice.

This was noted here Friday by the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on Judiciary which this week began executive meetings on a proposed drug bill to tighten new drug procedures and foster price competition in the industry.

On May 24, Dr. Helen B. Taussig, noted professor of pediatrics of Johns Hopkins University, testified about her personal study in Europe of the deformed babies born of mothers who took the drug, and told of the introduction of the drug under the name of Kevadon in the United States, although the extent of the distribution was not brought out in the testimony nor the fact that the U.S. manufacturer was the William S. Merrell Co., Cincinnati.

"I am told most of it was first given to men and women beyond the childbearing period, but I am afraid that we still may see deformities coming up in this country. They have, of course, in Canada where the drug was also on sale," she warned.

She also suggested that greater research and clinical testing may disclose that congenital heart cases and other infant malformations may be the result of other drugs on the market today.

She said she was more concerned about the careful screening of harmless drugs with wide distribution than the potent drug given to very selected patients who are seriously ill or who are emergency cases.

A week before her open testimony she had presented the same report to the American Pediatric Society.

And the week before her congressional subcommittee testimony, the same committee had heard George P. Larrick, Food and Drug Administration Commissioner, refer to the German experience with the drug, although he did not name the drug.

And although Mr. Larrick did not refer to the use of the drug in the United States, he reported that in 1961 there were 45 new drug applications voluntarily withdrawn, conceding that in retrospect the clinical testing was not adequate.

Of the 45 drugs, he disclosed that 3 were withdrawn because of injurious side effects, including 1 that was associated with 54 cases of hepatitis and 15 deaths and another with 13 cases of agranulocytosis and 3 deaths. In the first case, Mr. Larrick said harmful side effects had not been reported promptly to the FDA.

Dr. Taussig, coinventor of the "blue baby" operation which opened the field of cardiac surgery for children born with bad hearts, illustrated her lecture with color slides of the deformed babies in Europe.

"Let me assure you there is nothing you see in the pictures that is as terrible as seeing the children," she said.

"I am sure that if any of your wives had given birth to a child with this type of malformation, you would want to exert all the influence you possibly could to prevent the occurrence of another similar tragedy," she said.

Although American drug and food laws are tougher than those in Europe "nevertheless had this drug been invented in this country, I believe it would have passed our present laws, as it is only under special circumstances that tests of pregnant animals are requested," Dr. Taussig said.

"By and large, the less potent and less necessary a drug is, the most important it is to make sure the drug cannot do harm. For this reason, 'simple' or 'helpful' drugs such as analgesics, laxatives, sedatives, tranquilizers, tonics, drugs for colds and systemic drugs for allergies should be extremely, carefully, and thoroughly tested.

"It is not sufficient to merely state in tiny print somewhere at the end of the advertisement of a drug 'warning, this drug may not be safe for children—or for pregnant women—as this aspect has not been tested,'" Dr. Taussig said.

She said thalidomide is an allied compound to "Doridan," also a sedative, which has been given to hundreds of thousands of patients with no deformities resulting.

"Abnormalities in rabbit births have been produced in clinical testing of thalidomide," she said. In Germany, the drug also was known as Algosidiv, Peracon Expectorans, Grippex, and Polygripan. In England it was known as Valgis, Tensival, Valgraine and Asmaval. Initially it was sold over the counter and was considered such an excellent sedative it was added to cough medicine and other drugs.

It first was compounded by a Swiss firm that found it ineffective on animals, but a German firm later discovered it was an excellent sleeping tablet. By the time disastrous results were attributed to the drug, an estimated 3,500 babies in Germany and several hundred in England were malformed.

Louis Rosenman, associate counsel of the house subcommittee, asked Dr. Taussig if the patients were aware they were being given an experimental drug.

"I believe, and perhaps you know better than I do, that the law says that the doctor is required to explain to the patient that 'this is a new drug and given as an experiment but we believe it is good.'

"But I am afraid that is very laxly done—a good many patients may receive the drug and not realize that they are taking an unknown risk," she said.

She added that the patient may pass the drug on to another with a similar ailment.

Freedom for Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Knights of Lithuania held their 49th annual convention at the Hotel Robert Treat in Newark, N.J. At that time they passed the following resolution which I ask be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Their resolution is a living testimony to the free spirit of man; further it is a testimony to the free spirit of a captive nation. In part, the resolution speaks of Captive Nations Week.

I made reference to this memorable week on July 25, at which time I said that the week is a pertinent reminder of the fact that entire generations of men have lived in captivity under the most complete repression in all of history.

The Knights, in another part of the resolution, speak of their hope for Lithuania's freedom. Immediately after World War I, the principle of self-determination in international relations became operative but the Lithuanians have been denied the basic right since 1940. The occupation of their land cannot be excused.

At this time, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 17, 1962.

RESOLUTION AT THE KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA 49TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, HOTEL ROBERT TREAT, NEWARK, N.J., AUGUST 17–19, 1962

At the 49th national convention of the Knights of Lithuania held at the Robert Treat Hotel in Newark, N.J., August 17–10, 1962, the delegates and guests unanimously passed the following resolutions:

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Whereas the Soviet Communists are actively and practically dedicated to the principle of world conquest and to the victory of Soviet communism over all existing forms of government; and

Whereas the Soviet Communists have unjustly and against the free will of the people annexed Lithuania and have since subjected her people to a persecution the like of which the modern world has not seen; and

Whereas Lithuania for 22 years from 1918 to 1940 has amply demonstrated its ability and capacity to govern herself by the remarkable progress she has made in all phases of her independent life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we express our sincerest gratitude to the President of the United States for proclaiming the third week in July as Captive Nations Week, a gesture which renewed the hope of those nations now behind the Iron Curtain; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate and House Foreign Relations Committees pass the resolutions for consideration by Congress, resolutions which would ask the United Nations to use its influence to force Soviet Russia to take leave of the territorial boundaries of Lithuania and to permit free elections in Lithuania under the direct supervision of the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations make every concrete effort to impress upon the Soviet Union the need to return to their native land all those Lithuanians who are now in exile.

LAWRENCE JANONIS,
Chairman.
ANN MARIE KASSEL,
Secretary.

The Spread of Communism in South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in light of the growing Communist menace from Cuba, I think it is well that we learn as much as possible about the spread of communism in South America.

The attached articles are excerpts from a speech made by Dr. Joost Sluis, of the University of California, who has five times visited British Guiana and is considered an authority on this subject:

ON MAP COMMUNIST ENCIRCLEMENT CLEARLY VISIBLE

(By Dr. Joost Sluis)

While the people of the United States are deeply concerned about Castro's communism, British Guiana may become a second Soviet satellite in the Western Hemisphere, on the South American Continent itself, if this country is granted its independence with Jagan in power.

Communism has already enslaved 1 billion or over one-third of the people of the world, who a little over 40 years ago were free like ourselves.

UNITED STATES BEING GEOGRAPHICALLY ENCIRCLED

If we add to the Communists' numerical conquest the fact that—on a piecemeal basis—we are being encircled, geographically, militarily, psychologically, and in other fields, does it not become obvious that they are conquering the world?

Wherever you turn, who in the world is on the offensive? Who is largely on the move for example, in Laos, Berlin, British Guiana and Brazil? The situation has gradually crept up on us.

British Guiana is a relatively poor, tropical country the size of the State of Idaho, on the north coast of South America. It was recently projected into the world's headlines when major riots, violence and arson took place in its capital of Georgetown and British troops were requested by its first Premier, Dr. Cheddi Jagan, to restore and maintain order. The U.S. State Department's Report No. 4489 R–12 of 1960, entitled "World Strength of the Communist Party Organization" states that "the party's leadership (Cheddi and Janet Jagan) are recognized as the representatives in British Guiana of the international Communist movement and have contacts with Communists in the United Kingdom and in the United States."

JAGANS SET UP RED-LED PARTY

Jagan was born 44 years ago of illiterate parents in Port Mourant. His grandparents had been brought from India as indentured laborers on the sugar estates. At one time, African slaves had worked the plantations under cruel conditions and the history of rebellion had been long. Jagan harbored the seed of anger and revolt, spent 2 years at Howard University and from 1940 to 1943 studied dentistry at Northwestern University. He met and later married Janet Rosenberg, reputedly a member of the Young Communist League, a frequent defender of Marxism-Leninism, contributor to the London Daily Worker and presently attending the Helsinki Youth Festival.

Together they returned to British Guiana in 1943, and established a Communist-led People's Progressive Party.

The exploitation of racial tension, and promises of economic improvement were primary factors in Jagan's victory, though his plurality decreased from 47 percent in 1957 to 42.7 percent in 1961.

GUIANA SCENE FOR FIVE COMMUNIST STEPS

The five steps of Communist conquest are clearly revealed in British Guiana. These are:

(1) The recruitment for communism of a few student intellectuals;

(2) The organization of these few into a fanatical, flexible, zealous, monolithic army for world conquest, known as the Communist Party;

(3) The so-called scientific utilization and exploitation of social forces such as hunger, race, legitimate grievances for the Communist purpose. The program is: Find out what people want, promise the solution to them in order to come to power over them;

(4) The seizure of power, if Jagan continues in power when independence is granted;

(5) The ruthless consolidation of power in a Communist dictatorship.

Independence talks have been postponed until after the three-man commission which investigated the riots renders its reports and probably will be held in September.

BRITISH GUIANA NEXT COMMUNIST STEP TO CONQUERING LATIN AMERICA

If Jagan is in power when independence is granted, he is free to impose his minority dictatorship and make any agreement with the Communist bloc that he likes. This could have disastrous consequences for the United States, for it is a vital step toward the conquest of all South America.

The twin imperatives under which communism operates is that communism must come to power by deception and must remain in power by force. (An understanding of this gives a foundation for any effective program to halt the Communist advance.)

The reason communism must operate within this framework is easy to understand since human nature is tuned to freedom, whereas communism is the imposition of slavery by its fearful monopoly of all political, economic, educational, judicial, military and police power. The enslavement that results is complete and beyond anything known in history.

The only answer to deception before the Communist seizure of power is knowledge and understanding.

Last summer for 2 months and during 5 other visits in the past 1½ years, we engaged in a grassroot educational campaign throughout British Guiana to channel basic information in depth about communism to dedicated, motivated people in all walks of life and thus help them to preserve their freedom. This was done on a nonsectarian and nonpartisan, free enterprise, people-to-people basis. We showed films, gave talks and distributed literature throughout the country. We attempted to show the Communist objectives, methods and techniques from their own writings and how they exploit the good and legitimate in any walk of life to bring the ultimate evil and illegitimate Communist tyranny into being.

Since the election, the opposition to Jagan is rising, in part because the people are recognizing the unfolding Communist pattern. The government's introduction of a new budget helped precipitate last February's riots, climaxing 4 days of demonstrations against the government and involving an estimated 50,000 people.

Jagan had removed his Minister of Home Affairs, Hon. Balram Singh Rai from his post and from the party because he refused to retract his accusation that in April the P.P.P. conducted the foulest elections ever held in British Guiana.

PEOPLE TRYING TO PRESERVE FREEDOM FROM REDS

Dr. Schwarz and I were declared prohibited immigrants on May 24, 1962, by the governor under the direction of the council of ministers led by Dr. Jagan, but he cannot prohibit the continuing message of truth reaching the people in British Guiana who are fighting desperately to preserve their freedom. This is being done by thousands of pieces of literature being read and distributed throughout the country by dozens of local people in all walks of life.

REDS ENCIRCLING THE UNITED STATES

Part of the Communist program for the conquest of the ultimate objective, the United States, is our gradual piecemeal encirclement through the less-developed nations of the world.

Our own Government's functions in the struggle against communism are limited because of the very nature of representative government, which is not basically designed to meet the total warfare of the Communists against us in every avenue of life. Furthermore, governments deal primarily with other governments and not often directly with the people at the grassroots.

The U.S. Information Agency in British Guiana, for example, is not willing at present to release its anti-Communist films for use in the villages because it would displease the present Guianese Government. Furthermore, direct financial aid to Jagan would help him to achieve the Communist seizure of power and ultimately enslave the people. In the nations where communism threatens, governmental programs must be supplemented by nongovernmental free enterprise programs on a people-to-people basis."

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question. If we don't supply money to Jagan, will Russia do so?

Answer. Aid is extended by the Communist bloc within the framework of the timetable and plan of the piecemeal world conquest. During my last visit the Czechoslovak Chargé d'Affaires from Brazil was negotiating a trade agreement with British Guiana. There is strong evidence such Com-

munist aid is being granted now and future Communist aid will be forthcoming from now on, irrespective of any aid the United States may grant.

Question. Does U.S. State Department have any policy re British Guiana? Is the U.S. Government going to loan millions of dollars to British Guiana?

Answer. We are weighing whether to give British Guiana financial aid. Last fall Dr. Jagan requested $200 million of U.S. aid. That figures to $400 a head if we apply the same measuring stick to all of South and Central America. At that rate our total bill for Latin American aid would go to $80 billion. At present our State Department apparently is playing for time, and aid will have to be very carefully considered within the framework of communism's advances in British Guiana.

Question (E. E. Heavey). Do you believe California is particularly infiltrated with Communist collaborators?

Answer. Communist infiltration is a problem of the whole free world, and California, of course, is no exception. The policy of communism everywhere is to exploit the beautiful in order to bring the sordid into being; to exploit freedom in order to impose slavery; and to exploit the legitimate to bring the illegitimate to pass. It is vitally important we understand this and reach people at the "grassroots." This is the purpose of the anti-Communist school's policy. One should not look for Communists behind the door and under the bed, but should study the laws and practices of communism. In order to treat cancer we must understand the nature of the cancer, and once we understand it, it becomes predictable, and we can advise effective medication to deal with it.

Question (Guy H. Harris). If Jagan loses next election, will he accept defeat?

Answer. I don't know what is going to happen when the British troops leave. Incidentally, the Communists are often more effective out of power than they are in power—for when out of power they can promise anything they want to, even though they can't deliver it.

Question (Custis R. Nims). Not too long ago Jagan, like some of our own "civil libertarians," declared himself for "academic freedom." What is present status of free speech in British Guiana now?

Answer. Jagan controls the radio completely; his news conferences also are broadcast every day. Broadcasts by others are banned.

Question. What definite course do you believe the United States should follow re British Guiana?

Answer. We should put our governmental problems into tune in every country where communism threatens. It is a responsibility you and I have. We have every opportunity to help these people. I would like to see our businessmen get into action along the coast of British Guiana where we can build a highway and trade.

Agriculture's Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., for date of August 30, 1962, which is a very thoughtful commentary dealing with possible solutions to agriculture's problems.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION HAS A LAUDABLE AIM, BUT WE DON'T BELIEVE THEIR HOLDING ACTION WILL WORK

Whether the National Farmers Organization can achieve its aim of higher farm prices remains to be seen.

What they are interested in is getting a higher price for the farmer who raises the livestock and grain to feed America and much of the rest of the world, too.

The National Farmers Organization hopes to accomplish this by holding their produce from the market, until they get the price they want. They hope to organize the farmer and get firm contracts from producers.

Certainly, the objective of a profitable return for America's farm families is one that no one can argue with. The country needs a prosperous rural America. Higher prices would help the farmer.

The farmers, as individuals or as an organization, also have a right to keep their livestock and grain off the market, if they want to do so. As a practical matter, they can't. What they produce has to go to market sometime. We cannot imagine the American farmer holding food off the market while the public goes hungry.

WHERE PRICES ARE DETERMINED

We don't think the National Farmers Organization's idea will work—because the American farmer is the most individualistic operator in the world.

Some farmers will not go along with the National Farmers Organization, and will not hold their grain and livestock from the market. This, too, is their privilege—and the National Farmers Organization shouldn't attempt to coerce them into doing so.

Prices are determined by the world market and also by a number of area markets in the United States. They are further determined by the Government's support of grain, cotton, and other commodities, production of which is controlled by quotas. In the case of cotton and tobacco, the controls are rigid and supply meets demand. In the case of grain, controls have not worked so well. But they have kept prices up.

There are no Government controls on livestock. However, the support of grain prices by the Government has been effective in keeping livestock prices at present levels. Growers have tried to keep the supply somewhat in line with demand.

Thus, the holding action contemplated by the National Farmers Organization in the Midwest may have little, if any effect upon prices which farmers will receive for their produce.

James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, says the National Farmers Organization proposal "borders on the edge of lack of realism." He says the National Farmers Organization "doesn't represent enough farmers to make such a program effective and even if they did I do not believe in farmers striking. We have a public responsibility to produce an adequate supply of food."

Patton believes "there are only two ways in which a farmer can withhold his product practically. One is not to produce, because once he has produced the crop, he must sell it. The second is to have the Federal Government take the supply off the market by loaning money and storing it."

The Government has found out that it cannot do the latter without exercising some control. In other words, the public will not write a blank check to support prices for unlimited farm production.

MANUFACTURERS AND FARMERS

The Nation's manufacturers attempt to fit their supply to the demand. In doing so, they have assured themselves a price on the market that usually gives them a profitable return.

They are also insulated, to a greater degree, from the world market than the American farmer. Their prices, in many cases, are out of reach of the foreign consumer. They're also getting steep for American consumers.

The manufacturer is also able to shift his production from one gadget to another as the market changes. Up until now, the farmer has not had this flexibility. Diversification of farming to get away from dependence on single crops offers some hope in this respect.

The efficient American farmer has never attempted to fit grain supply to demand—except under Government controls. Here again, he has demonstrated that he can produce more on less acreage—thanks to his know-how, irrigation, fertilization and mechanization.

CONTROLS, SUBSIDIES GO TOGETHER

If the farmer should achieve control over prices—and we don't think he will by the National Farmers Organization's action—it would lead to another question. It is simply this: Will the U.S. Government and the public permit the farmer to have both Government subsidies and control over prices? We don't think so.

Most countries of the world subsidize their agriculture in one way or another. We do not think that the time is here when the Government can abandon controls completely—and place the American farmer on the free market. Nor do we think that complete Government control over agriculture is the answer, either.

It boils down to a fine question of how much control the American farmer will accept in return for Government assistance—and what specific and preferably minimum controls are necessary to insure a healthy and prosperous agriculture. Finding the exact answer has proved to be an elusive task in Democratic and Republican administrations alike.

The Kennedy administration insists that it's a question of either strict controls and price supports, or neither. This is an unnecessarily harsh solution. Congress would do better to extend the emergency wheat and feed-grain programs in effect during the last 2 years. They have worked reasonably well. They offer more prospect of coping with the farm problem successfully than the permanent solution that Washington is talking about for the farm problem. There is no permanent solution for any Government problem.

Setting up a mandatory feed-grain control program would be disastrous for South Dakota and the livestock feeders and farmers in nearby States. Livestock feeding offers the prospect of reasonable growth for America's farmers—if there's no big upset from today's conditions.

Unfortunately for the farmer, the clock is running out in this session of Congress. The legislative results will probably show it, too.

USE A SELECTIVE APPROACH

Not all American agriculture is flying a distress signal by any means. Prices could be better—but they've been a lot worse than they are right now.

In South Dakota, most farmers have been relatively prosperous. Ranchers and livestock feeders have had profitable years, particularly the cattlemen. But any drastic cutback in either production or in Government support prices would change this picture.

Congress and farm organizations would do well to devote their major efforts to those parts of the farm problem which need attention—and leave alone the parts which are not in trouble.

A $280 Million Industry Dangles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, the Greenville, S.C., News has published an excellent editorial emphasizing the reasons for the passage of an enabling act which would permit private industry to construct a $280 million power generating plant on Savannah River. This steam plant would be of tremendous benefit to the American coal industry and our hard-pressed railroads. It would use more than $26 million worth of coal annually, all of which would be transported by rail. Furthermore, the plant would pay into the coffers of the Federal Government, South Carolina and Anderson County, S.C., between $15 and $20 million per year in taxes.

I do not believe there is any valid reason for delaying a project of this magnitude. Certainly it is not only ironical but most illogical for the Congress of the United States to pass legislation providing for the expenditure of $900 million in depressed areas for the purpose of providing jobs and raising the economy in such areas, while at the same time Congress is dilatory, to say the least, in permitting favorable action on legislation that authorizes private industry to spend its own money to generate electric power and thus improve the welfare of the people in the fast growing southeastern region of this great Nation.

If Congress really believes in private industry then there is absolutely no excuse for further delay in approving this legislation.

I hope my colleagues will read the following editorial on this timely subject:

A $280 MILLION INDUSTRY DANGLES

A few days ago the House Appropriations Committee of the Congress got around to approving several major items in the annual public works money bill, familiarly known as the "pork barrel bill" because it provides the funds for the favorite projects back home.

Among the items was $3,700,000 for completion of the Hartwell Dam on the Savannah River between South Carolina and Georgia.

It's too late to oppose Hartwell. The money has been spent or obligated and we can only hope that even a small fraction of the claims made for the project and the predictions made about its benefits will prove to be true.

The bill, calling for the spending of some $4.6 billion in all, is certain to pass both Houses of Congress. There may be some minor changes and some adjustments up and down in the amounts for this purpose and that, but pass it will. And just to tighten the cinch this is election year.

Meanwhile, lying somewhere in the files of both the House and Senate are identical bills, all ready for passage apparently without opposition, which would allow a private power company to build on the Savannah River a low retaining dam to impound a relatively small amount of water for condensing the steam which will turn the turbines of a vast generating plant.

Many months ago (or has it been years?) the Duke Power Co. announced plans to build in Anderson County the largest steam plant in its entire system, probably the largest in the world. It is prepared to put up $280 million of its stockholders' money, much of it borrowed in the public money markets, to do the job.

The plant would produce more energy than many Federal hydroelectric projects costing many times more.

But instead of costing the taxpayers, the Duke plant would put money in the pockets of its stockholders, who are also taxpayers, and would pour millions into the treasuries of the Federal, State, and local governments.

In an address to the House urging passage of the bill at this session, Representative W. J. BRYAN DORN, whose district includes Anderson, said the plant would pay $10 million a year in taxes to the Federal Government, $7 million to the State, and $1 million to Anderson County alone.

And it would provide power for this whole region, much of it going into Georgia through the agreements for interconnecting lines over which the companies exchange power to meet emergencies and periods of peak demand. It would consume $26 million worth of coal a year, at the rate of 9,500 tons a day, a big boost in the coal market and a large source of revenue for the railroads which would transport the coal.

Duke must have the enabling legislation giving it permission to build the dam because the Savannah is controlled by the Federal Government.

Duke has shown to the satisfaction of all that the project will not damage existing Federal projects on the Savannah and it has offered to spend an additional $1,300,000 on the dam to make sure it will not interfere with future Federal projects.

Yet the bills have not been passed. As Congress overcomes the liberal filibuster against the communications bill and jams through "must" legislation in the rush for adjournment, they are likely to get lost.

This would mean a delay of at least a year. Duke may be forced either to forget the project or to move it to North Carolina, perhaps to a less desirable site, where it can get ready access to the water it needs. If the latter happens, South Carolina stands to lose heavily. And the delay would hurt the entire region.

There is no good reason for delaying this enabling legislation and every reason for getting the project started as soon as possible. And there is no excuse for the failure of Congress to act, unless some powerful individual or group is holding the thing up to insure approval of other proposed Federal projects on the Savannah.

There isn't a single South Carolinian who would not do anything within reason to bring a $280 million industry to his State. That is what is hanging in the balance here—a huge plant which by its very nature would attract many more industries.

So what are we and our leaders going to do?

Eight-Point Anti-Communist Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Communist menace—changing its tactics in a changing world—requires a constant effort to update our anti-Communist policies and strategy.

Recently, I made some recommendations reflecting upon the need for a more effective anti-Communist program.

I ask unanimous consent to have these recommendations printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EIGHT-POINT ANTI-COMMUNIST PROGRAM

The challenge of communism continues to threaten the survival of freedom.

Communism is cunning, therefore, it must be fought creatively. It can be blocked at home and abroad, without destroying America's freedoms. Communism can only be stopped if America is alert, remains strong and has a flexible global strategy. No simple battle plan can fight the international cobra of communism.

Recently, there have been new developments requiring reappraisal, including: (1) A demonstration of an increasing capability in space—reflected by the simultaneous orbiting of two spacecraft *Vostok III* and *Vostok IV;* (2) failures within the Communist system in nonspace, nondefense fields, particularly in agriculture, and a continued restlessness within the Communist-dominated countries, reflected in daring escape efforts, for example, from East Germany to West Berlin.

There is, in my judgment, also need to face other new realities in relation to Communist policy.

Unless there is a change of fundamental policy—of which there is no evidence—for example, the Soviet apparently: Will not agree to realistic disarmament; will not agree to use of outer space for useful purposes; will not voluntarily lift the chains of Communist tyranny from Communist enslaved peoples; and will not stop its policies of attempted missile blackmail; of exporting communism; of blocking efforts to create peace.

Instead, the Communists remain dedicated—at whatever costs—to the goal of conquering the world.

For the future, then, we face a long, tough struggle.

EIGHT-POINT ANTI-COMMUNIST COUNTEROFFENSIVE

For these reasons, there is a real need for a reevaluation of defense policies and strategy.

As leader of the free world, the United States should, I believe, undertake the following steps:

1. Evaluate the military significance of Soviet capabilities in space—for example, I recommended a congressional hearing to obtain testimony of military and scientific experts on the military threat of the Soviet man-in-space program.

2. A crystal-clear declaration that we will continue to firmly protect Western rights in West Berlin.

3. Readvocating the lifting of chains of Communist tyranny from the captive nations, including the right of self-determination by the people through secret ballot.

4. Regularly "skywriting" for the world, the Communists' deplorable record: Of treaty breaking; of blocking progress at the United Nations, particularly in the Security Council where it has exercised over 100 vetoes; of the slaughter of Hungary, etc.

5. Undertake a more dynamic nonmilitary counteroffensive—politically, economically, and ideologically (a) against the Communist countries themseves; and (b) against their efforts at penetrations elsewhere in the world.

6. Maintaining a mighty deterrent power to make attack against the free world suicide.

7. Fully exploit weaknesses within the Communist system: For example, inability

to produce enough food—contrasting the U.S. picture of overflowing surpluses.

8. More firmly cementing relations and cooperative efforts for mutual defense and progress with our allies, bilaterally, and multilaterally through regional organizations, including NATO, SEATO, CENTO, ANZUS, and OAS.

For the future, the preservation and perpetuation of freedom will require vigilance equal to—if not greater than—any previous time in history.

The United States, and fellow nations of the free world, now possess the military strength, economic power and the ideology with a universal appeal—freedom—if we are willing to dedicate the necessary manpower and resources—to triumph over communism.

The reality to face now, however, is that this will be a long contest, that will require great effort and sacrifice.

The preservation and perpetuation of our ideals; the maintaining and a hope, and possibility, of freedom for humanity; however, this is indeed a worthy cause deserving the best effort of all of us.

Disarmament: Limits on Efforts That Must Continue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly stated the need for this country to continue with undimmed determination our efforts to make meaningful progress toward an effective program of disarmament and ban on nuclear testing. At the same time there must be limits on these efforts—limits determined by the security requirements necessary to preserve free societies.

These limits, along with the important reminder that disarmament and an end to nuclear testing are issues "involving life or death for all mankind," have been pointedly stated in the lead editorial of the New York Times, September 2, 1962, and I commend this excellent analysis to our colleagues' attention.

THE U.N. AND DISARMAMENT

When the United Nations General Assembly meets in New York later this month, it will again have before it an issue involving life or death for all mankind. This is the issue of disarmament, with special emphasis on a nuclear test ban to avert both further poisoning of the atmosphere and an uncontrollable proliferation of nuclear arms that could easily bring on an atomic war. The latest disarmament conference at Geneva remains in deadlock and is returning the problem to the United Nations, the agency primarily responsible for its solution.

The United Nations has adopted many resolutions and guidelines on the subject. These call for progressive and balanced reduction of armaments and armed forces, under effective inspection until total disarmament is achieved. They call in particular for immediate suspension of nuclear testing under an "effective and impartial system of verification." But unless the United Nations gets down to a choice of concrete programs and fixes responsibility for the deadlock, it faces merely another exercise in futility.

The choice it must make is between two programs. One, submitted by the United States with Western support, is outlined in three draft treaties. The first calls for general and complete disarmament in three stages under international control based on internationally supervised national control posts. The other two, dealing with testing only, present two alternatives. One provides for an end of all tests but, pending development of better detection methods, with impartial on-site verification of suspected underground tests. Failing that, the second calls for an immediate end of all fallout-producing tests in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space (but not underground) without any control machinery whatever.

These draft treaties not only meet United Nations specifications. They also go to the outermost limits set by our own and free world security. They are made possible by scientific advances in our surveillance system. We must still insist on on-site inspection of possible underground tests because we have as yet no reliable instruments to distinguish between them and earthquakes, and the Russians who claim to have such instruments have failed to produce them.

The new policies may involve risks, but the greater risk is that we may soon face atomic threats not from one but from many states, including Communist China. Even a three-power ban may not completely stop atomic proliferation; but since (if there is no total ban, with inspection) the underground tests would presumably continue on both sides, we would be prepared to cope with any developments.

Soviet Russia also calls for general and complete disarmament. But the U.S.S.R. now rejects all international inspection by foreigners as espionage, in particular inspection of underground tests. It has canceled previous Soviet agreements and now asks for a mere paper pact on disarmament, including a new moratorium on all tests, without any control.

That is, of course, making a farce of the disarmament negotiations. The West would be taking risks beyond the limits of acceptability to embrace such a program, and so would the United Nations.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

STATEN ISLAND
YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM,
Staten Island, N.Y., June 25, 1962

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Your proposal for a permanent House Committee on Captive Nations is one of the finest moves undertaken by a Member of Congress. The need for a committee to bring to light the sufferings of the enslaved peoples of the world is a more urgent one than many people realize.

The establishment of the committee would aid greatly in waking the American people up to the fact that we are today embroiled in a great world conflict which has already resulted in the enchaining of over 1 billion fellow men. I am positive that by establishing the committee one good step toward freeing the Communist dominated peoples will be taken. We must engender a crusading spirit into the hearts and minds of the American people to spread freedom and liberty, to extend as our fathers did the rights and privileges of freemen to all corners of this earth. Defense of the free world is not enough; we must liberate our brothers. House Resolution 211 is the first step down the long road which I hope will lead to a world liberated from the malignancy of atheistic communism.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would have sent to the above address copies of House Resolution 211 so that members of the Staten Island YAF may learn for themselves the specifics of the resolution and in their own way undertake to spread the word of a truly freedom-loving and humanistic proposal.

Keep fighting.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM T. BOERUM,
President, Staten Island Young Americans for Freedom.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
July 18, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD:

I respectfully urge your support of the House Resolution 211. I hope I am sure you can help very much in that question.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

H. LUCHANKS.

JULY 19, 1962.

DEAR SIR: I respectfully urge your support of the House Resolution 211.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

C. CYMBALA.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 16, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in favor of the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

I respectfully ask you to support further the House Resolution 211.

Respectfully yours,

WASYL WYTWYCKY.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
June 12, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I fully support your House Resolution 211. It is the best proposal for waging the battle against the imperio-colonists of Moscow.

Sincerely yours,

OLGA CIPUZ.

Starts With Candle Salute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Philip E. McPartland, former editor of the Burlington Labor News has written an article, "Starts With Candle Salute," in which he speaks eloquently and appropriately on the "Moral Responsibility of Citizenship."

Believing this to be a significant contribution toward a better understanding of our responsibilities as citizens, and believing that a greater distribution of his cogent observations would be in the public interest, I am asking that this dissertation be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Burlington (Iowa) Hawk-Eye, Aug. 19, 1962]

STARTS WITH CANDLE SALUTE

(By Philip E. McPartland)

Probably this guest editorial, contributed upon the flattering invitation of the Hawk-Eye editor, might better be called "Moral Responsibility of Citizenship." But who would read a piece with a subject like that?

So, what is citizenship?

In these United States it is a condition that arrives with birth or completion of citizenship papers. Its era of adult responsibility, however, usually arrives without fanfare—unless it be a 21 candle salute lighted by a household match and fired off the luscious frosting of a birthday cake. The mantle of responsibile citizenship, in any case, floats to a resting place on one's shoulders without so much as a discernible rustle.

Yet, with all it's illusive presence, it lays upon one's conscience a definite moral responsibility—the responsibility of self-government.

How many citizens identify themselves with the Government of the United States, the government of Iowa, or their county or local municipal government? Yet, the President, Governor, supervisor and mayor are all acting and speaking for the citizen.

Whether the citizen voted for or against them, he formed part of the machinery that placed them there—the means of determining a majority. If he did not vote at all, he merely doubled the effect of another vote contrary to his. One cannot escape the responsibility of citizenship in a free democracy.

A good citizen therefore qualifies himself and votes at every election possible. Being qualified should mean compliance with registration requirements, and a serious effort to inform himself on issues and people involved.

A good citizen, too, participates in community efforts. He should do this because he respects his fellow citizens as such—or at least many or most of them—and is willing to contribute his talent and ability along with theirs for mutual benefit.

Community proposals, however, prove many and varied; sometimes of good and noble purpose, sometimes ill conceived, and unfortunately sometimes bearing a disconcerting likeness to a stone grinding upon the edge of someone's personal ax.

Discernment in accepting or rejecting any community project or public proposal is the citizen's right and duty, the honest and forthright exercise of which should bring him no public stigma or threat. What he chooses to support—or even to oppose—is a matter to be determined by his own conscience.

Responsible citizenship is unlikely to be well served when nonconformist citizens are harrassed for standing by their honest convictions. When individuals, in or out of public office, resort to the use of public ridicule, veiled threats, and implied reprisals to frighten fellow citizens into silence and acquiescence, they promote neither responsible government nor responsible citizenship. Willingness to appeal to reason and to abide by the final decision of the majority is essential to both.

Unfortunately today's citizen, by allowing himself to be robbed of his responsible part in government, is at the same time being robbed of his fundamental rights as a citizen. Some technical, professional and political experts are constantly seeking to convince the private citizen that he is incapable of governing himself, and he should therefore transfer the mantle of responsibility to better trained shoulders.

This he must jealously resist if he is to fulfill his part in preserving democratic government. At the same time he must improve his ability to continue his responsible part in government by greater and greater effort to understand the nature of government, the issues that face it, and the moral aspects of both.

So, upon completing this editorial pontification, we submit it for what it is worth—as the opinion of one private citizen.

Bon Voyage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of attending a dinner August 6 that was given by Pan American World Airways for the cadets and escort officers of the international air cadet exchange. In this program, we in the United States are hosts to 175 young men from 20 countries while our young men are guests in those 20 countries. I should like to commend Juan Trippe, president of Pan American World Airways, for sponsoring the dinner and proceedings in which I was pleased to participate.

The State of Maryland has had the honor of being host State to one of the delegations of visiting cadets. I hope that we shall have that honor again, because it gives us an opportunity to know young men from other countries of the free world a little better and them an opportunity to know us.

At the dinner in honor of the cadets and their escort officers, the toastmaster was Col. Barnee Breeskin, of the Civil Air Patrol, the coproject officer for the Washington phase of the exchange. I am happy to say that he is my constituent and one of the most distinguished residents of Montgomery County.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY made the principal speech of the evening. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, he delivered comments that were appropriate to the purpose of the evening.

Col. Paul C. Ashworth, U.S. Air Force, national commander of the Civil Air Patrol and a man who has served in the Air Force with much distinction, also was present.

I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks by Colonel Ashworth entitled "Bon Voyage" which appeared in the August 1962, issue of the Civil Air Patrol Times:

BON VOYAGE

Just 3 weeks ago, your group of 135 young men of 21 foreign countries of the free world were looking forward to their first visit to the United States. You were all selected to represent your countries and aero clubs in the 15th annual international air cadet exchange (IACE) sponsored by Civil Air Patrol.

You arrived in New York City where the Statue of Liberty stands in the harbor, with her torch of freedom held high in welcome to all visitors from foreign lands. Her welcome is symbolic—and the welcome extended to you by Civil Air Patrol in New York is also symbolic of the friendship and good will which is the essence of the international air cadet exchange.

Because of a tight timetable governing your brief tour in the United States, your stay in New York was limited. Yet every effort was made to give you the opportunity to see and do as many things as possible in that short time. I am certain that you will carry back to your country the memories of your boat ride around Manhattan, the visits to the United Nations and Radio City Music Hall, the special girl you danced with at the military ball on the Starlight Roof of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, and the fabulous international dinner party in your honor hosted by Lt. Col. Gene Leone at Leone's famous New York restaurant.

In the past 10 or 11 days you have discovered that there is a great deal more to the United States than the imposing skyline of New York City. You traveled to 21 of our great States—some of you going across the breadth of our land to the Pacific coast, others going to the Mexican Border, the Great Lakes region, the Atlantic coast, and the Great Plains States, where you were hosted by CAP wings.

Now you have returned to our Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C., where you are spending your last few days in the United States. You will tour this beautiful city, attend a space age briefing at the Pentagon, and visit the White House, home of President John F. Kennedy. At Bolling Air Force

Base you will attend a delightful international party at the officers club, and will be dinner guests of Pan American World Airways at the Statler-Hilton Hotel. You will have an opportunity to visit your respective embassies before departing for your homelands.

You have been guests of Civil Air Patrol on the 15th anniversary of the international air cadet exchange. At the same time your countries have been entertaining our CAP cadets with sights only found within the borders of your countries, and extending to them your own national brand of hospitality.

The impressions, the truths, the friendships and understanding gained through this 15th international exchange are lasting.

The youth of our free nations hold the key to international understanding and good will. The new horizons disovered through the exploration of space will demand greater understanding and good will among all nations.

You are faced with two journeys. The first will return you to your homelands in a few days—the second will begin a few years from now when you shoulder indivdiual responsibilities and begin your adult roles as potential leaders among your peoples. Use your "key" to international good will and understanding wisely, for it is desperately needed to unlock the hearts of all mankind.

On both journeys, I wish you success and bon voyage.

PAUL C. ASHWORTH,
Colonel, U.S. Air Force,
National Commander.

Safeguards in the American Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert a winning essay by Linda Litchfield in the 11th grade at the Clairemont High School, San Diego, Calif., entitled "Safeguards in the American Constitution."

It is most refreshing to find young America interested in the American Constitution upon which this great Republic was founded.

The essay follows:

SAFEGUARDS IN THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION

For nearly 200 years the Constitution and its safeguards have been a matter of heated controversy. The arguments still continue today. However, I think that nothing can change some of the basic principles laid down by the Constitution's authors in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787.

A separation of powers was set up, dividing the authority of our Government into three equally distinct Government branches: executive, legislative, and judicial. This separation insured that no despotic group or individual could gain control.

"How might such despotism arise? 'The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands * * * may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny'," wrote Madison. Thus, the three branches were independent of each other, and each was clearly defined. There was one more problem: It was possible that one of the Government branches might try to increase its powers so much as to be able to influence and control one or both of the others. The system of checks and balances was then set up to make sure that no Government branch could extend its authority beyond that which was originally intended. The system is "supposed to operate to 'provide some practical security' for each branch 'against the invasion of the others'." In addition, this prevented one branch or department of Government from too much interference with the rights of individuals and their property.

For example, the power of the legislative branch is limited by the constitutional provision that the President may veto a law passed by Congress. This Presidential power is in turn limited by congressional authority to override the veto by a two-thirds majority. The Senate approves treaties and most Presidential appointments. The Supreme Court not only has appellate and original jurisdiction but also the power of judicial review in which it can declare a law unconstitutional. Any Government official, whether elected or appointed, can be impeached for sufficient reason.

The Federal Government, on the whole, is restricted. Certain powers are denied to it, and it has to share its authority with the States. I think it is obvious that our Government is a Federal republic, which by definition shares its powers. "At no time, at no place * * * had the American people offically proclaimed the United States to be a democracy. The Constitution did not contain the word." The States themselves are also denied certain powers, and their authority is subject to that of the National Government.

Our liberties are protected by the Bill of Rights, and a free and republican form of government for us is insured. These cannot be changed by a mere whim of the people. To prevent rash changes in the Constitution, it was provided that amendments could not easily be added, and the very basic structure is almost unalterable. But the ultimate power lies in the people's hands. Only by their consent do they enter into government, only by their decisions are courses taken, and only by their consent does that government continue to have power.

I always thought one of the greatest things about the Constitution is its prudence. It is remarkable that so many possible dangers were perceived and guarded against, while at the same time, elasticity was provided. I feel it is amazing how the Constitution can be stretched to meet new demands of which its authors never dreamed. New problems can be solved by applying the provisions of the Constitution in entirely new ways and interpretations, yet it always retains constant vigilance against any and all encroachments upon our liberty. A poet has said, "And man turned into men in Philadelphia, practising prudence on a long-term lease."

To me the Constitution's authors not only wrote a plan of government that has since proved itself perfect for our needs and is one of the best ever devised by man, but it is also a great document of human liberty and of hope in the future. Somehow this hope was carefully interlaced among its lines so that all future generations might reap its benefits.

Lincoln: A New Portrait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered by Dr. S. K. Stevens, executive director, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. The occasion was a meeting of the Lincoln Fellowship of Pennsylvania held in Gettysburg, Pa.:

LINCOLN, THE COMMON AMERICAN

There is an old saying that "statesmen are dead politicians." There is really a lot of truth in this adage in terms of the way in which we evaluate our leaders in Government and affairs of state. Seldom is true greatness recognized in its own time. Rather, leaders are the victims of what oftimes has been an extremely vicious attack by their contemporaries. Some of this, of course, is inherent in the nature of our political system in which the party out of power operates on a basis of allout warfare upon those in power. A President, whether he wishes to or not, is looked upon as the party leader rather than as a national leader. Hence, he is inevitably a prime target for all types of abuse. It is in a large measure actually true that a political leader must die to achieve the distinction of being known as a statesman.

Unfortunately, I think we then in the passing years go to far in the other extreme. We make virtual folk heroes out of those leaders who happen to have been in office in certain critical periods of our history. Once these men belong to the ages they emerge as paragons of virtue, and assume an almost saintly status in our veneration of them. Thus, the first major biographer of George Washington, Jared Sparks, was careful in editing any of Washington's writings to correct any misspellings or poor grammar which might indicate that George was a rather ordinary person in terms of his command of the art of expressing himself on paper. It could not, of course, be thought of that Washington had a temper. Actually, it appears he did have a violent temper, though he learned to control it. And on occasion, he could rip out a few cuss words which would make a pirate blush. Indeed, Washington was made so entirely perfect that when Rupert Hughes wrote his more critical and realistic work it created a furore as "debunking."

I have chosen to treat Lincoln as a common American because I believe we have been guilty of creating in many quarters a false folk image of Abraham Lincoln. I must confess that the Lincoln Memorial leaves me a little cold for this reason. Here we create an image of a man who was full of all the wisdom of the ages, and bowed down by the burdens upon his shoulders. Today, no actor upon the stage dares to look like anything other than the Lincoln statue in the Memorial. Did you ever take time to think of Lincoln as he is thus portrayed in Washington, as compared with some of the contemporary photographs of Lincoln and more particularly with the way Lincoln conducted himself in his every day pursuits. I must admit, the comparison in terms of contemporary photographs is not as impressive as it might be in reflecting a difference between the monument and the man because of the horrible way early photographers had of stiffly posing their subjects. No person could escape from their clutches without the appearance of being mummified. The real Lincoln, however, as revealed in his everyday life as President, was far from an unreal human being. Indeed, a theory has been advanced that one of the reasons he wanted to come to Gettysburg to assist in dedicating the cemetery was to dispel a report that he has been guilty of levity when he had visited the Antietam battlefield site. Contemporary accounts are replete with stories of Lincoln's sense of humor and his ability to lighten a serious moment with a droll story. In fact, he was criticized for not taking his burdens seriously enough. This is a far cry from the picture of the man bowed down in his

sorrows which we find in the Lincoln Memorial. I honestly question whether Lincoln would himself like the treatment accorded him in the great national memorial. I am not suggesting, however, that we "de-Stalinize" the memorial.

What I should like to do is to review with you briefly a few thoughts about Lincoln the man—the common rather than the uncommon American. I think that such an approach to Lincoln will lead to greater rather than less appreciation of his true greatness. I like to review and confirm my concept of Lincoln, not by visiting the Lincoln Memorial, but rather by visiting reconstructed New Salem, Ill., and the Lincoln home in Springfield. I have heard severe criticism of the reconstruction of New Salem by experts concerned with the niceties of historical restoration. Probably they are correct, but I think the village as rebuilt, bears a very close general resemblance to the frontier town in Illinois to which Lincoln came as a young man in 1831. It was a village of log cabins, and log utility buildings, only one of which was more than one-story high.

If you will visit New Salem and let your imagination think of a tall, gangling, and very homely youth only 22 years old, who, up to this time had been something of a drifter with a drifter family following the westward moving frontier all the way from Berks County in Pennsylvania into Virginia, across the mountains to Kentucky, and finally into Illinois, you will begin to get a feeling for Lincoln, the common American. If there was anything uncommon about Lincoln's background it was that his family was poorer than the average and perhaps even less literate. Lincoln's mother was probably an entirely illiterate woman, great though her influence may have been upon his character.

Lincoln lived at New Salem 6 years—the most formative of his life. Here he broke away from the family tradition of poverty and wandering from clearing to clearing in the wilderness. He tended store, he managed the mill, he acted as village postmaster and even as a deputy surveyor—along with a lot of other odd jobs. Here he read law in his spare time and polished his study of English grammar. Here he made friends, for he was a likable fellow. Here he got into military service in the Black Hawk war. Here he was elected to the State legislature and served four terms. During this period Illinois moved its capital to Springfield and Lincoln came to know this larger Illinois city. In 1837 he left New Salem for the State capital to practice law. He was still so poor his surveying instruments were attached to pay his debts.

From here on the Lincoln story becomes brighter. Springfield was the center of Illinois political affairs and Lincoln had an aptitude for getting to know people. People liked this still gaunt and homely young man because he was not only good company, but he had good ideas. In the tradition of the American frontier, he was being recognized as a man of worth who could speak for a lot of people who could not speak for themselves. He was elected to Congress. His law practice grew until he was a corporation lawyer for the Illinois Central. He married into a good family. He had a very nice house for the times and was settled toward becoming a prosperous mid-American lawyer with a flair for politics and office holdings.

Now I submit this is still a picture of an ordinary man. Lincoln was no superman, nor did people think of him as such. He was an able man, and using to the very best his natural talents for winning friends and influencing people with whom he came into contact. Had it not been for the accident of the powerful national Democratic Party splitting in two, Abraham Lincoln very probably would have made no mark on the pages of American history. When that party did split over the slavery extension issue, there were plenty of ambitious political leaders in the East who were willing to have the lightning strike them as candidates of the new Republican Party for President. Two things over which Lincoln had absolutely no control worked to shove these men to one side, and to make an obscure Illinois lawyer the man whom the lightning would strike.

One was the fact there were so many prominent easterners such as Seward and Cameron anxious for the nomination that they killed each other off. Men prominent in Washington affairs were vulnerable to attack because their views were well known and their lives were an open book. Furthermore, their supporters were busy fighting each other and ended by blocking each other. The time was ripe for the familiar dark-horse, a well-known feature of American politics right down to the present. Secondly, by 1860 the Midwest had become an integral and important part of the national political system. Indeed, it held the balance of political power nationally between the North and the South. This situation dictated that the dark horse should come from the Middle West. Once nominated, the temper of the times and the split in the Democratic Party dictated the election as President of the darkhorse the Republicans selected as their candidate. Can anyone say that Abraham Lincoln had very much to do with becoming President of the United States? One can almost say he was the victim of circumstances. He was no super political leader who emerged before the people as the great leader. He achieved the Presidency in the very common, ordinary, and somewhat accidental way in which American democracy conducts its political affairs.

What about the Lincoln who came to Washington in 1861 and faced the agonizing crisis of disunion? It would be nice to paint a picture of a man with a blueprint for action who at once assumed full control of all governmental policy and action. That would be in the great man or Napoleonic tradition of history. Not so with Mr. Lincoln. It is impossible in my time limits to portray the confusion, the battle of personalities, and the contests for power which went on in the administration of Lincoln. These are being set forth with clarity and sharp interpretations in Allan Nevins' four volume history of the Civil War era, two of which already have been published. Much has been written, and more will be written during the centennial period, on the ordeal of the American Union which the Civil War represented in our history and on Lincoln. The Civil War was also the ordeal of Abraham Lincoln.

The more I study this era in our history, the more convinced I become that Lincoln's true greatness in terms of what he did in the years of his Presidency rests upon the fact that he was a common American. Lincoln grew into greatness as the pressures of civil war mounted about him. This is in the American tradition and as it should be. I think we as a Nation would rue the day when the strong man with all the answers appears as the solution to our problems.

What were the elements in Lincoln's character which transformed a common American into a great man? This is not a question easy to answer but I should like to suggest a few. First, and perhaps foremost, among Lincoln's attributes which enabled him to surmount the confusion, the conflicts for power, and the sharply antagonistic personalities contending for power and place all about him from his inauguration until the very day of his assassination, was his patient tolerance of other men and other views conflicting with or trying to dominate his own judgment. This made him a master of the art of practical politics. Lincoln was President at a time when the office was not surrounded by a vast official bureaucracy as it is today. The President had merely a secretary and staff. His office was open at all times to anyone who wanted to take up his time. Lincoln never had even a dependable Cabinet to which he could delegate certain responsibility. Rather it was made up of men who tended to hinder rather than help, and many of whom sought power and advantage at the expense of that of the President. In what other administration in our history could it be a subject of historical consideration as to whether a member of the President's Cabinet did not actually conspire in his assassination. Only a man with the greatest of tolerance and patience could have surmounted the swirling, snarling, confusing forces which operated in Washington throughout the years 1861 to 1865.

Coupled with tolerance was humility. Abraham Lincoln was ever a humble man. He was humble, I think, because he himself appreciated very well the nature of his background and the limitations upon his ability. At no time can one imagine Lincoln assuming the familiar pose of Napoleon or a Hitler. He knew full well that he was a common American and their spokesman, their instrument in time of dire trouble.

These virtues alone probably could not have enabled Abraham Lincoln to survive and to grow in stature in those perilous, turbulent years. Lincoln had a paramount ideal before him. As a common American, Abraham Lincoln had an abiding faith in the people, in the basic doctrine of equality of men as it was set forth in the Declaration of Independence. This was a principle not merely applied to the Nation created by that Declaration, but to the people of the enitre world. At Philadelphia on February 22, 1861, in an impromptu address connected with raising at Independence Hall the flag which bore the star of the new State of Kansas, Lincoln said, "I have never had a feeling politically which did not stem from the Declaration of Independence." He went on to say, in a vein which reappears in the Gettysburg Address, that the great principle of the Declaration of Independence was not merely the assertion of freedom from England but "that sentiment which gave liberty not only to the people of this country, but to all the world, for all future time." In a prophetic note he ended by saying that if the Nation could not be saved without giving up that principle "I would rather be assassinated on the spot than surrender it."

At Harrisburg the next day he told the general assembly, "I feel that, under God, in the strength and wisdom of the heads of these masses, after all, must be my support * * *. I am quite sure I do not deceive myself when I tell you I bring to the work an honest heart; I dare not tell you that I bring a head sufficient for it. If my own strength should fail, I shall at least fall back upon these masses, who, I think, under any circumstances will not fail." So spoke Abraham Lincoln in humility and with tremendous faith in the ultimate wisdom and justice of all the people. This was the common American at his best.

I need hardly add that Lincoln's address at Gettysburg, which we commemorate today, rests upon this same basic philosophy. Lincoln warned in his opening sentences that the ideal of a nation "conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal" was at stake. We were engaged in a great Civil War testing not just whether the United States but "any nation so conceived and so dedicated might long endure." He urged all who listened to humble themselves before those "who here gave their lives that this Nation might live." And he concluded with that classis declaration that "government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Hence, today I present to you Abraham Lincoln the common American, rather than

the heroic strong man of invincible will and supreme intelligence. Nevertheless, he gave in his brief period of service at the Nation's altar himself the last full measure of devotion that government of the people, by the people, for the people should not perish from the earth.

I submit to you that this is the Lincoln worth careful study—worth thoughtful study in these days by those who would seek to know the essence of the American ideal. The strutting, petty dictators who at brief intervals cloud the pages of human history with their stridant mouthings and succeed from time to time in throwing great fear into the hearts of millions fall into petty insignificance in due time. They become unpleasant memories of the past. Democracy can never hope to match them in their strutting, their mouthings, or their capacity for brief intervals to create fear. Indeed, we should never try to do so.

The essence of the democratic process is such that we fumble and we make mistakes. We put up with what is sometimes not merely vexing, but senseless opposition to sound national policies. I am disturbed today by the growth of some feeling in this country that these processes cannot suffice in meeting the challenges which confront us. There are those who appear to be demanding the strong man approach and using, so help us, the precedent of the minute men of the Revolution. This is the negation of the principles upon which Lincoln based his philosophy of action in national crisis. The Lincoln way is the American way. Lincoln has come down to us as one of the greatest, if not the greatest single figure in our political history, because he was the common American forged in the fires of a civil war into a greatness he otherwise would have never known.

Susquehanna River in Pittston Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles A. McCarthy, a historian of my congressional district, has written a series of articles on the early history of the Susquehanna River, particularly in the Pittston area. This series has been appearing in the Pittston Sunday Dispatch and as part of my remarks today I include the latest installment which was published this past Sunday, September 2.

The article follows:

FROM LOCAL HISTORY: SUSQUEHANNA RIVER IN PITTSTON REGION—THE FERRY BRIDGE WAS OPENED TO INITIAL TRAFFIC IN 1851

(By Charles A. McCarthy)

Expansion of anthracite mining operations in the Pittston region, with the consequent influx of men to work in the mines, and their families, was a prime factor in the development of the need for a bridge across the Susquehanna River in this area.

By an act of the Pennsylvania legislature, approved March 29, 1844, Pittston Ferry Bridge Co., was incorporated and was authorized to erect a bridge across the Susquehanna River at Pittston Ferry, as the region was then known.

John L. Butler, of the Butler Coal Co., of Pittston, obtained the charter on behalf of the bridge company.

Commissioners named in the act to construct, operate, and supervise the bridge included: Amos Smith, John Sharp, James Jenkins, Peter Polen, George Shoemaker, Thomas F. Atherton, and John L. Butler.

TOLL RATES

The act authorized the following toll rates:

For every carriage or wagon having four wheels and drawn by four horses, used for the purpose of trade or agriculture, 50 cents; for every such carriage drawn by two horses, 25 cents.

For each four-wheeled pleasure carriage drawn by four horses, $1; for every such carriage drawn by two horses, 25 cents; for every such carriage drawn by one horse, 10 cents.

For every two-wheeled carriage drawn by one horse, 10 cents.

For every sleigh or sled drawn by four horses, 25 cents; for every sleigh or sled drawn by two horses, 20 cents; drawn by one horse, 10 cents, with a rider, 6¼ cents.

Every vehicle drawn by oxen, at the same rate as the like drawn by horses, rating two oxen for one horse; mules to be rated the same as horses; for every horse driven or led, 4 cents; for every mule driven or led, 4 cents.

For every score of sheep or swine, 20 cents, for every head of horned or muley cattle, 2 cents, and for every footman, 2 cents.

EXCEPTIONS

Provided, that any person going to or returning from divine services on the Sabbath Day, all persons going to or returning from elections, or military trainings, or students or children attending seminaries or school of learning in the neighborhood of such bridges, shall at all times be excepted from any tolls.

Solomon Brown, president of the Pittston Ferry Bridge Co. issued a call for the annual meeting of the stockholders to be held at the home of John S. Carpenter, on January 6, 1850.

PLANS ADVANCED

On February 5, 1850, plans were advanced for the construction of a single-lane, 750-foot-long, covered wooden bridge in approximately the same location as the Rope Ferry. The contract for its erection was awarded to Truscott and Hurlbut, contractors.

According to the Wilkes-Barre Advocate, of February 13, 1850, a meeting of the bridge company stockholders was scheduled at the house of J. D. Forsman, at Pittston Ferry, for March 6, 1850. The purpose of the meeting was to elect a president, secretary, six managers, a treasurer, and such officers as deemed necessary. Among those named were: Amos York Smith, Samuel Vandenburg, E. F. Ferris, John L. Butler, and William S. Reddin.

The Wilkes-Barre Advocate of December 11, 1850, announced an annual meeting of the Pittston Ferry Bridge Co. stockholders for the election of officers. The meeting was to be held at the house of John S. Carpenter, at the "Head of the Valley," a hotel near Carpenter's Creek, on the west side, on January 6, 1851. The announcement was signed by Solomon Brown, president of the bridge company.

ON THE BOARD

Theodore Strong, the manager of the Butler Coal Co. company store since the early 1840's, who served as superintendent of the First Presbyterian Church Sunday School in Pittston for 50 years and as president of the Pittston Bank and its successor, the First National Bank of Pittston, for almost a half century; and William S. Reddin, an Irishman who fought in the Napoleonic Wars, a businessman who also served as postmaster at Pittston Ferry, an organizer of the first Masonic Lodge in Pittston and a member of the original group which founded Saint James Episcopal Church of Pittston, both served on the bridge company's board of directors in its early days.

William Schooley of Exeter was a stockholder of the bridge company in the 1850–51 circa.

Isaac C. Shoemaker eventually succeeded George Shoemaker on the board of directors and in 1875 his son, Jacob I. Shoemaker, was named to this position which he held until the bridge company was sold.

STONE WORK

It was mentioned in the press on January 15, 1851, that President Daniel Harding and Secretary E. F. Ferris, of the Pittston Ferry Bridge Co., were requesting proposals for the completion of the stonework on the bridge. Bids were to be in by January 25, 1851.

High water in the Susquehanna River that spring was a deterrent to workmen engaged in building the bridge.

On October 15, 1851, two abutments of the bridge were completed, at which time work was proceeding on the third abutment.

When complete, the east side of the bridge rested on the top of the towpath of North Branch Canal.

The Ferry Bridge, the first bridge to span the Susquehanna River in the Pittston region, was opened to traffic on Saturday, December 6, 1851. The first persons to use the bridge were Mrs. Peter Polen and her son, James Polen. They drove across it in a horse and wagon. At the time the bridge was opened, it was stated it would be roofed and sided the following spring.

Address of Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland, 1951–59, Dedication of Hager House, Hagerstown, Md., Friday, August 31, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the city of Hagerstown is now celebrating its bicentennial anniversary. For 200 years Hagerstown has been rendering service not only to its own citizens but to the entire Nation. Its sons and daughters have helped to fill the needs of successive generations by their industry and ability. Many have gone forth from Hagerstown to found new communities in many parts of the Nation. On August 31, 1962, I had the privilege of attending bicentennial ceremonies during which the home of Hagerstown's founder, Jonathan Hager, was dedicated as a museum.

These ceremonies were attended by a large and distinguished group of Marylanders which included former Governor William Preston Lane, Jr., former U.S. Senator George L. Radcliffe, Mayor Winslow F. Burhans of Hagerstown and many others. The principal address was delivered by the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland from 1951 to 1959. Governor McKeldin's remarks are appended because of their interest not only in relation to the city of Hagerstown but for their historical prospective which is of value to the whole Nation:

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, 1951–59, DEDICATION OF HAGER HOUSE, HAGERSTOWN, MD., FRIDAY, AUGUST 31, 1962

I am greatly honored by being invited by Mrs. Frank W. Mish, Jr., chairman of the Jonathan Hager House Restoration, on behalf of the Bicentennial Committee of Hagerstown, to make the principal dedicatory address on this occasion.

Many people deserve credit, thanks, and congratulations for this restoration and this dedication here today, but one name stands out among the rest—for her persistence, her knowledge of the area's lore and her love for the history of the region—and her ability to keep interest alive—Mrs. Mary Vernon Mish.

I am also greatly honored to be associated with my very good friend, our distinguished former U.S. Senator, George L. Radcliffe, president of the Maryland Historical Society, who is here on this program to dedicate the Hager House. And, of course, as usual, I am extremely happy to be associated with your fine Congressman, CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, who is always interested in and in attendance at affairs affecting the people of this district.

To thoughtless minds that never penetrate below the surface it may seem odd that we pause just on the eve of the commemoration of one of the fiercest battles in which American soldiers have ever engaged to pay tribute to a man who died long before the battle and who, during his lifetime was never a man of war. But if one has only a slightly greater understanding of the significance of things it is more than appropriate, it is great fortune, that we may turn our minds at this moment to the accomplishment of Jonathan Hager, founder and builder, rather than avenger and destroyer.

For it is what men like Hager did, rather than what the armies did in this area that remains our heritage to this day. I do not mean to depreciate in the slightest that value of the memories that come down to us from the battlefield. I simply point out that all we know of Jonathan Hager we can accept and cherish; but among our memories of the battle, we must pick and choose. The valor, the devotion, the sacrifice of the men who strove on the field, both those who called it Antietam and those who called it Sharpsburg, are indeed infinitely precious. But blood and agony and corroding hatred were also part of the battle; and those things we should bury in oblivion as quickly and as deeply as we may.

About Jonathan Hager we know much less, in fact, we know very little because his activities were not dramatic enough to make a deep impression on the minds of his contemporaries; but what we do know is of the very essence of the best American tradition.

The scanty records state that when Hager acquired this property he found on it "a sorry house," which means one that probably was not much good to begin with and had become dilapidated in the course of time. The researchers of Mrs. Mish's committee have found evidence that the walls of this house were of wattles, daubed with mud, regarded as flimsy construction, even in that day.

This house Jonathan Hager replaced with the one that you see before your eyes—built of stone laid so well and truly to the line and the plummet that its walls have endured for 220 years.

If you call that a small achievement by comparison with the tremendous event that took place more than a hundred years later, I shall not argue the point; but if you disdain it because it was small, you are wholly and terribly wrong. For Hager's small feat was directly in line with the best American tradition, while the clash of arms was outside that tradition, indeed, a contradiction of the tradition.

For the real greatness of this Nation was not created in the smoke of battle. It came into being through the process of finding a sorry house and replacing it with a good one. I speak only in part of houses built of brick and stone, or nowadays of steel and glass; I speak also of other kinds of houses, habitations of the mind and spirit, invisible and intangible, but just as real as these sturdy walls that Jonathan Hager raised.

Augustus Caesar, certainly one of the greatest of Roman emperors, fought many wars and gained many brilliant victories; but at the end of his long reign his great boast was not that he had defeated both Pompey the Great and Anthony, and had brought the whole world under his rule, but that he had "found Rome brick and left it marble." This country, like Augustus, has defeated powerful enemies and overthrown many great empires; but its supreme achievement was also like his—it found the North American continent a wilderness and has converted it into a garden.

How can it be denied, then, that Jonathan Hager, when he found a sorry house and built a good one, was going straight down the road traveled by the great emperor and the great Nation? True, he acted in a small way, but he acted in a great tradition, and that makes his worthy of our respectful memory.

I think, too, that our memory of this man should be more than respectful. I think it should be joyful. For the path that he followed is open to all of us, as a military career is not. Every American whose instincts are civilized, including those who wear the uniform of the United States, ardently hopes that no armies will ever again clash on our soil, and wishes, if he dare not quite hope, that American soldiers may never have to go into battle again on any soil. So, while we hold Lee and McClellan in the highest honor, we neither can nor wish to imitate their achievements.

But there is not a man or a woman within sound of my voice, or anywhere on this continental expanse who cannot imitate Jonathan Hager. We cannot all build stone houses, but why should we? We have the highest authority for it that there are houses not made with hands, dwelling places of the mind and spirit which we can neither see nor touch, but each of which nevertheless is, "a stronger thing to abide and stand than the square stones of Rome."

We present-day Americans have come into the greatest inheritance that ever fell to a nation. Even in material things it is the greatest in history and in things of the mind and spirit it is my proud belief that it is even greater. Our forefathers built and have left to us in the moral and intellectual realm palaces of a magnificence beyond compare. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Gettysburg Address, to mention only three are habitations of the mind and spirit that put to shame the marble halls of Augustus.

But if we are honest with ourselves, we must admit that our inheritance includes also some pretty sorry houses. "All men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights" is a concept statelier than the mighty dome that Hadrian set upon the Pantheon, and it is part of our heritage; but we have also inherited from darkened minds and twisted souls certain religious and racial prejudices sorrier than the mud-daubed wattles that Jonathan Hager swept away.

"We here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom)—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth" is also our inheritance, and it is a mansion of the soul by comparison with which golden Ophir is tinsel and silken Samarcand rougher than sackcloth. But we have likewise fallen heir to blind greed that would sell humanity for less than 30 pieces of silver, to the same stupidity that presented the cup of poison to Socrates, and to the cowardice that would readily sacrifice all the rest of the world to purchase an utterly false sense of national security.

So let us not flatter ourselves with the delusion that the age of the pioneers passed with Jonathan Hager, and that there is none of his kind of work left for us to do. There are plenty of sorry houses left upon our land, plenty of opportunities for builders who build so true that their walls will stand for centuries. America is great, but is can be greater; and the decision as to whether or not it shall rise to its high destiny will be our decision. Jefferson said that the earth belongs to the living, but it is true only in the sense that Eden belonged to Adam, whom God put into the garden "to dress it and to keep it."

Some of our American forefathers—not all, but enough—understood and accepted this responsibility to us, their descendants. Every many among them who found a sorry house and replaced it with a good one was acting in that spirit; and their labor created for us the rich estate that we enjoy. But in so doing they also created for us the responsibility "to dress it and to keep it"; and that responsibility we must discharge, for failure to do so would brand us as unworthy successors to such men as Jonathan Hager.

Antitrust Is Probusiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the August issue of Fortune magazine entitled "Antitrust Is Probusiness" by the Honorable Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General in Charge of Antitrust Matters.

Because of the misunderstandings arising because of the vigorous antitrust actions of the administration and the hysterical antibusiness charges raised by violators and indeed by some segments of the otherwise responsible business community, it is important that this excellent article should be widely read.

The study written by a distinguished scholar, attorney, and jurist gives an insight into the mature aims and devotion to the public interest so well exemplified by this distinguished public servant. The article gives a still more important understanding of the basic concepts underlying not only the antitrust law but the sound enforcement practices and program of the present administration conducted by this outstanding and propublic member of the legal profession.

The article follows:

ANTITRUST IS PROBUSINESS

(By Lee Loevinger)

The Department of Justice is not out "to control business activity generally or to impose arbitrary limitations on mere size." So says the man in charge of antitrust.

Is the present administration of the antitrust laws a fire-breathing dragon threatening business, especially big business, and thus antagonistic to free enterprise, or is it merely a paper tiger intent on watching mouseholes for minor violators while oblivious to the lumbering tread of elephantine monopolies? The first view has been reflected recently in the business press, where terms such as "antibusiness," "wild," and "fanatic" have been used to describe the current trustbusters. On the other hand, a liberal Senator recently expressed the second view, characterizing current antitrust enforcement as "toothless" and suggesting it was ineffective and inactive in attacking big business monopolies.

The facts support neither view. The antitrust laws themselves are the foundation and the bulwark of the free-enterprise system. Those in charge of enforcing the antitrust laws understand this thoroughly and apply the laws to achieve this purpose. The present administration of antitrust is both thoroughly probusiness and steadfastly antimonopoly.

Why, then, are such charges made? It may help in answering this question to know that the same criticisms have been voiced by those with similar viewpoints throughout the history of antitrust enforcement.

Since the purpose of the antitrust laws is to set standards for business conduct, their enforcement necessarily involves legal proceedings against business. The Antitrust Division is no more antibusiness when it seeks to enforce the standards of business conduct set by the antitrust laws than the bar association is antilawyer or the medical society is antidoctor when it attempts to uphold ethical standards of professional conduct. Nevertheless, many businessmen seem to feel that business itself is being persecuted merely because antitrust cases are necessarily brought against some business firms.

On the other hand, those who are particularly fearful of the concentration of economic power feel that the Antitrust Division does not go far enough. The Antitrust Division neither has nor seeks authority to control business activity generally or to impose arbitrary limitations on the mere size of business. It attempts only to enforce the standards specified by the statutes as construed by the courts. In doing this it brings cases only after thorough investigation and where it is thought that competent legal evidence fully supports charges that the law has been or is being violated. This does not always satisfy those who think that the power of big business should be curbed; such critics feel that antitrust enforcement is too timid and to limited to be effective.

Certainly antitrust enforcement is not perfect. No human effort is. Differences of judgment among lawyers are very common; and enforcement effort may be too rigorous at some times, too lax at other times. However, a long-range view suggests that generally a reasonable balance is maintained. A fair appraisal and understanding of antitrust enforcement can be made only in the light of the objectives and methods of the laws involved.

THE OBJECTIVES OF ANTITRUST

In a broad view the antitrust laws are statutory statements of ideals of the American people. Although there is infinite variety of detail possible, there are few fundamentally different methods by which society can achieve its economic aims. All involve the existence of laws that control or limit economic activity in some degree. Any society that has a business and economic system is based upon legal order. Most business enterprises, such as corporations, partnerships, trusts, and joint ventures, are creation of law, as are such elements of business as money and credit, bills and notes, contracts, property, and, most basic of all, the reasonable expectation of law and order. The law, which creates these economic instruments, also specifies their use and limitations.

Basically, there are three legal methods of doing this. The first is by a limitation on the form and extent of economic power. This is the method of competition or free enterprise. The second is by government's determination of the standards of economic performance, made effective either by the imposition of sanctions for failure to comply or by the offer of incentives for compliance. This is the method of regulation. The third alternative is the control of economic institutions by government through ownership. This is the method of socialism.

All governments utilize some elements of each method to some extent. In the United States the post office is owned by the Government and may be regarded as a socialized enterprise. The transportation industry is largely subject to government control, and is an example of the method of regulation. However, with respect to the greater part of the economy, the American method is that of free competitive enterprise maintained by the antitrust laws.

The first and most obvious objective of the antitrust laws is to avoid exploitation of the consumer by maintaining reasonable prices and good quality. It is assumed this can best be achieved by the maintenance of competition.

The second objective is economic efficiency, which is thought to result from an impersonal and automatic control of prices, products, quality of goods, and, perhaps most important, the allocation of manpower and resources. Our economic system is based on the premise that the automatic and impersonal action of the free market is likely to be more effective and more efficient in the long run than personal judgment, whether exercised through governmental power or through private monopoly.

The third objective is to insure technological and economic progress by full utilization of the diversity that a free competitive market offers. Our great resource of individual inventiveness and personal initiative can be fully utilized only in a free-enterprise system. Under a system of cartels or monopolies, inventions and technological innovations ordinarily will be employed only by the cartel or monopoly with established power over the relevant field. As one of our greatest judges, Learned Hand, has said, the Sherman Act is based on these premises: "That possession of unchallenged economic power deadens initiative, discourages thrift and depresses energy; that immunity from competition is a narcotic, and rivalry is a stimulant, to industrial progress."

Fourth, by preventing concentration and thus maintaining dispersal of economic power, the antitrust laws lay the foundation and secure the conditions for preserving political democracy and civil liberties. In an economy composed of a single monopoly or a series of cartels, an individual skilled in a business, craft, or profession might find only a single employer. The overwhelming majority of citizens would then find their personal freedom wholly dependent on the tolerance of their employer. Precisely this situation exists in countries with a wholly socialized economy. Private monopoly is merely slightly less extensive in its effect. In the words of a recent opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court, "the Sherman Act was designed to be a comprehensive charter of economic liberty."

Finally, by seeking to maintain and preserve economic freedom the antitrust laws secure something valued as an end in itself. The American people believe freedom to be inherently good and to be an essential part of that ethical system in which the ultimate standard of value is the welfare of the individual.

WHAT THE LAWS PROHIBIT

As modern industrial society is complex, so are the laws that govern it. The antitrust laws are numerous and involve many special rules for specific situations and some immunities and partial exemptions. Basically, however, four simple principles are involved.

The first and most general principle, in section 1 of the Sherman Act, is that all contracts, combinations, and conspiracies in restraint of trade are prohibited. Here the word "trade" means competition. The second, in section 2 of the Sherman Act, is that it is unlawful to monopolize, attempt to monopolize, or combine to monopolize. The third, in section 7 of the Clayton Act, is that no corporation shall acquire or merge with any other corporation where the effect may be to lessen competition substantially or tend to create a monopoly.

The fourth principle is in the Robinson-Patman Act, which is an amendment to section 2 of the Clayton Act. This prohibits discrimination in price between purchasers of the same commodity where the effect may be to lessen competition or tend toward monopoly. The act permits price differentials that make due allowance for differing costs arising from different conditions of sale, and it also specifies a number of detailed rules as to what is discriminatory.

There are some additional substantive provisions in the antitrust laws, such as the prohibitions against tying agreements and against interlocking directorates. But these are merely efforts to specify particular practices that Congress regards as restrictive of competition.

HOW CASES ARE SELECTED

The basic antitrust enforcement policy of this administration is to achieve the objectives of the law by compliance. It does not seek to impose penalties upon business, to secure injunctions, or to win cases just for the sake of a statistical record. Were the program of enforcement perfectly effective, there would be universal voluntary compliance and litigation would be confined entirely to borderline cases in which the application of general principles required judicial determination. No such utopian condition seems imminent or prospective. However, such a hypothesis emphasizes the point that statistical measures of cases filed are not a good indication of the effectiveness of enforcement activity.

With respect to the specific cases that are brought, there is an inescapable burden of selection imposed by the limitations of manpower and money. There always are more complaints than it is possible to investigate fully and more potential cases than it is possible to prosecute.

Within this area of discretion, cases are now selected on the basis of economic significance and potential contribution to the achievement of antitrust objectives. Enforcement activity is not fashioned to fit any preconceived ideas as to which sections of law should be enforced or which areas of business should be prosecuted. While errors of judgment are always possible, enforcement policy now is guided solely by the policy and standards of the statutes on the basis of the specific facts in each case. Despite some published opinions to the contrary, enforcement policy and activity during the past year have been neither hostile to business nor punitive. For example, the proportion of criminal cases to total cases filed in 1961 was the lowest of any year in the last decade. (See table, below.)

Law enforcement does not, and should not, involve the promulgation of policy at all. It is rather the expression of the official view of the law. So some of the questions concerning enforcement can be answered best by discussing specific aspects of the law.

ARE ANTITRUST STANDARDS UNCERTAIN?

Businessmen and their spokesmen sometimes claim the antitrust laws are too indefinite and uncertain. They say that this uncertainty makes it difficult or impossible to comply with antitrust standards. On the other hand, some business critics, often the same ones who claim uncertainty, also assert that the laws are too rigid and inflexible. It should be evident that it is impossible for laws to be both flexible and certain at the same time.

The antitrust laws combine both flexibility and certainty, both generality and detail, as do most of our important laws. The basic principles are stated in broad general terms, requiring interpretations by application to specific situations. Thus, decisions in specific cases build a body of judicial precedents that supplements the statutes and provides guides to the meaning of the laws.

This is the common-law method of developing legal doctrine and is fundamental to our system of government. For example, the legal principle of most common and general application is the rule imposing liability for negligence. The rule states generally that anyone who fails to exercise the care of a reasonable man and thereby injures another must pay for the damages caused. This is a principle of wide application stated in simple and general terms and most flexible in its application. The interpretation or application of this principle has given rise to literally tens of thousands of cases that give specific content to the general rule.

Similarly, the Sherman Act is a charter of freedom that, in the words of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, "has a generality and adaptability comparable to that found to be desirable in constitutional provisions. It does not go into detailed definitions which might either work injury to legitimate enterprise or through particularization defeat its purposes by providing loopholes for escape. The restrictions the act imposes are not mechanical or artificial."

Early in the history of the antitrust laws, the Supreme Court declared that the Sherman Act was to be applied in a reasonable manner, which would not interfere with the conduct of business by all normal methods, but would prohibit all acts and practices that restrained competition. Over the years the courts have recognized that certain practices are of a kind the statute was clearly intended to prohibit. Thus the Supreme Court has held that certain acts are unreasonable per se and therefore illegal. These are principally price fixing of every kind, agreements among competitors for the allocation of customers or territories, group boycotts, the pooling of profits by competitors, and other similar types of agreements not to compete.

Regarding these practices, there is great certainty and little flexibility. On the other hand, practices that are not per se unreasonable must be judged by their purposes and probable effects in the light of all relevant economic circumstances. For these, there is considerable flexibility but correspondingly less certainty.

WHAT IS A MONOPOLY?

Enforcement of the Sherman Act provisions prohibiting monopoly inevitably involves some flexibility. Monopoly is a situation in which a single seller has complete control of the supply of a commodity in a given market. In real economic existence, such a situation is seldom, if ever, found. To pose a paradox, in theory monopoly is a practical concept, but in practice it is a theoretical one. In practice a single seller controlling the entire supply of a commodity is rarely found because the concepts of both commodity and market are so broad that there is nearly always some degree of competition with even an apparently monopolized product. Thus in the famous cellophane case the Supreme Court held that Du Pont did not have an illegal monopoly of cellophane, although it was the dominant manufacturer, because the "relevant market" included many other flexible packaging materials that were competitive with cellophane.

The courts do not deal in terms of perfect competition or complete monopoly, but practical applications of these concepts. As long ago as 1911, in the Standard Oil case, the Supreme Court said that the Sherman Act forbids "all contracts or acts which [are] unreasonably restrictive of competitive conditions." In the same case the Court referred to "substantial power over the * * * product" as amounting to monopoly. In a series of subsequent decisions the Court has made plain that monopoly is the power to control the price of a product or to exclude competition from a market.

There is no quantitative test to identify monopoly, and indeed the concept of economic power itself cannot be analyzed directly by objective criteria. Unfortunately, no objective or operational criterion of monopoly has been furnished by economics or any of the social sciences. While legal standards are vague, their application in prior decided cases gives them at least as much precision as the definitions provided by other disciplines for such concepts as competition and monopoly.

The Department of Justice continues to be guided by the Supreme Court's statement in the 1932 Swift case that: "Mere size * * * is not an offense against the Sherman Act unless magnified to the point at which it amounts to a monopoly * * * but size carries with it an opportunity for abuse that is not to be ignored when the opportunity is proved to have been utilized in the past."

Market power is recognized as an economic circumstance that is relevant in some, but not in other, antitrust cases. Practices such as price fixing, which are unreasonable per se, are equally forbidden for all business, whether big or small in market power. On the other hand, a far wider range of practices is prohibited only where they appear to be unreasonable in the setting of economic circumstances. In such cases the relative market size of the enterprise involved clearly is important. An acquisition or merger by a company already very large in relation to its market is far more likely to lessen competition substantially or tend to create a monopoly in violation of the antitrust laws than a similar transaction by a small company. But size alone is not controlling. For example, in a recent case the Antitrust Division acquiesced in the merger of two large oil companies, Standard Oil of California and Standard Oil Co. (Kentucky). The situation was such that the merger would create new competition in an area previously dominated by a larger oil company, Standard Oil of New Jersey. The introduction of new competition outweighed the increased market power of Socal and Kyso and consequently was thought to be consistent with antitrust objectives. Competition, rather than size, is the ultimate criterion.

Although we cannot formulate any exact quantitative definition of monopoly, we can thus establish standards in terms of intent, of conduct, and of the maintenance of competitive market conditions that serve as reasonable guideposts from case to case and mark out the area of illegal monopoly power.

HOW TO GET CLEARANCE IN ADVANCE

The Department of Justice seeks to give as much assistance as it properly can to businessmen who are attempting to comply with the antitrust laws. The Department is not authorized to give advisory opinions to private persons or enterprises. However, it has a program, which has been in existence for a number of years, that permits the submission of matters to the Antitrust Division for "release" or "clearance" letters.

Antitrust "release" letters permit an advance review of business plans or proposed programs to ascertain whether they involve risk of criminal prosecution if adopted. The procedure is relatively simple and informal. Its elements are these:

1. A request for a release or clearance letter must be submitted in writing to the Department of Justice.

2. The submission must contain a full disclosure regarding a specific business proposal. If additional facts or data concerning the proposal are sought by the Antitrust Division, the information must be supplied upon request.

3. The submission must relate to a plan or program that is purely prospective and not operative. No consideration will be given to a request for an expression as to operations that are being conducted at the time.

4. The facts and plans disclosed must affirmatively show that the plan and the proposed operations will be fully consistent with the antitrust laws.

5. In the event of such a submission and showing, a release letter will be issued waiving the Government's right to institute criminal proceedings against the parties involved.

6. In the event of a submission that does not affirmatively show that the plan and proposed operations will be fully consistent with the antitrust laws, the Government may refuse to take a position or make any comment upon the proposal; or it may advise the parties that the proposal appears to be contrary to the antitrust laws, if that is the case.

7. The Government in any event reserves the right to institute civil proceedings if it appears that the legality of the activities or program in question should be tested.

8. If the plan in actual operation or the activities engaged in go beyond the statements set forth in the submission, or if there was not a full disclosure in the submission made to the Department of Justice, the Government reserves the right to proceed either civilly or criminally.

9. The submission of a request for a release or clearance letter does not prejudice the position or any right of the party making the submission. The submission may be withdrawn prior to the issuance of a letter. An unfavorable opinion by the Department of Justice is not binding, and does not legally preclude the proposed action if the party making the submission is prepared to defend the action in court.

10. The submission of a request for a release or clearance letter does not by itself create any immunity from prosecution, and such submission does not preclude the Government from taking any action that may be appropriate upon the basis of facts disclosed. Release and clearance commitments are given only in formal written communications. Such commitments are never given and are not authorized to be made except in writing over the signature of a responsible official of the Department of Justice.

Although the Government's commitment under the release program is limited to a waiver of its right to proceed in a criminal case, as a practical matter such a letter will seldom, if ever, be issued if the staff of the Antitrust Division believes that either a civil or a criminal proceeding should be instituted on the basis of the proposal submitted.

MINIMIZING UNCERTAINTY

The merger-clearance program differs chiefly in the nature of the commitment, since legal actions against mergers are, except in the most extraordinary cases, civil rather than criminal. Under the merger-clearance program the submission and disclosure required are the same as under the release program mentioned above. Where the Antitrust Division finds that a proposed merger does not raise serious questions under the antitrust laws, it may issue a "clearance letter" stating that the department does not in-

tend to take legal action against the merger if consummated, but that it reserves the right to institute action later if subsequent developments or operations involve antitrust violations.

The Department of Justice cannot answer abstract or hypothetical questions, but it does seek by the release and clearance program to give businessmen as much assurance as possible under the antitrust laws and to minimize the inevitable area of uncertainty that is involved in the application of all law. Last year the Department received 18 requests for release or clearance and issued 8 letters.

It must be recognized that there is uncertainty not only in law, but in business, and, indeed, in living itself. Economic trends, the future of the market, international relations, public taste, technological developments, and a host of other matters are less predictable than the application of the antitrust laws. Those who would assume the power of management decision must be prepared to assume the responsibility for dealing with such uncertainties. One of the country's most prominent and successful businessmen, speaking to a chamber of commerce meeting recently, said: "I am tired of people who are trying to make business so complex that this is an excuse for violation of law or business failure." Those who fail can always find excuses. But there is no more reason for failure to comply with the antitrust laws than for failure to comply with any other laws.

ANTITRUST ABROAD

It has been argued in the past that, whatever the domestic situation, the antitrust laws handicapped American business in foreign markets, and that it should be permitted to cartelize or monopolize in order to compete abroad. Consideration of this argument requires examination of the situation in other industrial countries.

Since the close of World War II, nearly all the major industrial countries have adopted new or substantially strengthened statutes to prohibit restrictive business practices. More significantly, a strong antitrust provision was written in the Treaty of Rome establishing the European Economic Community (Common Market) in 1957.

In December 1961, elaborate and extensive regulations were adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Common Market making more specific the antitrust provisions of the basic treaty. These became effective March 13, 1962, and require the filing of a wide variety of business agreements by August 1. (The deadline may be extended to November 1.) The regulations provide that violation of the antitrust rules of the Common Market may incur a maximum fine of $1 million or 10 percent of a company's annual gross income, whichever is greater. In this country, the maximum fine for antitrust violation is only $50,000. In addition, the organization of the Common Market has a Director General of Competition, with a substantial staff; and there is every indication that the antitrust provisions and regulations will be efficiently enforced.

The principal difference between American and European antitrust laws is in the method of dealing with monopoly or dominnant enterprise. The prevalent European view is that government regulation of economic performance can prevent or ameliorate abuses rising from the possession of dominant market power. In contrast, the American view is that one of the principal values of competition is its function as an automatic regulator of economic performance, and that this is largely lost by resort to direct government regulation. Therefore, we seek to prevent undue concentration of economic power in order to preserve an economic structure that will operate satisfactorily by the interaction of impersonal market forces.

One of the basic reasons for these differing American and European viewpoints is the relative size of the national markets. Many European countries have national markets no larger than those of some American States of even than some of our larger metropolitan areas. Within those markets it may be impossible for an enterprise to become large enough to engage in certain industries without being dominant. Further from the European viewpoint, it has been necessary for their enterprises to become large in relation to their own markets in order to compete with American enterprises in world markets.

It now appears that as the European market expands with the advent of the unified European community, the problems of monopoly or market domination and relative economic size will become essentially the same for Europe as they have been for America. This will probably tend to bring the European and American views into closer correspondence. It would be anomalous indeed were this country now to take the position that American enterprises must be permitted to cartelize or monopolize in order to compete with European enterprises. It is clearly the time for us to move forward toward a fuller realization of our ideals rather than backward toward the now outmoded systems and laws that European countries have themselves largely abandoned.

COMPETITION IS GOOD FOR BUSINESS

Some businessmen, in both America and Europe, would prefer to avoid competition. This is understandable. Competition requires effort and ability; it poses a constant threat of failure for indifference, indolence, or incompetence. Cartels and monopolies promise assured profits without requiring commensurate effort, ability, or achievement. Nevertheless, competition, and the qualities that sustain it, have been the foundation of American business and American achievement. As President Kennedy said in his New Orleans speech in May, "trade and competition and innovation have long been a significant part of the American character." There is increasing recognition today in Great Britain and in continental Europe, as in the United States, that cartels and monopoly breed economic stagnation and weakness, while competition leads to economic vigor, progress, and prosperity.

Thus the antitrust laws and their enforcement, by protecting and strengthening the role of competition, are truly and profoundly probusiness. This is demonstrated by the fact that of more than 1,200 complaints received by the Antitrust Division each year over two-thirds are from businessmen—small, middle-sized, and big businessmen. The great majority of antitrust investigations and of cases filed under the antitrust laws are the result of requests by business for this legal protection.

All businessmen should realize, as many do, that by keeping the economy free, by preventing restrictive and unfair practices, by protecting competition, and by permitting equality of opportunity for all, antitrust enforcement maintains the conditions that permit and foster the growth of American business.

Beyond this, the antitrust laws offer one common ground upon which those of varying political and economic viewpoints can, and indeed must, meet if Americans are to work together in building greater economic strength for the future. The concept of pluralism in the organization of power is the one positive and practical program that can challenge the strength of tyranny arising from the monopolistic concentration of power under the totalitarian systems.

This concept is built into the very structure of our Government. The Constitution itself provides for a system of checks and balances by organizing the power of government into three separate and coordinate branches. In the economic as in the political realm, we must insure that power is organized on a pluralistic, not a monopolistic, basis. The spirit of antitrust is the spirit of liberty, and its method is the most practical means of securing and maintaining liberty that mankind has yet learned.

The antitrust scorecard

Year	Total cases filed	Civil	Criminal	Price fixing	Mergers (sec. 7, Clayton Act)	Individuals indicted
1961	60	41	19	28	[1] 18	44
1960	90	57	33	70	11	53
1959	63	29	34	42	10	54
1958	59	33	26	33	5	25
1957	56	30	26	34	1	57
1956	46	29	17	25	6	55
1955	54	33	21	25	5	81
1954	34	23	11	12	----------	37
1953	29	10	19	21	----------	73
1952	36	24	12	13	----------	58
1951	49	35	14	29	----------	62

[1] Another antimerger case was brought under the Sherman Act.

UNESCO: Communism's Trap for Our Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert an article by Mr. Paul Harvey, news analyst, American Broadcasting Network, entitled "UNESCO: Communism's Trap for Our Youth."

I have long contended that UNESCO posed a threat to our American youth by imposing international control of our curriculum by an international organization which does not embrace the American ideals liberty and freedom.

This article points up the fact that UNESCO is not tolerated in the Communist countries, as these countries do not accept the precept of UNESCO. Therefore, this program is simply preparing the youth of the free world to the subjugation of international communism. I hope that every parent who has children in school will read this and demand that the UNESCO program be forbidden in our American schools.

The article follows:

UNESCO: COMMUNISM'S TRAP FOR OUR YOUTH

When your child comes home from school parroting some phrase about the "world society of the future—" are you going to tell him it's wrong for him to "love his neighbor"?

When he comes home talking of world brotherhood, are you going to contradict the Christmas message of peace on earth and tell him that all men are not brothers?

Now wait a minute.

When your child goes from house to house for UNICEF, collecting coins for underprivileged children overseas, are you pre-

pared to tell him he should not be charitable to those who have less?

When his elementary school textbooks indoctrinate him with the philosophy of world government are you prepared to insist that world war is preferable?

Are you against world government just because the American Legion is against it?

I have been wrestling with these questions and seeking answers for several weeks.

I told you there was evidence that UNESCO was brainwashing patriotism out of our youngsters and substituting the United Nations for God.

I said if I found fire where I'd smelled smoke we'd go into it further. Well, I have gone into it further, I have burned a lot of late lights digesting and analyzing all the evidence, pro and con, concerning UNESCO, and I have reached a conclusion which I want to discuss with you, but you are going to have to wade with me through some of the preliminary evidence.

UNESCO is the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. It is an organization with thousands of publications too vast to enumerate.

UNESCO booklets are distributed through the National Education Association and the PTA to teachers and students.

UNESCO literature is issued through YMCA groups and churches, radio and TV programs, newspapers, magazines, civic groups, government agencies, but mostly directly and indirectly, it's philosophy of one-world government is aimed at the classroom.

Twelve persons connected with the administration of UNESCO have been identified in sworn testimony before congressional committees as Communists.

Seven have been connected with Soviet espionage.

Six others refused to appear before Government loyalty boards.

But now we are not challenging the loyalty or the motives of this organization. We are seeking to determine whether, whatever their intentions, a whole generation of young Americans is getting brainwashed for their own good or somebody else's.

Sometimes the defenders of the citadel, when they get desperate, become as vicious as the attackers.

The critics of UNESCO have sometimes let themselves get so worked up that they start flailing their arms, swinging in all directions, becoming at once ineffectual and slightly ludicrous.

Let us, instead, suppose that the world government idea is a good one.

Let us admit that all God's children would be better off living together than fighting and that the next generation of children all over the world should be reared to this understanding.

That national boundaries are not something to fight over and that a United Nations is the way to discuss our disagreements.

That it is unnecessary to spill any more blood defending the American flag if we all pledge allegiance to the U.N. flag.

That is what the UNESCO disciples believe.

They are not all Communists. They are decent citizens who are convinced that this is the better way and that is why they are indoctrinating your child today through UNESCO literature and UNESCO influence in his elementary school classroom.

But this is the rest of the story:

Russia is not thus indoctrinating Russian children.

This is the larger issue. This is the point well-meaning veterans organizations and others have missed. While we are allowing our youngsters thus to have their American allegiance brainwashed away so they do not consider Americanism worth fighting for anymore, the Russians in their schools (and I wouldn't say this if I couldn't document it with current evidence) continue to preach and teach their elementary school children that communism is the only efficient government.

That God does not exist.

That Russia will one day rule the world.

Now wait a minute.

I'm talking now to the mostly good American parents who have been convinced that UNESCO was the proper way to prepare the next generation of world citizens to live together.

Don't you see what's happening?

Through UNESCO—American schoolchildren are being influenced away from their national allegiance.

American schoolchildren are being indoctrinated with world government ideals while the Russians prepare their children to run that world government.

They are softening the patriotism of our next generation, while hardening their own.

The end result of this lopsided indoctrination is too obvious to require elaboration.

Ex-Senator William Benton, speaking to UNESCO, said, "We are at the beginning of a long process of breaking down the walls of our national sovereignty. In this UNESCO can be, and indeed must be, the pioneer."

But Red Poland has pulled out of UNESCO. And Red Hungary. And Red Czechoslovakia.

They will not use this "break down the walls" and love everybody stuff in their schools.

They will love communism and teach communism and only we, United States of Americans will dilute our patriotism until the American flag is a faded rag not worth fighting for.

You may have difficulty getting your school administrators to admit that they are using UNESCO materials even if they are. The best test is to learn directly from the students if they are being taught that "collectivism is inevitable," that "polygamy is acceptable," that "private property has no place inthe new order," that "we are all citizens of the world with an allegiance to all nations and to no one nation."

School teachers are vulnerable.

The president of the National Education Association, Dr. Lyman Ginger, says Russia "has an excellent school system." The basis for his judgment is that the Russian teacher is paid 1½ times as much as the Russian skilled worker. Of course, that fact loses its luster when you realize that the Russian factory workers have to work 80 hours and 49 minutes to buy one pair of shoes.

Yet many American teachers have felt that in adopting the international outlook they were being modern and imitating what their NEA president calls the Soviet Union's "excellent school system." Though Russia's schools are not teaching internationalism.

Communism over God. Russia over all.

Ask Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt about her recent visit to Russia. Are Soviet schools incorporating the UNESCO program? Certainly not.

Are Russian schools teaching that one nation is just like any other nation and that we must all live together under a United Nations? Certainly not.

Our UNESCO literature is indoctrinating American children with the idea that we should have an international anthem. Would Russian schools thus teach Russian children? Certainly not.

Mrs. Roosevelt found the Russians demanding an indelible allegiance to their own country. Seeking in every way to strengthen their own country. Teaching their children, by the Pavlovian reflex method, precisely and only what the Soviet state wants them to believe. As Pavlov taught his conditioned dogs, they teach their children to hate the United States.

Is there nothing to encourage international peace in their curriculum? Nothing. The classroom is a nationalistic weapon of the Kremlin.

The UNESCO Seminar—which guides American teachers—states, "One of the chief aims of education everywhere is to develop those qualities of citizenship which provide the foundation upon which international government must be based." No, not "everywhere."

So before we rewrite our textbooks, as the UNESCO Seminar recommends, "on a view to improving them as aids to international understanding," let's be sure everybody else follows suit or the implication is obvious. We grow nationally soft while they grow hard and strong. Only a Russian citizen or a Soviet subversive would want that.

Now please don't come back at me with the many old pro-and-con arguments that have been weighed by the American Legion and the VFW and countless civic and discussion groups for years. I have, I believe, seen them all and I am not concerned with more hash from these leftovers.

We are not debating whether UNESCO's philosophy is good or evil.

We are not opposing the United Nations. We are not denouncing international cooperation.

We are not challenging the rightness or the wrongness of editing textbooks to put the U.N. in and rewriting history, to take the United States out and coaching our teachers to erase national boundaries from the minds of the next generation.

I only object to this one fact. It is not who is right that is of greatest importance, but what is right.

That while we are thus conditioning our children to salute a mongrel flag, Russia is conditioning her children to salute only the hammer and sickle.

Suppose you and I were trainers, training professional fighters and you taught yours to fight and I taught mine to dance the minuet, we'll have a real happy party. But Russia is training fighters.

Now, you say, what can you do?

If you are concerned with preserving patriotism in the next generation of Americans then the youngster first must hear it at home.

Dad's constant complaining about unfair taxes and "crooks in Washington" does little to instill faith and confidence in our Government. It must be counterbalanced with a respect for the strengths of our Nation, rather than a constant exaggerated emphasis on its weaknesses.

After the youngster has heard a little star-spangled conversation around the house, it's time for the parents to attend PTA meetings and to take an active, intense, personal interest in what the school is teaching and what it is not teaching.

If you don't others will.

If you figure you can stay home and play cards on PTA night and "let George do it," you'd better expect the worst because George doesn't always agree with you.

The FBI has established that the Communists in the United States, under orders from Moscow, are making a concerted effort to work through respectable forums, including PTA groups. If you can't take an interest in directing your child's education, they will.

They are. Right now.

Much has been said about what Americans stand for. Equally important are the things Americans won't stand for.

And for goodness sake, understand this: Everybody who subscribes to the UNESCO philosophy of education is not a Communist. He may unwittingly be their tool, but a host of them are decent, honorable, entirely sincere parents like yourself who believe this is the best way to prepare their children for a future day when they must live with others in peace or perish in an atomic ash pile.

Don't try to shout them down, but try patiently to help them understand that

Russia, as usual, is not keeping her part of this cooperative bargain.

Russia permits no UNESCO indoctrination of her youngsters.

Russia teaches "communism without compromise," and unless we prepare young Americans to believe in freedom without compromise, so that they will keep it strong and defend it against all enemies (foreign and domestic), we are dooming tomorrow's Americans to the fate of today's Hungarians.

But if we can revive in America's youth some of the faith of our fathers then this will again become the land of the free and the home of the brave and strong enough to keep your enemies at arms length which is quite enough to hope for in our time.

Can Government Operate in a Vacuum?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, my very good friend, Dr. John W. Lederle, the president of the University of Massachusetts, among his many and varied interests is particularly concerned with the problems of keeping the public service responsive to the needs of the people, and of continually improving the quality of the service rendered by our public servants.

An address which he delivered recently at the annual conference of the College of Business Administration at Boston College has just come to my personal attention. I have found it both interesting and stimulating and it is a pleasure for me to see that his remarks are inserted in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues here in the Congress:

CAN GOVERNMENT OPERATE IN A VACUUM?

(By John W. Lederle, president of the University of Massachusetts)

Few would deny that the major theme of this conference is timely and important. Practically every moment of the day this country's citizenry hears about government and its operations through every means of communications—radio, television, newspapers, magazines, speeches, and person-to-person conversation. We cannot deny that there is certainly communication about government.

The daily headlines draw our attention to the immediate situation, to the events of the hour. But we are less aware of the routine process of political communication that is not susceptible of headline attention but is fundamental in maintaining our country as a viable democracy.

Certainly political communication is related to my assignment this morning—which is to discuss the question, "Can government operate in a vacuum?" I will postpone my answer to this question until the end of my remarks. Although this answer might come as something of a surprise to you, I ask you to consider it carefully and to compare your own thinking with what I offer in evidence here.

First, let me reiterate the importance of communication to our form of government. Of all forms, democratic government most requires for success an atmosphere of free two-way communication between governors and governed, between elected officials and electors, between bureaucrats and citizens. In the absence of such an atmosphere of free communication the governors may develop and sponsor programs which run directly contrary to popular desires. In the absence of such an atmosphere the governed may actually frustrate enlightened and otherwise acceptable governmental programs simply through lack of understanding.

It is essential that public officials report to the public frequently and fully. And it is essential that the public listen, using discrimination in screening the propaganda and self-praise from the informational and educational. Only after listening can citizens logically decide whether the governors should be continued in office. Democratic government cannot operate except with broad public understanding of what those at the moment entrusted with office are trying to do. Yet today many members of the body politic have their ears closed. They do not pay attention to their responsibilities as citizens. Indeed they seem to repudiate their basic responsibilities. They will defend democracy, yes, even with their lives, but will not practice or live democracy.

I should now like to explore three kinds of obstructions of free communication between governors and governed which it seems to me prevent our American democratic institutions from operating to the fullest.

The first obstruction I find is related to a negative attitude many citizens have toward Government. I find a widely held feeling of estrangement between citizen and government, an almost illogical expression of belief in democratic government coupled with a revulsive withdrawal from the responsibilities and practices of democratic citizenship. More than lipservice is necessary if democratic government is to succeed.

There are several types of this estrangement between citizen and Government. One type of estrangement takes the form of a feeling of frustration. "What can I do about the problems of war and peace, of unemployment, of care for the aging? What good is my one vote?" The individual suffering with this type of malaise can see little relation between the civic function of going to the polls to vote and the actions of his elected representatives as they pass laws in the State legislature or the Congress. The symbolic act of voting does not automatically produce a governmental program corresponding in detail with his desires. His concept of the public opinion process is often oversimplified and leaves no place for compromise. He does not understand that much more than voting is involved—that active participation in political parties is an important element in the process of reducing atomistic individual voter differences to a limited number of reasonably orderly but different programs to be proposed as legislative alternatives. Because Government in fact frequently fails to solve pressing problems satisfactorily—unemployment, farm surpluses, and war continue with us—our frustrated voter stops going to the polls, throws up his hands with a sigh of hopelessness. Frustration leads to estrangement.

Another type of estrangement has more positive roots. I refer to citizens who literally have no use for democratic processes. I would call such individuals antidemocratic, for in a very real sense they not only have a feeling of hopelessness, but they deny the very possibility that anyone in public office could have integrity. They believe that every officeholder is "on the take." This kind of cynicism, this disbelief in the fundamental integrity of most public officeholders, leads them to repudiate our form of government.

Given today's headlines and radio and TV news with their emphasis on graft and corruption and chicanery in government, is it any wonder that many citizens become disaffected? But these righteous citizens are wrong. A few bad officials should not destroy our confidence in the possibility of integrity in government. As for myself, I have known countless fine, honest public officials. My own father gave 50 years of dedicated service. And so I resent it when a citizen irresponsibly classes all public officials as grafters, clockwatchers, parasites.

The other day I was talking to a Boston representative in the general court who said constituents not infrequently tell him that they view all public servants as corrupt. Such comments strike him like a sharp slap in the face. What is worse, the citizens making derogatory remarks about official honesty are at the same time often asking the legislator to do something that is improper. When he refuses, they ridicule him for his claim of honesty, obviously implying he is either in fact dishonest or a fool, and if he is the latter he is the more to be pitied.

Instead of talking about corrupt government and corrupt politicians, it is high time we concentrated our talk on the corrupt private citizens who corrupt politicians. Some years ago one of my friends in the legal department of a leading auto manufacturer called me asking for suggestions for a speech the company president was scheduled to give on governmental ethics. I gave him a number of references and ideas. Then I concluded the conversation by saying that I would have no respect for his president if he focused exclusively on the ethics of public officeholders: "Let him remind his audience that politicians don't bribe each other. Private citizens do the bribing and deserve some of the stigma." There is too much preaching today about governmental corruption which ignores the nonofficial participant. Whether in government or private enterprise, venal practice is equally reprehensible. We should be equally vehement in stamping it out.

Ironically, one way in which we tend to corrupt our public officials, both elected and appointed, is in our failure as a society to see to it that good service is adequately compensated. In a society which has been for over a hundred years industrially oriented to the production of material goods, public service—like public education—has frequently appeared to many to be a luxury or fringe benefit to which little material rewards should be assigned. Thus we have tended to be parsimonious in salaries for public service, while being magnanimous in the high standards of integrity and service demanded of those serving us in a public capacity.

In my opinion, we cannot realistically expect to make great headway in breaking down the barrier of estrangement unless and until we are ready to compensate public service at a rate comparable to other callings. This must be done throughout public service, including legislative and elective offices. Reasonable remuneration is no ironclad guarantee of integrity, but it is a building block for creating a structure of government based on the concept of service, rather than on servility. Criticism leveled at proposals for raising low salaries are therefore wrong: a worker should be worthy of his hire.

If a substantial body of our citizens has an attitude of complete cynicism about the existence of honesty and dedication on the part of public servants, it is little wonder that the next attitude is one of disengagement from government and civic responsibility. As a former professor of political science, teaching courses in political parties and politics, I can testify to the widespread antagonism toward politics and the politician. Students as they arrive at college are already prejudiced by their parents and by mass media against politicians and government employment. It is a paradox that at the same time that government is becoming more pervasive and its services more widespread with a consequent premium on recruitment of a share of the very ablest

personnel, there is a corresponding attitude on the part of youth of antagonism toward government employment. Instead of viewing public employment with approval, both parents and students give it low status. Elective public office has the lowest appeal of all.

I do not know how many of you have looked into teaching of social studies at the high school and junior high school levels, but I can assure you that if you go very far in such an examination, you may be appalled. Public school people are making great progress in such areas as the teaching of mathematics and science, but practically nothing is being done in the area of the social sciences. As a college teacher, I have long been disturbed at the amount of erroneous information our high school students bring with them to political science courses in college. There is no understanding of the role of the politician in our society. The assumption that all politics is dirty and that all politicians are corrupt can lead only to the conclusion that the democratic form of government itself is unsound and unworkable. How we can have our form of government without politics is beyond me, but some of the teaching at the high school level would assume that ideally we should conduct our form of government in a political vacuum.

Estrangement or disengagement is a widespread phenomenon today. Whether it is a product of mere frustration over the seeming inability of the individual or society to solve complex problems, or whether it is based on more positive philosophical considerations which deny the possibility of honesty and integrity in government, estrangement stands as a bar to communication. Disengaged citizens neither listen nor do they see any value in listening. They deny the very possibility of democratic government, and by refusing to participate in it they render the task of the remaining interested and participating citizens more difficult.

The second obstruction to communication is the trend toward impersonalization of government. Inevitably as the population of a legislative constituency increases, it becomes more difficult for the legislator to talk personally with each citizen, or even visit each town or village in his constituency. So too as the total population of a State or the Nation increases it is harder and harder for each executive department official to get out and learn what the people are thinking or to explain the departmental program. This leads to further disengagement.

Today it has become easy for an official to rationalize the impossibility of effectively reaching, personally, any substantial body of the public. Hence, officials too often sit in their swivel chairs in Washington or the State capital and opine on the state of the Nation or on public opinion in the State. But if democratic government is to work, officials must get out and take the popular pulse. While statesmanship certainly involves more than keeping your ear so close to the ground you get dirt in it, true statesmanship is possible only in a climate of two-way communication.

The British have a wonderful phrase for it. In the tight little isle the member of Parliament goes home to his constitutency over the weekend, even though during the working part of the week he spends nights in London in parliamentary activity. This practice of homing once a week is referred to as "nursing his constitutency."

Today, all elected officials and administrators must fight against the notion that it is no longer possible to have useful interplay between official and citizen. No constituency is too large, no official so wise, that substantial time in communicating with the public is anything but mandatory. If government is not to become callous, inhuman, indifferent, officials must everlastingly be out meeting and talking with the citizenry. The impact of government is at the citizen level, and no official can ignore the views of the citizen at the grass roots. Fine slogans and idealistic programs developed at the capital or administrative headquarters too frequently become distorted in their administration at the grass roots. All the fine-feathered words of the agency head are for nothing if he does not get out in the field and see how they are in fact implemented.

The public university president who, because of his endless problems, goes less and less to alumni meetings, who drops his old habit of eating lunch with faculty members, who has no time for question-and-answer sessions with students and parents, will shortly be more and more out of touch. In this day when educational institutions face the danger of diluting quality as they try to absorb a goodly portion of the legions of students knocking at our doors, it is all the more important to find time for face-to-face human relations with the most precious possession that parents have entrusted to our care. Greeting and shaking hands with 1,850 University of Massachusetts freshmen may be arduous, but it is an important symbolic act as an institution increases in size. I should like to think it is something more than that—that it helps materially to establish in each student's mind the truth that the institution cares about his welfare, that he is not just a punched card in an IBM machine.

Too often today our State Department representatives in foreign lands spend most of their time in the capital. They fail to get a real feel for the country in which they are resident. Instead of mixing with the populace they live in American enclaves speaking only English, bringing up their children in American schools, walling themselves off. Too often, although obviously for different reasons, public officials within our country unconsciously wall themselves off from sufficient contact with the public. Elected and appointed officials alike need to get out where communication takes place.

Whether it be a Governor Williams visiting the dying communities of the upper peninsula of Michigan, or a President Magsaysay traveling from barrio to barrio in the Philippines or a President Kubitschek visiting the jungle villages of the upper Amazon never before seen by a Brazilian chief executive, the two-way communication which takes place gives a lift to the democratic process. Hopefully things learned by the leader will be followed by better administrative programs. And the attitude of the populace, previously one of hopelessness and of being forgotten, becomes transformed. The government cares, as governments should care. Government becomes personal again, not some callous, indifferent, inhuman institution always demanding taxes but giving little in return.

All this requires energy and drive and, above all will. It is much easier to stay in one's office protected by a secretary from phone calls and visitors. Who cares whether information gained from a chance visit or phone call might prevent bad governmental action? There are just too many people, distances are too great and, besides, our travel budget is too small.

A public official must want to communicate. He must want to go out and see for himself. He must believe that by listening, not just talking, by seeking criticisms of his program, not merely corroboration of its efficacy, he will best do his job. There is no place for the thinskinned. Two-way communication is the way of democracy. There must be a constant struggle against ennui, against the temptation to sit in our own offices by day and sleep in our own beds each night. We must not assume that the era of personal attention is over.

If we are to bring the governors and the governed into profitable association, there is a third obstruction that must be removed. It has to do with the means of communication, with language, particularly as it is used in the printed matter that we issue to keep our constituencies informed.

There is, of course, a basic dilemma surrounding government publicity in a democracy. Those who hold public office have tremendous advantages—for their very actions are news. For example, some of you will remember that in the 1940 presidential campaign Wendell Wilkie could talk about the conflict in Europe being our concern but F.D.R. could blanket this talk by the mere action of the destroyers-for-bases trade. Free radio and television time for press conferences and news program announcements are readily available to the "ins" while the opposition frequently has to purchase access to mass mediums. It is little wonder that what the "ins" consider to be information and education is classed by the opposition as advertising and propaganda.

Legislatures are almost always critical of expenditures for agency publicity. They are constantly sniping at additions to agency personnel for public relations or at publications which they feel are unduly illustrated and glossily printed on fine paper stock. Even so able a Senator as Robert Taft became incensed when American troops landing in North Africa, as part of propaganda warfare, distributed to the natives a slick-paper publication on America with a big picture of F.D.R. on the front cover. Taft viewed this as a propaganda piece for F.D.R. and the Democratic Party, and failed to see any validity to the point that, to the outside world at war, F.D.R. was the personalization of the American war effort, just as Churchill with two fingers raised in the victory salute was a symbol for Britain. To the North African this made sense, yet to an intelligent American it was a perversion of the democratic process.

As Professor Hyneman has pointed out, "Free elections become a farce if the people do not have sufficient knowledge to support judgments on political questions. * * * A great part of the information that is relevant to the issues of the day is in the possession of men and women in the administrative branch. * * * It is essential, therefore, that most, if not all, administrative officials report to the public frequently and fully. And it is most desirable that the report be truthful and unbiased." After explaining that such reports inevitably are political documents, almost invariably reflecting favorably upon the agency program and ignoring if possible its failures, he stresses that "It is paid for with your money and mine. It is prepared by public officials and employees; the costs are borne by taxes. You and I thus pay to hear or read the story of what the group in power say they have done or propose to do." This is our dilemma.

Frankly it is my own judgment that we err on the side of insufficient Government-sponsored information of an educational character. We are so afraid of propaganda that we fail to educate. I react against the many Government publications coming out in forbidding format and phraseology. I do not believe Government reports need appear in a dull gray garb. There should be room for freshness and personality in expression. Government style should communicate, not estrange.

Some of you will recall the press conference in the early stages of the last war at which President Roosevelt was announcing the blackout ordinance. Apparently he had not read the ordinance in advance of the conference. When he did proceed to read it out aloud to the assembled gentle-

men of the press, he discovered that the word "illumination" was repeatedly used, and that the bureaucrats in their desire to be precise, had produced a very lengthy document designed to meet all contingencies. After he had gotten some distance into the regulation he finally stopped and exclaimed with obvious irriation: "This will have to be rewritten. What they mean to say is: 'Turn out the lights.'"

You may remember that at one stage of the war the Office of Price Administration, concerned about the problem of communication, added to its staff a man named Rudolf Flesch. Flesch was trained as a lawyer in his native Vienna. He arrived in this country as a refugee, and took his doctorate at one of the New York City institutions. Flesch had become interested in the problem of writing English as a language that can be readily understood. It has always intrigued me that the highly trained OPA lawyers, brought up in the American educational system, did not know how to communicate, and that a refugee from Vienna should be hired to simplify their language in order that Americans might understand what OPA wanted.

Here is an example of an OPA rule before it was de-Fleschedi "Unless the Office of Price Administration or an authorized representative thereof shall, by letter mailed to the applicant in 21 days from the date of filing application, disapprove the maximum price as reported, such price shall be deemed to have been approved, subject to nonretroactive written disapproval or adjustment at any later time by the Office of Price Administration." When Dr. Flesch got through with this, it read as follows: "You must wait 3 weeks before you can change the ceiling price you applied for. OPA can always change that price. If they do, they will write you a letter." On another occasion Flesch asked, "How does a bureaucrat say, 'I love you'?" His answer: "Complete assurance of maximum affection is hereby implied."

The language of Government publications frequently is a professional jargon that is not intelligible to the uninitiated. Prepared by researchers and specialists, such efforts need skilled editing or rewriting in order to appeal to a popular audience.

It is amazing the amount of professional jargon that slips into any agency's publications. My background is in the field of public administration, and I read Government publications related to accounting, purchasing, budgeting, and organization problems. Public administrators habitually use their own particular form of shorthand. I remember a few years ago taking my wife to a meeting of the local chapter of the American Society for Public Administration. Since she had not enrolled in any political science courses in college and since I do not make political subjects the main topic of conversation at the dinner table, she arrived at the meeting in pristine innocence. That evening I paid special attention to the speaker's vocabulary, concerned as I was about my wife's comprehension. The speaker threw around such terms as "line and staff," "span of control," "functional departmentalization," never pausing to define them. It suddenly dawned on me that so far as my wife, whom I consider to be an intelligent person, was concerned, he might as well have been talking Greek. I suspect that many of our governmental publications are written in Greek—or, at any rate, communicate as much to an English-speaking public.

Again, I am reminded of the city manager of Manistee, Mich., who had been attending our city management clinic for 3 days. As he was expressing appreciation for a stimulating experience and saying goodby to me, he remarked that he was going to try to forget those "$64 words" we had been using when he got back to Manistee, because they simply would not understand him up there.

That was a city manager who knows his business. Realizing the crucial importance of communication, he also recognized the wide divorce between the language that experts use among themselves and the language that must be used if persons uninitiated in the hocus pocus of the profession are to understand. I therefore feel that a third kind of obstruction to communication which leads to government's operating in a vacuum is related to language. Not enough attention is paid to the format of publications or to careful editing so that they will be attractive and clearly understood.

In concluding my remarks, I would like to revert to the question standing as the title of this talk: Can Government Operate in a Vacuum? The answer: It can, unfortunately. James Bryce in his monumental commentary on "The American Commonwealth" asserted that the "ordinary American voter does not object to mediocrity" in his candidates for public office. This was Bryce's view of a 19th century condition. In the 20th century I am afraid there is a very great danger that the American voter, for the reasons I have cited, might simply not object, period. He may become so estranged, and so complacement in his estrangement, that he will not object to mediocrity, to venality, to injustice—to all those forces that make mock of democracy.

Government—and all who serve in it—must be dedicated to inspiring the citizen to care. There must be the same militant offensive on the citizen's interest that marks our efforts to sell commercial products—with this difference, that the process be creatively directed to giving citizens the chance responsibly to talk back to government, to examine and to criticize, to protest and to object. Government will have ceased to operate in a vacuum, total or partial, when government's officialdom with all its expert resources abets and fosters this communications process.

Salute to Mike Thompson: Outstanding 12-Year-Old Native Kansan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, all this summer our congressional office here in Washington has benefited from the services of an outstanding native Kansan, James Michael Thompson, as a volunteer page boy. Mike Thompson was born at Fort Riley, Kans., on September 19, 1950, and is one of the most energetic and outstanding boys I have ever known. His parents, James O. and Mary Thompson, ought to be proud of him, indeed, I am sure they are.

On a purely volunteer basis Mike Thompson served in our office, in order to help improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our operation here on behalf of the people of our district in Kansas. He performed that function with distinction and energy and with great good spirit.

At the same time, he learned a great deal about the operation of his National Government. Mike shook hands and visited with many of the greatest leaders of our Nation today: Majority Leader CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma; Minority Leader CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana; Minority Whip LES ARENDS, of Illinois; and many, many others. When Mike enters the seventh grade at Williamsburg Junior High, in Arlington, this fall, I know he will be able to make a fine contribution to his classes, partly as a result of his rich and worthwhile experience this summer.

We all salute Mike Thompson, outstanding 12-year-old native Kansan. We were proud to have him in our congressional office this summer. He made a solid and worthwhile contribution to our office, and to the people of our district.

Police-Dog Teams: An Ally Against Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I have been impressed with the efficiency of police-dog teams in the District of Columbia. This year the committee has recommended the expansion of this program, which not only helps to reduce crime, but to apprehend criminals. I have recommended this program to the police officials of the city of New York because of the rampant crime taking place in the suburban areas and in projects. Police dogs are intelligent and are silent sentinels who can aid police officers to do a better job of crime prevention. This program of obtaining police dogs as an ally of police officers is meeting with favor throughout the United States.

Mr. Sam J. Slate, CBS radio vice president, and general manager of WCBS, recently editorialized on the radio on this very important expanding program. I believe his words merit consideration and reading.

The text of his remarks follow:

Scratch a visitor to New York City and 9 times out of 10 what do you find? A touch of envy over this great town of ours, just as often as not expressed in these words: It's a great place to visit. But I wouldn't want to live here.

How many New Yorkers have heard this remark and shrugged it off with a smile? Supposedly we're the lucky ones, living and working in the midst of unequaled variety and vitality. But lately we've come to recognize a core of truth underlying this statement. New York visibly is growing into a city of violence, one that shows that symptoms of becoming not only too dangerous to live in, but even to visit.

Newscasts and newspapers are filled with reports of knife duels, gang fights, muggings. No area is safe from vicious assaults and robberies. A sampling of the city's weekly rundown of brutality includes a motiveless beating in Central Park, a rape attempt in

a housing project. The breakdown of law and order in some areas is so complete that police, in performance of their duty, are pelted with salvos of bottles and bricks. Muggers roam the streets in open defiance of fundamental human rights and dignity brazenly assaulting their victims in crowded subways, or in daylight before a ring of onlookers.

Increasingly, and not only in summer, the hoodlums causing this type of crime are teenagers who see in school a form of punishment. As soon as they can, they drop out. The jobs they once might have had, automation now does. In one American city 59 percent of male youths between 16 and 21 were found to be aimlessly roaming the streets. Former Harvard president James Conant calls this combination of out-of-work and out-of-school youths "social dynamite" that has the makings of potential disaster. The picture in New York is spread plainly before us for all to see.

For this army of youths the problem is nationwide. It will require far-reaching Federal, State, and local work programs to get them off the streets and into gainful employment. But until that day arrives, law-abiding citizens demand, and deserve, adequate protection. In New York City this means an expanded police force, even new and tougher police methods—the one that comes immediately to mind is the use of police dogs. This has proved a success in any number of cities.

The Baltimore police, for example, told WCBS that their 6-year-old experiment in having dogs accompany foot patrolmen has reduced crime in the areas they cover. The psychological effect of a dog is undeniable. Young thugs for whom jail holds no horrors recoil in fright before a trained dog, which they know to be fearless, and tireless in pursuit. Police dogs are carefully schooled to attack and capture on command. They are not, as is commonly supposed, vicious or dangerous or unsafe around children. WCBS urges that they be tried.

Violence has become a citywide scandal and disgrace. It must be brought to a stop. It is squarely up to the mayor to provide for the public safety if New York is to grow into something other than, quite literally, an asphalt jungle.

First Military Monument to Military Women Unveiled in New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day, Wednesday, May 30, 1962, was an important milestone in the history of the Women's Army Corps Veterans Association, and especially that of the New Orleans chapter.

The first military monument in the country dedicated solely to military women was unveiled and dedicated in New Orleans at Elk Place and Cleveland Avenue, facing the new City Hall Plaza. It was the culmination of a 4-year effort.

The former national president, Mrs. Camilla Mays Frank, was the general chairman, and she also designed the monument. It is dedicated "to the honor and glory of all military women who offer their lives in defense of the United States in the cause of peace."

The base, separate from the shaft, indicates the broken lives, those which have already been sacrificed and those who will always bear a service-connected disability. Atop the shaft is a bronze orb depicting the universe. A dove with outstretched wings, and holding an olive branch in its mouth, is perched on the orb—to denote the hope of peace throughout the world.

Etched into the face of the base, and just above the dedication bronze plaque, are the following words "erected May 30, 1962, under the sponsorship of the New Orleans chapter, WAC-Veterans Association."

Each of the four sides of the base bears a 10-inch bronze plaque. Each plaque designates one of the five main military branches of service. While the face on each plaque is the same—the cap and shoulder insignia refer to the service concerned.

The side facing the plaza bears the plaque of the women of the Army—underneath is etched: "Army Nurse Corps—ANC, Women's Army Corps—WAC, Army Medical Specialist Corps—AMSC."

Reading clockwise, the lefthand panel bears the plaque of the women of the Navy and has etched below: "Navy Nurse Corps—NNC, U.S. Naval Reserve Forces—Yeomanettes, Women's Auxiliary Volunteer Services—WAVES."

The rear panel bears the plaque of the women in the Marine Corps and has etched below: "Women of the U.S. Marine Corps."

It also bears the plaque of the women in the Coast Guard and has etched below: "Women's Auxiliary Reserve in the Coast Guard—SPARS."

The fourth side bears the plaque of the women in the Air Force and has etched below: "Air Force Nurse Corps—AFNC, Women's Air Force—WAF, Air Force Specialist Corps—AFSPC."

All of the five plaques or medallions have been cast in bronze to match the dedication plaque, the world, and the dove. The monument itself is of gray granite. The overall height is about 15 feet, and the weight is 14,000 pounds.

It was the great weight that gave the final problem. All of the neutral grounds in New Orleans house tremendous cement sewer pipes. It was found that the weight of the monument would be too great without additional concrete substructure to protect the sewer pipes.

Result—an additional cost of $700 which was a total and surprising expense. They went ahead and borrowed the balance in order to complete the project and have yet to raise about $600.

The completed cost of this project will total about $7,000, of which the Louisiana State Board of Liquidation generously provided $500. Even so, the task of raising the balance has been an arduous one.

I am very grateful to those members and those chapters taking part in this project. I am sure they will feel amply rewarded when they read this article and realize the importance of the accomplishment to military women throughout the Nation.

A local TV station covered the entire process of erection of the monument; the newspapers have carried a whole series of articles; three TV stations covered the dedication ceremonies as did our newspapers; and the Times-Picayune even carried an editorial honoring the farsighted women veterans who brought this project to fruition.

National Association of State Aviation Officials Proposed New Airport Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the National Association of State Aviation Officials, I introduced H.R. 12826, to make comprehensive amendments to the Federal Airport Act.

To explain the proposed amendments, I include a statement prepared by Mr. A. B. McMullen, executive director, National Association of State Aviation Officials, as follows:

PROPOSED NEW AIRPORT PROGRAM

When the original Federal Airport Act was passed by the 79th Congress in 1946, it provided for "the establishment of a nationwide system of public airports adequate to meet the present and future needs of civil aeronautics * * * and * * * take into account the needs of both air commerce and private flying" (now known as general aviation).

The act has been extended and amended several times, and I am submitting today a bill to further amend the Federal Airport Act. These amendments have been recommended by the National Association of State Aviation Officials, whose membership consists of the aeronautics commissions and departments of the several States. The State laws creating these aviation agencies generally permit the States to participate in the Federal-aid airport program, both by making available State financial, technical, and other assistance to counties and municipalities and other political subdivisions, for airport purposes, and for the development of State-owned airports and emergency flight strips.

The National Association of State Aviation Officials estimates that to date the States have contributed approximately $215 million for planning, designing, and construction of airports. In accordance with section 9(b) of the Federal Airport Act, 30 States have adopted legislation requiring State approval of Federal-aid project applications; 21 States require channeling of Federal aid funds through State aviation agencies, in a manner similar to the channeling of Federal-aid highway funds through the State highway departments.

Based on experience gained from these activities and 16 years active participation in the Federal-aid airport program, at Federal, State, and local levels, the various State aviation agencies are of the opinion that the amendments contained in the bill submitted here today would greatly improve the administration of the Federal-aid airport program and permit a more orderly and eco-

nomic method of constructing airports that are urgently required to meet the needs of the commercial air transportation industry, and the business and utility aircraft fleet, which, together with privately owned aircraft, is commonly known as general aviation.

Officials of the National Association of State Aviation Officials have furnished the following commentary on the bill, and the major amendments to the Federal Airport Act that are being recommended by the various State aeronautics departments and commissions.

SYSTEMS

These amendments provide for the establishment of an air commerce system and a general aviation system of airports. These terms are proposed to more clearly delineate the pattern into which airports have evolved.

The Administrator of FAA would designate the air commerce airport system, which would include the air carrier airports that are primarily interstate in character.

The State departments of aeronautics would designate the general aviation airport system, which would include all public airports not in the air commerce system. While these general aviation airports are national in scope, they are primarily State or local responsibility.

LONG-RANGE PLAN

Since inception of the Federal airport program, the national airport plan has left much to be desired, and often has not adequately included the views and recommendations of the States and local communities. The application of the plan has been of relatively little assistance in developing an effective construction program or in accomplishing the broad objectives outlined in the act.

In the past, it has been believed by many that when named in the plan their community would automatically receive Federal aid for airport development. This was never the case.

The amendments assure that any airport placed in the plan will be included in a program without further justification, although it is contemplated they will be subject to a priority schedule.

Airport development can be classified by priority number in the plan. By this method, the sponsor would know the general order in which projects would be programed. Once the airport or location were included in the plan, the sponsor could then proceed with the development of a master plan, and after approval, be assured of a position or priority in the program. With this assurance, the sponsor could proceed with detailed engineering plans, determine work priority, acquire land, and arrange financing, without fear that the project would be rejected when Federal funds become available.

The present national airport plan would continue to be used as a guide through fiscal year 1965. In the interim, a new national airport plan for the fiscal years 1965–75 would be established. The bill provides that this 10-year plan be reviewed and updated every 3 years following 1965.

FUNDING OF PROGRAM

The bill would continue, under the present State apportionment-discretionary fund procedure, the current $75 million annual program through fiscal year 1965, a 1-year extension of the presently authorized program. Continuing the present program through 1965 would provide leadtime necessary to develop the proposed new 10-year plan and program and determine the estimated cost of its completion by 1975. (The need for long range planning for airport and other aviation facilities development has long been recognized. In 1957, the President in a letter to Mr. Edward P. Curtis, his Special Assistant for Aviation Facilities Planning, stated: "Modern aircraft can be operated in the numbers required by the national defense and the civilian economy only if airports, navigation aids, air traffic control devices, and communications systems are suitable for their needs. The preparation and acceptance of a comprehensive aviation facilities plan will provide the basis for the timely installation of technically adequate aids * * * and for effective participation by State and local authorities and the aircraft operators in meeting facilities requirements." In Mr. Curtis' subsequent report, he included aircraft population and traffic estimates through 1975, a date that corresponds to the recommended airport program.)

The bill authorizes to be appropriated an amount of $100 million annually for the fiscal years 1966 through 1975. (The need for a $100 million program was established as a result of a national airport survey completed in 1961 by the National Association of State Aviation Officials, the Airport Operators Council, and the American Association of Airport Executives. Airport project requests filed annually with the FAA during the past 6 years have exceeded this amount. For fiscal 1962, project requests totalled $158,100,000; for fiscal year 1963, project requests for Federal funds totaled $163,929,000.)

Apportionment of funds authorized to be appropriated through fiscal 1965 would continue on the basis of 50 percent area and 50 percent population formula.

Beginning fiscal year 1966, the total estimated cost (taken from revised 1963 national airport plan) of completing the national airport system will be used as a basis for apportionment among the States in the ratio which the estimated cost of completion in each State bears to the sum of the estimated total cost of completing the systems in all of the States. This method of apportionment would result in a more equitable distribution of funds consistent with the needs of the various States.

The Administrator, based on recommendations of the State aeronautics departments and local sponsors, would allocate funds to specific airport projects.

To assure the orderly and effective development of the general aviation airport system, the amendments propose that 25 percent of available funds by allocated for this system, with the remaining 75 percent earmarked for the air commerce airport system.

The need for this division of funds was determined from the results of the national airport survey conducted in 1960–61, and plans prepared by various States for the development of aviation.

Although the bill provides for a 75–25 percent division of funds between the air commerce and general aviation systems, transfer of 50 percent of the funds allocated to either of the two systems may be made upon request of the State concerned and the approval of the FAA Administrator. A precedent for this procedure has been established by the Federal Highway Act which authorizes a similar division of funds, with a clause which authorizes transfer of funds from one system to another when there is an access under one system, and there is construction needed to be accomplished under the other system.

RESEARCH

Deduction of 1½ percent of authorized funds is provided for use by the FAA Administrator to accomplish the research, planning, and the preparation of uniform standards necessary to develop a national airport plan, with total estimated cost, adequate for the types and volumes of traffic forecast for the year 1975. Upon the request of a State aeronautics department, 1½ percent of the State's apportionment would be made available for research and planning and for the development of the plan and estimated cost thereof, in cooperation with the Administrator. (This is in conformance with procedure adopted by the Federal Highway Act.)

STATE AERONAUTICS DEPARTMENTS

The bill defines State aeronautics departments and authorizes the Administrator of FAA to utilize the personnel, facilities, and experience of these State Departments by discharging his responsibility relative to the plans, specifications, estimates, surveys, contract awards, design, inspection, and construction of all projects in the general aviation airport system within the State; although the Administrator would make a final inspection of each project after construction, and require an adequate showing of the actual cost of construction. (Such a precedent has been established in the secondary road program.)

It is believed this procedure would reduce materially the cost of administration of the Federal-aid airport program and reduce greatly the amount of time involved in the construction or improvement of general aviation airports. It would also encourage the States to contribute financially to an even greater degree in the development of public airports.

These proposed amendments are in general agreement with the following recommendations of Project Horizons, a Presidential study undertaken "to define national aviation goals in this decade, and to provide the administration with broad policy guidance and direction with respect to civil aviation development":

"5. The Federal airport aid program should be continued, expanded, and improved in the future as follows: (a) Funds should be committed as far ahead as possible; (b) the FAA should have the greatest latitude in allocating funds on the basis of need; without regard to geographical distribution; (c) availability of Federal funds for airport planning should be included in the enabling legislation."

A Lift or a Lollypop?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there has been a great deal of discussion within the First District of Minnesota—as there has been throughout the Nation—over the advisability of a reduction in Federal taxes. One of the most noteworthy contributions to this discussion which I have seen is an editorial from the Caledonia Argus entitled "A Lift or a Lollypop?" For the benefit of our colleagues, I will insert the entire editorial at this time:

A LIFT OR A LOLLYPOP?

No doubt about it. There is no official act to compare with tax reduction in winning friends and influencing people—corporate and individual. No, in all probability was there ever a time when, on the basis of hardship and the needs of the economy, a tax reduction would provide a greater immediate sense of relief and stimulation.

But, there is another side to the story that we can ignore only at our peril. In this country, which has long cherished a sense of fiscal responsibility, tax cuts have been made at those times when there was reason to believe the Nation could meet its obligations on less income.

A tax cut today, in the face of continuing reckless extravagance that has put the budget billions out of balance, that has required in recent weeks another lift in our debt ceiling to the level of $308 billion and brought our actual national commitments to the incomprehensible figure of over a trillion dollars, can only be a reckless, irresponsible gesture of political desperation.

Tax reform, to be sure, is urgently needed. Business should—as a matter of right, not privilege or special dispensation—deduct full and realistic depreciation on plant and equipment. Tax withholding should be outlawed for the swindle it has proved to be. And a start should be made in progressive tax reduction for all—individuals and corporations—as provided, for example, by the still-pending Herlong-Baker bills, which should have been enacted 4 years ago.

But enduring tax reform can only follow a reform in tax spending. Enacted in good faith it would follow, not precede, the rejection of welfare and the pork barrel as instruments of public policy, and of foreign aid as rental on peace.

If the administration honestly believes that tax reduction now is in the Nation's interest, it must just as firmly believe that economy in Government is in the public interest. And there is still time for our leaders to demonstrate their good faith by checking their squanderlust by at least the $7 billion now considered as the cost of tax concessions.

Without some token of the sort, we can expect nothing more wholesome than an election-year lollypop.

The Late Honorable William M. Whittington

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join other Members in paying tribute to this dear departed colleague and to extend my sympathy to his family.

When I came to the Congress one of the first committees on which I served was the Committee on Government Operations, or as it was called then, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department under the chairmanship of the distinguished Representative from Alabama, Mr. Manasco. The ranking member of that committee was Mr. Whittington. I served with him 4 years. I never worked with any Member who had a greater or more comprehensive command of all the factors involved in a complicated piece of legislation.

At the end of the war our committee had the problem of the disposal of literally tens of billions of dollars worth of surplus property scattered all over the world. The legislation which Mr. Whittington helped work out operated very successfully. At that time also there was presented the so-called full employment bill which would have regimented the whole U.S. economy and, really, its life.

Mr. Whittington did as much as anybody to expose the unsoundness of the wide controls which that original proposal would have established. But having helped to defeat that, he did not adopt a negative attitude toward the problem. He worked constructively to produce an alternative, the present Employment Act. He rejected the idea of trying to guarantee full employment. Nobody can guarantee full employment any more than the Constitution promises more than to promote the general welfare.

Mr. Whittington, by the clarity of his mind and the logic of his arguments, helped demolish the wrong remedy; then led in devising a sound proposal to help our Government look ahead, foresee, and try to even out ups and downs in the economy. That act will stand as a monument to him quite as much as the footprints he has left on every State in the Union through his remarkable vision and skill in promoting sound programs of development of our natural resources, flood control, navigation of our inland waterways.

When I was working to get authorization of a harbor project which would mean more to the long-range development of my city than anything that has happened to it in 50, if not a hundred, years, he was most helpful to me in developing the presentation of the project and getting it enacted into law. Will Whittington made an unforgettable contribution to me as to all of us through his strong character and integrity, the superior quality of his mind, his ability, his industry, his temperateness and unfailing courtesy in handling all matters both official and personal.

Our country has lost a giant in the passing of Will Whittington.

Tax Rates and Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Sylvia Porter which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of August 28. It is, I believe, one of the most successful efforts I have seen at clarifying the vital relationship between economic growth in the United States and the way in which we pay our taxes.

WHY TAX RATES BRAKE RECOVERY
(By Sylvia Porter)

"Why is it that our tax system is now getting so much blame for being a drag on our economy?" asked the intelligent woman across the dinner table the other evening. "I listened to President Kennedy's TV address on taxes, heard him condemn out high rates, promise tax cuts in 1963 and refer to how much faster the Common Market countries are growing than we are. But I've not heard a simple explanation of why the system is a drag and how our tax rates compare with those of Europe."

These are pertinent observations. So here goes with my attempt at a simple explanation.

No other federal government takes so big a bite out of the paychecks of workers and the profits of businessmen as our does—and this includes Communist Russia and the socialistic and totalitarian nations of Europe and South America. None hampers employment and production with such confiscatory tax rates as the United States.

In this country, for instance, 86 percent of the Government's take comes from taxes on paychecks, profits, estates, or gifts. In Communist Russia, in complete contrast, only 15 percent comes from taxes on incomes and the 85-percent balance comes from direct taxes on Soviet citizens when they buy food, clothing, shelter, etc. In the prospering Common Market nation of West Germany, only 22 percent of the central government's collections comes from income and capital taxes; the rest is raised from sales, excise taxes, customs duties. In the prospering Common Market nation of Italy, the income-capital tax bite is only 26 percent. The closest to the United States in relying so heavily on income and profits taxes is New Zealand, which collects 65 percent from these sources.

EXPANSION PENALIZED

No other federal government in the world penalizes individuals or businessmen with extraordinary abilities and ambitions to the extent that our tax structure does. Our top tax rate of 91 percent on individual incomes is confiscatory, cannot possibly be justified on financial grounds for, few individuals who qualify for this bracket permit themselves to get into it. A personal income tax rate which reaches 50 percent on as low as $16,000 of taxable income is distinctly discouraging to individual risk taking. As for the 52-percent tax rate on corporations, the evidence is overwhelming that this has retarded American industry's ability to reinvest earnings in job-creating activities.

RECOVERY STRANGLED

No other federal government has held to an oppressive tax structure as long as we have—with the possible exception of Great Britain, another nation turning in a sluggish performance. Every other nation which slapped on steep taxes during World War II has long since reformed them—which is what President Kennedy was referring to when he mentioned in his TV address that "by lightening tax burdens," the Common Market countries have achieved "full employment and an economic growth rate twice ours."

No other federal government has "accepted" four recessions since the end of World War II without its leaders getting down to work and saying flatly our tax structure is at least partially responsible and reform is overdue. There is no doubt that our tax rates helped to strangle the 1959 recovery—for they bit so quickly and substantially into rising incomes and profits that the advance didn't have a change to survive. Tax reduction-reform was bypassed in 1960, though, bypassed again in 1961, and now it's dead for 1962. Meanwhile, as Mr. Kennedy pointed out, during the past 15 months of economic expansion, Federal taxes have siphoned out $5 billion from the economy than increased Federal spending has poured into the business stream. This is a measure of the way our high rates tend to brake a recovery almost automatically as it proceeds. In the first half of calendar 1963, when Federal tax collections will be at their peak, the brake will be on in earnest—and if we don't get the tax reductions pledged for this period, the economic consequences for us could be dismal.

Much of this was hidden in the earlier postwar years, when the enormous pent-up demands of the whole free world kept the

United States heading strongly upward. Now, in this new competitive era the realistics have become clear, and, significantly, agreement on the depressing effects of our tax rates is virtually unanimous among informed economists and financiers—"liberal" and "conservative," Republican and Democratic.

The Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER H. DOMINICK
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, recently, the editor of the Colorado Tumpet, Mrs. Jane Harper, included in that newspaper's editorial column an open letter to her daughter. In this election year, her advice to her 13-year-old eighth-grader seems especially noteworthy. I include Mrs. Harper's well written letter as part of my remarks and commend its study by my colleagues:

OPEN LETTER TO MY DAUGHTER

Last week you electrified me with the statement: "What work is there to voting—after all, you just go in and push a button."

I cannot tell you why an eighth grade social studies teacher would leave a class with such an unanswered question—but I am glad that she chose this year in which to do so. I hope you will listen, read and learn from now until November 6. Perhaps then you will have your answer. Perhaps then you will realize that there is a great deal more to voting than just pulling a lever on a voting machine or marking a paper ballot.

Good government is not just "pushing a button"—and government is what you get when you cast a ballot. You, as a citizen, will be granted the right to vote, but you are not granted the right to destroy that privilege because you are not careful with it.

In the little bit of history you are getting in the schools you are learning why the 13 Colonies were founded. You are learning why the American Revolution was fought. What were the colonists against—and what kind of government did they set up for themselves?

You have heard the words "rights of man" and "freedoms," democracy and republic, government of the people, and other general phrases. These are not just words. The dictionary can define them for you, but it is up to you to understand why they were words worth fighting for; why men would risk and give up everything they had for them; and why, today, these words let you cheer at football games, spend hours on the telephone and watch television while you polish your fingernails. Do you think a 13-year-old girl in Russia can do these things?

This year is an election year. November 6 is "push button" day. You will have many opportunities to read about, hear and see candidates, and learn what goes into a campaign. You already know there are candidates, platforms, issues, debates, speeches, meetings, rallies—you could probably make a longer list yourself. The voter should not only read about and listen to the candidates, he should find out what made the candidate outstanding enough to be chosen by his political party—and why he is the better choice than the candidate from the other party.

In your student council elections at school now are you voting for the candidate who wants to make your school the very best in the city—and whose honesty and work as your representatives will bring honor to your class?

The voter should compare what each party has to say—and does the party keep its promises when it gets elected?

The right to vote is one of the most precious things you will ever have. It should be guarded as carefully as you can. Most of the things you lose can be replaced, but if you lose your vote the chances of your getting it back are almost nothing. You will hold the right only as long as you study and learn what your United States is and must be. You will preserve that right only as long as you vote with the knowledge that you are casting your ballot for what you believe in and for what will give you the best government.

I do not agree with the teacher's idea of voting, but I voted for a school board which hires teachers, and in whose hands I have placed my trust for you to receive the best education possible. I can only hope that you will sometime question what is said in class and—as in this case—find out if a statement is really true. Schools teach you the facts, but they also teach you to think for yourself if you will—and this is one of the greatest rights Americans have, freedom of thought. It is that freedom of thought which separates you from communism and allows you to go to the polls and thoughtfully cast your ballot.

Remember this in 1970—a State election—when you vote for the first time. Remember you can start this year learning what the rest of us will vote for next November. Please do. In this way you will be fulfilling one duty to the country which offers you so much.

Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Hammond, Ind., Times is of interest to the newspaper fraternity throughout the Nation. Gary, Ind., is the youngest metropolitan city in the Nation. In 1906 Gary, as a village, was incorporated when the United States Steel Co. started its plant construction on the south shores of Lake Michigan. Today Gary is a metropolitan city of almost 200,000 inhabitants.

H. B. Snyder and his brother, the late Ralph R. Snyder, as young men pioneered a small newspaper into a publication which today ranks as one of the outstanding newspapers of the Middle West:

H. B. SNYDER STEPS DOWN AS POST-TRIBUNE EDITOR

H. B. Snyder stepped down Saturday as editor and publisher of the Gary Post-Tribune and turned over the post of editor to Dale E. Belles, Jr. At the same time, Snyder appointed Howard L. Kastel as general manager.

Snyder, himself, will remain as chairman of the board and president.

In his statement, Snyder said all decisions will be made by Belles and Kastel.

The change in management marks the first time since 1910 that H. B. Snyder or his brother, the late J. Ralph Snyder, have not directed the business and policy of the newspaper.

Belles joined the Post-Tribune staff in 1948. He became assistant managing editor in 1952 and in 1954 was named managing editor. He assumed the added duties of assistant editor and publisher in 1956.

Kastel joined the newspaper in July of this year as business manager.

Extension of Temporary Unemployment Compensation Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of the House at the end of August, the Ways and Means Committee held hearings on the extension of temporary unemployment compensation benefits. One of the witnesses on August 23, 1962, was the Honorable A. Allen Sulcowe, secretary of labor and industry, of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

His presentation of the subject and his statement in support of the proposal before the committee to extend unemployment compensation was so informative, interesting, and significant, that I have included same with these remarks, so that all the Members would have the benefit of reading the material presented.

In the past Congress has extended unemployment compensation to persons who had exhausted their benefits through prolonged lack of work. This year the Kennedy administration asked for another extension of 13 weeks. Last week the House Ways and Means Committee voted against the extension by a margin of only one vote. The action should be changed and the argument presented by Secretary Sulcowe furnishes ample reason for the passage of the bill.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF A. ALLEN SULCOWE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is A. Allen Sulcowe. I am the State secretary of labor and industry in the cabinet of Gov. David L. Lawrence. I appear in support of the proposal now before this honorable committee to extend unemployment compensation; I am authorized to say that this statement has the endorsement of my Governor.

THE STATE AND NATIONAL INTEREST IS INVOLVED

This committee and the Congress have already said that recessionary unemployment is more a National than a State problem. The Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations in effect said this with their signature to the two acts extending unemployment compensation. When we have a recession, there is little that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania can do to increase the operation of the steel mills of Pittsburgh, and there is little that any State can do to revive production in the nationwide industries and yet, individual States and my State in par-

ticular, are currently required to shoulder the entire burden of unemployment compensation costs which are part of a national dip in employment.

This Congress has also said: "that the skills of many persons have been rendered obsolete by dislocations in the economy, arising from automation or other technological developments, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands and other changes in the structure of the economy; that Government leadership is necessary to insure that the benefits of automation do not become burdens of widespread unemployment" (76 Stat., p. 23).

We are now recovering from the 1960–61 recession. Whether the recovery is mild, partial, unfulfilled or meager is a matter of semantics, but the Kennedy administration and the Congress are aware that much yet remains to be done.

In Pennsylvania, every month this year has shown a significant improvement over the similar month last year:

[Upper figure is unemployment rate; lower figure is number of unemployed in thousands]

	Annual average	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August
1961	9.4	11.4	11.6	10.8	9.9	9.3	9.9	9.4	8.7
	440.7	533.0	544.0	505.0	462.0	435.0	472.0	444.0	411.0
1962	9.6	9.2	8.7	7.6	7.3	7.9	8.1		
	446.0	426.0	400.0	353.0	339.0	373.0	380.0		

If we look at the month of May, which is uncomplicated by school and college youth, we see that there were 96,000 less unemployed in 1962 than in 1961, but there were still 339,000 unemployed, or a rate of 7.3 percent.

RECOVERY FROM RECESSION AND TECHNOLOGICAL UNEMPLOYMENT USUALLY UNEVEN

Recovery can be measured in months in a nationwide or statewide picture, but frequently it has to be measured in terms of years for individual regions. I mean by this, that when a recession lifts, the general economic picture improves, but in individual regions it may not improve significantly. When the market for a particular commodity is lost or sharply curtailed, or a new material replaces long-used basics, the towns or areas affected do not respond quickly to a resurgence in the economy. This is one of the reasons for depressed areas in Pennsylvania and elsewhere. As coal markets disappear because of the use of residual oil, or plastics replace steel and aluminum, or diesels make the puffing steam engines of our youth almost a rarity, towns where employment depended upon such industries need more than a recovery in the economy to bounce back to normal levels.

The severity of these changes is sharpened by the continuing process of industry improving technological manufacturing and commercial methods. When a market declines, this process is hastened in order to reduce costs, and this usually means less manpower; ofttimes it means consolidation, or elimination of plants.

How quickly can a town recover, when a plant employing 60 percent of its workers closes? Surely the recovery process must be measured in terms of long months. The point I am striving to make is that recovery measures, and temporary extended unemployment compensation is such a measure, must look to substantial lengths of time to allow the orderly processes of change, stimulated by community, State, and Federal action, to evolve.

For this reason, I contend that temporary unemployment compensation should be a program without a 1-year limitation.

MAKEUP OF TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFICIARIES—1961–62

Since this hard-working committee approved the bill which expired several months ago, a good deal of information, based upon congressional mandate, has been obtained. We now know with some definiteness the kind of people who benefited from temporary extended unemployment compensation. In Pennsylvania:

(a) Persons who drew temporary extended unemployment compensation benefits in Pennsylvania were predominantly males and relatively young. The median age for Pennsylvania claimants was 44.3 (46.2 years for males and 40.4 for females).

(b) Generally they were the primary wage earners of families.

(c) They came mostly from factories and especially from durable goods manufacturing.

(d) Most of the claimants had long and current attachment to the labor market. They were either recessionally unemployed or idled by other factors beyond their control, such as automation and technological advances.

Attached is a chart showing additional characteristics of this group of 207,000 claimants for temporary extended unemployment compensation for period ending June 30, 1962.

PERSONS BENEFITING FROM NEW TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The following are estimates of temporary extended unemployment compensation extension: By October 1, 1962, the number of unemployed workers in Pennsylvania exhausting their regular unemployment compensation benefits since the expiration of the covered period in the previous temporary extended unemployment compensation law, will reach a total of 50,000. Thus, if the temporary extended unemployment compensation law were renewed effective October 1, 50,000 workers in Pennsylvania would file for benefits during the first month and 44,000 would actually get one or more checks.

If the covered period in the renewed temporary unemployment compensation law extended from October 1, 1962 through March 31, 1963, with a phaseout over the ensuing 3 months, a total of 104,000 unemployed workers in Pennsylvania would get one or more temporary unemployment compensation payments and an additional 11,000 would file for, but not receive such benefits.

During the time of the last temporary unemployment compensation 207,000 Pennsylvanians benefited from the temporary unemployment compensation program. They received $75,514,000 of which $23,773,000 was reimbursed to the State unemployment compensation fund.

Another chart which may be of interest is attached and shows the duration of claims under the regular State program. This indicates that 50 percent draw less than 10 weeks or not at all.

IS PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE TO THOSE WHOSE BENEFITS END?

Sometimes it is said that the unemployment program should not be burdened beyond a certain point, and that those who have exhausted their benefits should turn to public assistance for aid.

In 1959 my Governor appointed a nine-man committee, equally divided between labor, management, and the public, to review our program in Pennsylvania. They asked for information on the same matter. Surveys were made for previous years, and these showed that less than 5 percent of the persons who exhausted unemployment compensation benefits found their way to the public assistance rolls.

A quick review during the last several days, indicates that this percentage is still low. For the last two years this percentage has risen to 9 percent because, I am told, of a change in Federal law which made dependent children eligible for public assistance even though an employable parent was present. In other words, we are dealing with people who are not relief recipients, but people who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, who have not exhausted their total assets, or will not turn to public assistance programs; who are nevertheless, in need of help, and whose predicament is a matter of public concern.

PENNSYLVANIA'S PROGRAM TO DETECT FRAUD

How certain can we be that those receiving unemployment compensation benefits are really entitled to them? What does Pennsylvania do to assure sound administration?

In Pennsylvania, all claimants are registered for employment and are periodically exposed to the job tests, insofar as jobs are available. This is a real test, and thousands of persons are disqualified each year for failure to respond to call-in cards, or to accept suitable employment. Every employer is charged for the payment of benefits to a former employee, and he receives monthly a complete statement, showing the name, social security number, and amount of unemployment compensation paid out to former employees. Up to 10 percent of all claimants are spot checked each week for possible employment, so that of that group who are longtime unemployed, it is certain that 80 to 100 percent are spot checked.

Each year from 1,000 to 1,200 persons are prosecuted for improper receipt of benefits. These are usually in small amounts, because the program detects them before many weeks have gone by. There are many other devices used to keep the lists clear of fraud.

WHAT HAS THE PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE DONE?

It is proper to ask whether the Pennsylvania Legislature has required sufficient revenue for the State program. The legislature in my State has enacted tax rates which are realistic, and range from 2 to 4 percent, with an average in the neighborhood of 3.2 or 3.3 percent.

Pennsylvania has borrowed $112 million to help its fund over serious periods of recession. Its employers are faced with repaying this money, $80 million for the 1958–59 temporary unemployment compensation program, and in addition, money expended for temporary unemployment compensation. I think it can be said with certainty that the Legislature and the people of Pennsylvania are facing up to reality, and are not shirking their responsibilities. However, the question recurs whether one State should be required, without help, to support the costs of unemployment, which are not attributable to factors within the State, but are caused by national matters, and I add, automation and technological changes which can strike an individual state with a greater impact than others.

ARE OTHER PROGRAMS HELPING THE UNEMPLOYED TO NEW EMPLOYMENT?

Sometimes one instance illuminates a situation more clearly than any statistics can do. On August 13, when President Kennedy spoke to the Nation with regard to the national economy, he told the world about George DeMartz, of Junedale, Pa., a longtime unemployed anthracite coal miner, who had exhausted his State unemployment compensation benefits, and then his Federal extended benefits, just before he was enrolled

in the ARA program and trained as a welder.

This Pennsylvania worker was successfully placed, or transplanted if you please, from coal mining to metal fabrication in a new occupation and in a new industry which had been brought to the area by local initiative and industrial development measures. Here is firsthand evidence that the programs passed by this and previous Congresses are beginning to have their good effect in the war against unemployment. Can one think of any greater good that Congress can do, than it did for George DeMartz, and for similarly affected fellow workers who were tided over, and their families held together by State unemployment compensation and Federally extended benefits until the new ARA program was able to get underway?

Let me give another example. We are about to begin a training course, under the Manpower Development and Training Act passed by this Congress, for electronics mechanic, in McKeesport (Turtle Creek, Pa.); 25 perons have been selected. All of them have from 1 to 4 dependents, and their age range is from 19 to 47; 16 are veterans; more than half are former steelworkers; 1 is a former railroader; others include professional men, a foreman, a porter, an insurance agent, a warehouseman, and a maintenance mechanic.

Four of these people have been unemployed from 24 to 27 months; five more than 10 months. This is the kind of people who can benefit from extended unemployment compensation and who display eagerness to learn a new trade.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania has many scores of communities organized for industrial development. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has made available over $32 million for loans to new and expanding industry. Our State is frequently studied by people interested in this program. Over 39,000 new jobs have been created or made possible by these activities. I cite this to show that in this area, too, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is bestirring itself. However, we have a long way to go.

During the last 8 years, total employment in Pennsylvania showed an increase of 61,000 workers. This, despite the fact that coal mining lost 56,000 workers during this period; railroads 36,000; the farms over 48,000; primary metals almost 20,000; transportation equipment over 20,000; textiles, 19,000. We have made up, in other words, 200,000 jobs, and added 61,000, but this has not been on a 1-for-1 basis, and in many areas of our State, the persons disemployed find great difficulty in obtaining new employment.

LENGTHY UNEMPLOYMENT EXPLAINED

Why do some people remain unemployed for long periods? If industry is down in their area, why do they not move to more prosperous places? Human beings are not like checkers; they are warm flesh; they have attachments to their friends, neighbors, and relatives. They will not leave the valley where they were born and reared, or the homestead near the hill where their parents are buried. They want to make a living and a home where they have always lived and worked. Many times their hopes are realized and new industry does come in, or there is a revival of the old industry. They hope against hope that their mortgaged home will not need to be sold at a sacrifice price; that their children will not need to be uprooted from school classes; and that employment will return. It is not folly or "orneriness." It is the makeup of human beings.

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE LARGE INDUSTRY IN TOWN CLOSES?

The last time I made a presentation to this committee I cited the sudden closing of the Ford assembly plant at Chester, Pa., and the devastating effect this had on 1,500 workers in Delaware County.

Let me give you another example, much the same, that is today current in my State. Some little time ago the American Car & Foundry Co. in Berwick, Pa., announced that it would close its plant and leave permanently unemployed some 2,000 steelworkers who had grown up in this area. Most of them knew no other work; many of them had followed their fathers and grandfathers into this mill for a livelihood. Berwick is a good example of a community on the banks of the Susquehanna where conditions were reasonably good. A new hospital had recently been undertaken by the people of the town; schools were expanded. Then disaster struck and the announcement was made that the company would phase out its operations and close permanently on October 1. This company is by far the largest industry in town and indeed in that section of Pennsylvania. Here we have householders and families faced with the terrible choice of waiting to see if the community efforts to bring in new facilities would eventually, in time, employ them, or to break off all connections with the homes of their neighbors and their families, and to move elsewhere.

How much time must it take for many of these people to make this agonizing decision? They know that the community organizations, the State and the Pennsylvania industrial development agencies, as well as Area Redevelopment Administration are trying to bring new employment, and like most human beings, they decide to wait. They know they are good production people, with steady work habits, who have been a credit and honor to their town and their community. It must seem unbelievable that all this will go for naught, and they follow avidly every chance of remaining in the area.

From this group will emerge a large percentage who will find new employment, and a significant percentage who will remain unemployed. The additional help which they could receive from the Federal Government would be succor for them, during a trying time.

There is no one to blame for this situation. This fine company has been a good citizen for over half a century, but subway cars and freight cars and Army tank retrievers, which they built so well, no longer are in high demand, and they must curtail their operations.

DEPRESSION AMIDST PROSPERITY

I would be remiss if I were to leave the impression that only the unemployed people in specific local or depressed areas require this kind of help. The peculiar nature of our economy now shows us instance after instance where, in the same town or city, there is boom and bustling employment while other industries are closing down or sharply curtailing production. This is due to the dizzying changes in marketing, engineering, and manufacturing of materials, and other factors well known to your committee. I am sure that this obtains in every State, and while the newly unemployed man usually finds work in the booming industries, there are those with lesser skills, who usually are older, who find that this is not so readily available.

SUDDEN UNEMPLOYMENT AS HARSH AS NATURAL DISASTERS

If, then, we need training programs, industrial development, and extended unemployment compensation to help toward new employment, I submit to this committee that all of this is indeed a national problem, which calls for national participation. Just as in most years when some section of our country is visited by a natural disaster, a hurricane, tornado, or tidal wave, all levels of government rush to the assistance of these communities and their people, and properly so. Their plight is open, visible, and dramatic. Their homes have been lost, their property destroyed, and the area has received damage from the violent elements. The 50 States, acting through Congress and the national administration, are glad to be of help. It seems to me that the onslaught of engineering changes, automation, and the disappearance of standard markets all have brought a similar form of devastation to many homes and families. They have lost jobs, income, homes have been disrupted, education of children deferred or discontinued.

The kind of program we are talking about today will not solve these problems, but they help, and they are in the national interest, just as much as the restoration of a devastated area is in the national interest.

To aid in the economic and social adjustment caused by job dislocation and because of the high number of exhaustions in our State, I urgently recommend prompt passage of a program for extended benefits. The people who have exhausted their benefits have been out of work at least 30 weeks, and as a rule, have serious problems to solve before they can be reemployed. In many cases they must obtain a new skill. In others, they must migrate to other areas. At times, the problem is the renewal of a defense contract in the plant of their last employer. But whatever the reason, the need is real, and the loss of purchasing power is not only unfortunate for them as individuals, but is depressing for our State's economy which needs every possible support, in order to regain the rate of economic growth needed to insure continued prosperity in our land.

I thank you for your attention and your courtesy in permitting me to appear before this committee.

Arthur J. Goldberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Arthur J. Goldberg as Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court meets with scant opposition. The following editorial by Dale E. Belles, Jr., editor of the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune, outlines some of the reasons for his qualifications:

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, Aug. 31, 1962]

GOLDBERG TO THE TOP COURT

The American success story retains its essence despite changes in setting. It is currently typified in the elevation of Arthur J. Goldberg to the U.S. Supreme Court.

That Goldberg came from the ranks of relatively poor immigrant parents in a big city is not new though the more accepted formula was the rise from a poor farmhome. That the route of his climb was through the field of labor law rather than through one of the more orthodox fields of commerce or industry is a departure. However, it is a departure primarily because only comparatively recently has there been any field of labor law.

If there should be any tendency to challenge his fitness for the Court—and there will be, whether it comes into the open or not—because of his association with the labor side of some of our most controversial

legal questions, at least three counterbalancing factors should be considered.

First, one could cite several examples of corporation lawyers who have gone onto the Court and shown the ability to consider both sides of questions despite their previous experience. There is no reason why the same cannot be true of a man whose principal clients have been labor unions. As a matter of fact, unless we are to recruit our judiciary from the academic field, it is necessary to draw men whose experience has been primarily with one side or the other of controversy.

Second, it should be pointed out that in his 13 years as counsel for the United Steelworkers and 7 years as chief counsel for the Congress of Industrial Organizations he insisted on operating as a fee attorney rather than as a paid—even if a well-paid—employee. In other words, he showed a determination to maintain a certain freedom of thought and action.

Finally, it should be remarked that while Secretary of Labor, Goldberg did not always act in strict accord with the wishes of labor leaders, but rather sought to influence settlements designed to reduce open conflict and to serve the public interest as he saw it. His part in reading Communist and hoodlum elements out of the AFL–CIO can be cited to demonstrate his willingness to offend those labor leaders he believes deserve to be offended.

In passing it should be noted that Felix Frankfurter, whom Goldberg will succeed, came to the bench from Harvard denounced by many as a radical, yet stayed on to be denounced by others as a conservative but to be praised by most as an impartial jurist. While Goldberg does not match Frankfurter's erudition, his own academic success in leading his Northwestern University class while working his way through school and graduating at 21, shows that he has the makings of a legal scholar.

Because of the life tenures of those appointed, one cannot be sure just what direction a Justice may turn after his appointment. It is impossible to know, therefore, in just what direction Kennedy appointments will influence the Court. The influence, however, should be relatively prolonged. Echoing his own youth, Kennedy's first appointee, Byron White, was only 45. His second, Arthur J. Goldberg, is a comparatively young 54.

Africa and Food for Peace—An Address by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Before the Michigan Food for Peace Council, Detroit, Mich., September 1, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an outstanding address by the distinguished Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, on the subject of "Africa and Food for Peace."

Assistant Secretary Williams described the way in which American agricultural abundance has been utilized under the food for peace program in the countries of Africa.

His address was delivered before the Michigan Food for Peace Council at the Michigan State Fair Grounds in Detroit on September 1, 1962.

The text of the address follows:

AFRICA AND FOOD FOR PEACE

(Address by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, before the Michigan Food for Peace Council, Michigan State Fairgrounds, Detroit, Mich., September 1, 1962)

It is always a great pleasure for me to return to Michigan and be among old friends. But when I have an opportunity to return here for the Michigan State Fair and speak on both agriculture and Africa, such pleasure is heightened many times.

Let me begin by congratulating Sandy Brown and his associates on the Michigan Food for Peace Council, as well as those of you who represent the other States in regional committee No. 2. I commend you for your public-spirited and selfless cooperation in this vital task of developing public understanding and support for the food-for-peace program.

The importance of this program has been made abundantly clear by President Kennedy. One of his first acts after taking office—in fact, his second Executive order dated January 24, 1961—established a food-for-peace office in the White House. At this time the President said:

"American agricultural abundance offers a great opportunity for the United States to promote the interests of peace in a significant way and to play an important role in helping to provide a more adequate diet for peoples all around the world. We must make the most vigorous and constructive use possible of this opportunity."

What is it about our food-for-peace program that makes it so important in the overall scheme of our foreign policy? What are its objectives, and what kind of thinking is there behind the program?

Initially, the food-for-peace program—which operates under Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act—was conceived of as a kind of "surplus disposal" plan. But its objectives have been broadened considerably in the last year and a half. We have come to realize that we can put America's agricultural abundance to work to relieve hunger and improve nutrition throughout the world—and to contribute to world economic growth and security at the same time.

In 1961, exports under the program amounted to some $1.5 billion, or approximately 30 percent of the total U.S. agricultural exports of $5 billion. In volume, this adds up to about 60 billion pounds of U.S. commodities, principally wheat, corn, rice, and fats and oils.

In Michigan, out of total agricultural exports of $94.9 million in fiscal year 1962, almost 30 percent, or $27.4 million, were shipped under the food-for-peace program.

Africa ranks at the bottom among continents receiving food-for-peace assistance, but it has been receiving an increasingly larger share in the last 2 years. In fiscal year 1962, for example, our African food-for-peasce program, excluding Egypt, amounted to $163 million, which is almost 10 pecent of the total worldwide porgram. I might point out here that the value of all of the program's commodities are figured at Commodity Credit Corporation prices and do not reflect absolutely equivalent benefits in dollar expenditures.

We now have African programs under all four titles of Public Law 480, and an example or two of each may more meaningfully explain what we are trying to do under the program.

An important segment of the food for peace program is contained in title I of Public Law 480. Under this title, we can sell U.S. agricultural commodities abroad and accept payment in the currency of the importing country.

This part of the program also has a second advantage. Much of the money paid to the United States under title I can be returned to the purchasing country in the form of loans or grants for schools, dams, roads, electric power, or other projects that can help speed the country's development. In addition, we can use some of this currency to defray the costs of our representatives abroad. Also, some currency is used to support joint efforts of Government and industry to develop larger commercial markets for U.S. farm products in foreign countries.

At the present time, six African countries are participating in title I programs—Congo (Léopoldville), Egypt, Guinea, Morocco, Sudan, and Tunisia.

Guinea, for example, signed a title I agreement on February 2 of this year. At that time, Guinea agreed to buy $7.5 million worth of U.S. rice, wheat, edible oils, and other agricultural commodities over a 3-year period, in exchange for Guinean francs. Two subsequent amendments raised this agreement to $10.67 million. Seventy-three percent of the proceeds from this sale will be loaned back to the Guinean Government for development of industry, agriculture, education and public administration—projects agreed upon by both the United States and Guinea.

There are two principal uses to which America's farm abundance is put under title II of the law: (1) emergency relief, and (2) economic development.

In East Africa in the past year, both floods and drought raised havoc with the natural food supply of many thousands of people. You may recall the airdrop of corn and dried milk in Tanganyika in May of this year, in which our Air Force worked around-the-clock in speeding food to a famine-stricken area of that country. In Kenya, too, more than $5 million worth of corn, dried milk and edible oil was sent into the country in the past year for famine relief. Our Air Force also air-dropped supplies in Kenya.

One of the most dramatic examples of emergency relief under both titles II and III of the food for peace program took place in Algeria, where since 1957 private organizations have distributed $14.7 million worth of grain, milk, beans, and other food supplies to the people inside that country. These goods and transportation costs were paid for by the U.S. Government, but the distribution and handling was the responsibility of voluntary organizations. The most active of these organizations were Church World Service, Catholic Relief Services, the American and other Red Cross Societies, the American Friends Service Committee, and CARE-Medico.

During the last days of the secret army terror in Algiers and in the confused first few days after Algeria became independent, the United States delivered 3,500 tons of food and medical supplies to the Casbah. This was the very center of the storm—an area where people had been cut off from supplies by the disruption of communications and transport and the attendant unemployment brought about by the OAS terror campaign.

Turning now to that section of title II under which food is used as an instrument of economic development, both Tunisia and Morocco are using U.S.-donated food for partial payment of wages on public work projects. We have a $17.8 million work project agreement with Morocco under which 200,000 tons of U.S. wheat will be used by the Moroccan Government as partial wage payments

for 200,000 workers employed in economic development projects. In Tunisia, another 180,000 people employed on roads, irrigation, reforestation and land conservation are being partially paid in U.S. wheat. Both Morocco and Tunisia pay part of the workers' wages in cash. The significant part of this program, however, is that it gives highly useful work to the unemployed—unemployed workers in Africa and unemployed foodstuffs in the United States.

Under title III of Public Law 480, food supplies are made available for distribution abroad through U.S. voluntary agencies. Although the volume of total agricultural exports accounted for by these efforts is relatively small, the benefits from this approach are very great.

On my recent trip to Africa, in April and May of this year, I had an opportunity to see some of these operations firsthand. I was greatly impressed with the effects of these voluntary programs and the dedication of the Americans distributing U.S. food in such places as Upper Volta, Dahomey, Ruanda-Urundi, and the Congo.

The least-known and thus far least-used part of Public Law 480 is title IV, under which the United States can deliver surplus agricultural commodities over a number of years and be repaid in dollars over an extended period. Last April, the first such agreement in Africa was signed with Liberia, and only 2 weeks ago one was signed with Ethiopia. Under the Liberian agreement, wheat, rice, and mixed livestock feeds valued at $8.64 million will be provided to that country over a 3-year period, and repayment will be made in dollars in 15 equal annual installments.

On balance, then, how effective is America's food-for-peace program? Is it meeting its objectives and doing the job it was designed to do? Is it helping us to fulfill those aspirations of the American people that underlie our national policy—our interest in seeking a stable world, and our deep and sincere concern for the welfare of people throughout the world?

I can see a resounding affirmative in the eyes and actions of an otherwise-unemployed North African I met. This man was throwing all his strength and pride into running a pneumatic hammer on a country road work project. I can feel it in the lump that came into my throat as I watched central African school children line up to receive their milk, which came from boxes of dried milk proudly bearing the insignia of the United States of America.

Before pointing out positive feasures, however, let me make clear that we are aware of the genuinely difficult problems related to food for peace. I would be less than frank if I didn't mention some of the program's difficulties.

First, this program is not a cure-all for our agricultural surplus problems.

Secondly, in administering this program abroad there are day-to-day practical problems. Distribution in recipient countries is a particularly thorny one. Furthermore, reasonable precautions must be taken to be sure that these programs do not interfere with normal patterns of commercial trade. We want this program to supplement rather than hinder the development of the world's agricultural countries. And again, traditional eating habits in many countries cannot be changed overnight. Our surpluses may be completely unsatisfactory to people who have never tasted such food.

These are a few of the knotty problems connected with food for peace, and it is clear from them that our use of agricultural surpluses must be approached judiciously. Nevertheless, the stakes are so high—the urgent need to eradicate hunger and malnutrition and to solve some of the pressing difficulties of agriculture—that we must have the vision to accept these problems and try to surmount them.

On the positive side, the program offers constructive outlets for surplus agricultural production without endangering our balance-of-payments position; it lowers the costs of surplus storage; it bolsters farm income; and it is improving business for our railroads, seaports, and shipping lines. Furthermore, it is showing the people of the world that farmers in our free democratic system can outproduce regimented Soviet farmworkers by a ratio of 5 to 1. Our food for peace program also is raising nutritional levels abroad, developing new markets for American agriculture, and assisting in the vital economic development of many new countries.

Perhaps most importantly of all, food for peace reaches large numbers of individuals in the recipient countries directly. This is one of the most personal of all our foreign aid programs. The African people know where these foodstuffs are coming from, and this is building a broad-based reservoir of good will for the United States.

In terms of how this program is received in Africa, we have evidence that it is widely and gratefully welcomed. On my recent trip, for example, I was personally thanked many times in Coquilhatville, in the Congo's Equateur Province, for the flood relief supplied under Ambassador Gullion's special fund. Following the airdrop in Tanganyika, the appreciation of the Tanganyikan people was widely reported in the press when they presented President Kennedy with a stuffed baby crocodile and a dugout canoe.

In Kenya, Masai tribesmen sent the President a shield and spear, and their spokesman said: "We are an insignificant people, but America is a big nation and probably the richest in the world. If she chose, she could remain unconcerned. We are deeply touched by the generosity of your people. We believe the kindly action has no political bearing, and in it we can learn that even in the world of atomic bombs the simple and natural kindness of man to man still remains."

Now, what of the future of the food-for-peace program?

This is a good program and will be with us for a long time. It is of interest to the Congress. Based on discussions abroad and evaluations by the Department of Agriculture, we expect the program to expand and become increasingly effective in years ahead. We foresee more long-term arrangements under title IV as these operations become better understood. We see a broader variety of foods made available, and we see greater use of food to pay foreign workers on public works projects.

You on the Michigan Food for Peace Council and Regional Committee No. 2 have a unique opportunity to contribute materially to the program's future. You can give us advice on how to conduct the program and expert technical assistance on problems of production, storage, transportation and distribution. You can arouse the interest and enthusiasm of civic groups and private citizens alike. You can select specific agricultural problems in particular countries and take on their solution as your personal projects to make the program more effective.

With your help, the future of the food-for-peace program takes on a very optimistic outlook—even though we realize the program in itself will not solve our farm problem, nor will it end the world's hunger and malnutrition. But it can make a major contribution toward an eventual solution of these problems and help speed the development of new and emerging nations—and this is a desirable goal that we can share with all people interested in world peace and stability.

How To Give Our Economy a Boost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, cooperation and understanding between Government and business are essential for the well-being of our country. Mr. Roger Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel Corp., has made this point the subject of an article which was published in This Week magazine. This article deserves the thoughtful consideration of business and Government leaders.

The article follows:

HOW TO GIVE OUR ECONOMY A BOOST

(By Roger M. Blough)

(For the first time since his big White House battle, the head of United States Steel speaks up publicly to give his answer to the question everyone's been asking: Can Government and business cooperate for the profit of the whole country?)

Many people are worrying about the growing antagonism between business and Government. Often in recent months I have been asked, "Are you anti-Kennedy?" or "Do you think Washington is antibusiness?"

I suppose these questions are directed to me even more frequently than to other businessmen because I was involved earlier this year in a widely publicized disagreement with the President over the price of steel. The events connected with that controversy have undoubtedly caused many people to wonder whether the administration is not basically antibusiness. Reactions within the business community generally have led some in Government to suspect that business is antiadministration.

I believe Labor Day is a good time to reexamine the relationships between Government and business for, in my opinion, continued hostility between the two is just about the worst thing that could happen to our country.

I, as a businessman, am not hostile to the Government or the President. And I cannot imagine that our Government, as a matter of policy, would deliberately engage in warfare with the business community.

Yes, there are misunderstandings on both sides—serious ones. There are differences of opinion, deeply felt differences. There are instances of strong disagreement. These may continue. There are moments of pique. They will probably occur again.

But on one thing there is no valid or debatable difference. That is the absolute necessity of a strong, virile domestic economy for America's protection and for the protection of our allies.

If America is to grow and prosper as all of us wish, then that growth must come essentially from the productive sector of our economy—from the business community. Government cannot bring it about, nor can business do so without the understanding and cooperation of Government. Both must work together; and we shall not solve our intricate economic problems by denouncing the administration or by shouting "down with business."

Let's stop a minute and ask ourselves: Who is Government? Who is business? And who is "They—when the word is spoken disparagingly by either side to refer to the other?

Government? In the broadest sense, it's the nearly 70 millions of us who voted at the last Presidential election. Acting for us in the vast task of administering our country are 8½ million civilians in Government posts either elected by us or appointed by those we elected.

Business? It is 55 million of our people organized into almost 5 million units varying in size from A.T. & T. to the corner grocery. These business units provide 80 percent of the country's jobs and payrolls and practically all of the goods and services that enable the American people to live as we like to live.

So essentially, these two groups are composed of the same people, and between them there is an excellent basis for mutual understanding.

An extraordinary number of businessmen—far more than you might think—have served in Government, often at considerable financial sacrifice to themselves and their families. For example, many of the Nation's leading industrialists and corporation presidents belong to an advisory group called the Business Council; and over 40 percent of the 170 members of this group have held full-time Government jobs in the present or former administrations.

In addition, 31 Senators and 134 members of the House of Representatives, or nearly one-third of our legislators, were businessmen or bankers before they went to Congress.

Such interest on the part of businessmen in the political scene is not new. After all, Ben Franklin was a businessman, as were other patriot leaders.

While common sense and common interest in our national welfare argue for cooperation between business and government, most of us have to admit that currently something seems wrong. What we are suffering, it seems to me, is primarily a crisis of confidence.

On one hand, some Government people question whether business can successfully operate the productive sector of our society in the world as it is today.

On the other hand, many in the business community wonder whether Government understands the kind of climate that has historically made the United States the most productive country in history.

Now on this Labor Day I propose that all of us—management, labor, and Government—embark on a great quest for the kind of Government-business confidence that will increase investment, speed the installation of new machinery and create jobs.

How do we build this confidence?

Each side must be able to speak freely and fully. And each side must be listened to when it presents its problems.

It would be helpful if businessmen and Government officials alike could express their differences—sometimes vigorous and basic differences on such touchy subjects as pricing, taxation, and foreign trade—without generating group antagonisms or hostility on either side.

In addition, business and Government must seek to know a great deal more about each others' problems. Let me give an example on each side:

Our Government faces the unbelievably difficult and delicate question of balance of payments. Last May the President asked a committee of businessmen to study the problem and suggest measures. The deeper the committee dug, the more intensely its members realized the complex interrelation of foreign aid, the draining away of gold reserves, the value of the dollar, and military expenditures abroad.

Once a businessman appreciates how thorny and many-sided this issue is for the Government, he views proposals that are offered with new understanding.

On the other side, some in Government do not seem to understand the function of profits. But if they studied the problem more deeply, and if they truly understood the extent to which depressed profit levels are acting as a deterrent to our national growth, they would certainly want to help business deal with the present disastrous profit squeeze.

But words, no matter how friendly, sincere or well meant, are not enough. Confidence is a bridge. If it is to serve as an effective bridge between business and Government, it needs support at both ends in the form of action.

Here are specific steps I feel the Government might take to rebuild a faltering confidence:

1. Taxation—Tax laws which discourage greater investment in job-producing plant and machinery are wholly inconsistent with our efforts to increase national growth. Our competitor nations in Europe are putting 8 to 12 percent of their gross national product into new plant and equipment. We are only using about 5 percent for this purpose. Wise tax revision can remove many of the present obstacles to growth.

2. Competition—Business confidence could be greatly improved if Government clearly stated its intention to keep out of business fields that are being efficiently served by private, taxpaying companies.

3. Attitude—It would help if Government recognized that no centralized agency can make the innumerable day-to-day decisions of 5 million individual business units which are competing for survival and success. Each of these businesses has its own unique problems and only those who actually live with these problems can decide best how to solve them. That is the responsibility of these businessmen and they should be allowed to discharge it in a lawful manner without Government interference, pressure, or dictation.

Here's what I think business might do to bolster confidence:

1. Restraint.—I believe that we in business should be sure that we fully understand what Government is trying to do and why; and that if we disagree with some proposed action, we should not just oppose it, but should try to advance a better proposal.

2. Explanation.—Business must do a better job of explaining its problems and positions. Everyone understands that a 15-year-old car is not competitive with a new model. Our industrial machinery is around 15 years old on the average. If we in business had been able to explain better, through the years, the indestructible links between taxes, profits, tools and jobs, we could have avoided many difficulties.

3. Production.—Business can strengthen the competitive potential of our Nation by putting even more emphasis on research, product innovation, quality improvement and increased sales effort.

Of one thing I am sure. If this Nation is to be strong, secure, dynamic and free, it cannot be divided into warring groups and contending factions.

In my travels I have visited countries that were undergoing serious internal upheaval. I have been struck by the complete economic paralysis that resulted. Nobody wanted to buy a new car or build a house or start a business.

The same thing sometimes happens in a family torn by dissension. The plan to remodel the kitchen is dropped. Nobody bothers with a new carpet for the stairs.

In a household and in a nation the actions that bring comfort and provide jobs are actions of faith. You spend your money, you seed the lawn, you build a steel plant because you have confidence that your plans will work.

That is why I feel so strongly that there must be understanding between business and Government. For it would be a tragedy beyond belief if uncertainty in the future or lack of confidence were to block our progress. And that is what we must renew today—our faith in our ability as Americans to accomodate our differences and to agree ultimately upon a wise and well-reasoned course of action.

Of course I recognize that we will disagree on policies and procedures. But even as we debate, let us remember the simple arithmetic of survival:

Government divided from business equals stagnation. But government plus business equals national strength, national prosperity and national growth.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 7, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of September 1, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Tex., Sept. 1, 1962)

USE OF PUBLIC MONEY FOR A SLUSH FUND

The House this week passed the Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act (H.R. 10113), a fancy title for the creation of the biggest slush fund in history, putting more power in the hands of President Kennedy and, as usual, the people pay the bill. The motion to recommit (the only way to defeat the measure) was defeated 221 against (202 Democrats, 19 Republicans), 192 for recommittal (148 Republicans, 44 Democrats). A vote for recommittal was a vote against the bill. I voted to recommit. This legislation creates a $900 million fund (all of it deficit spending) for all types of public works projects, including swimming pools, golf courses, and ski slides. Congressman LES ARENDS, the minority whip, called it the "most depressing and reckless legislation ever passed by the House."

Arguments for: (1) Permit the President at his discretion to authorize public works projects (pump-priming philosophy) to provide employment. (2) To provide money for projects in key Democratic districts to help elect Democrats.

Arguments against: (from the minority report (1) The bill will not accomplish its stated purpose to provide immediate work for a substantial number of unemployed and underemployed persons. (2) The Congress should not authorize the appropriation of additional funds to construct public works for the purpose of creating jobs when unobligated balances in existing programs amounting to billions of dollars are available. (3) Expenditure of $900 million for unauthorized projects will necessitate deficit financing and will contribute to the necessity of increasing the public debt. (4) Federal share of the cost of public works projects of State and local governments will increase to 50 or 75 percent. (5) Local public works projects which are now eligible for interest-bearing loans, under the new law, will be able to secure grants and gifts. (6) It delegates to the President the constitutional power and authority of Congress to authorize new Federal grant-in-aid programs and projects. Another step toward dictatorship.

The conclusion of the minority report on this bill is so important that I feel it must be quoted at length: "In our opinion this bill is ineffective to provide immediate em-

ployment, and over a period of 2 years, or more, at best it will create jobs for only about 3 percent of the persons now unemployed. Whereas, the bill purports to offer hope for the millions now unemployed, in reality, it will only bring more disillusionment and despair when its inadequacies become known. Enactment of this bill is entirely too high a price to pay, both in dollars and in the unwise delegation of congressional powers to the President, in return for the few temporary jobs which will be created too late to be of any immediate assistance to those who now desperately need work, and cannot find employment.

"The real end result of this bill is to give the President a book of blank checks with authority to draw $900 million from the Treasury of the United States and to use such amounts thereof as he decides for the construction of projects he selects in localities of his choosing. Under the authority of this bill the President can approve or withhold funds for projects in such a manner as to coerce Members of Congress to support his New Frontier program, or to buy political support for favored candidates for public office, or to pay political obligations. When the people of this country learn what this bill does and does not do, they will strongly resent the political contrivance to give the President a political slush fund to be paid for by the taxpayers.

"Thomas Jefferson warned against traveling the road down which the present administration is taking the country, when he said: 'I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest danger to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.'" I stand with Thomas Jefferson.

For my part, effective representation by me of a self-respecting electorate, Dallas County, means—refusal to: (1) Endorse fiscal irresponsibility, (2) contribute to deficit financing, (3) create more inflation, (4) increase Federal boondoggle and political spending, all of which means I and the people of Dallas cannot be bought nor intimidated by Federal aid—whether it be Dallas Love Field, Dallas Federal Building, or Dallas public works—offered or denied. This is the issue—the battle is joined—the Democrats have chosen their side, and no Democrat candidate can effectively and responsibly represent his district warring with his President (the head of his party) and all his congressional leaders. It is now for the people to decide and this fall is the time for decision.

The Golden Eagle—A Predatory Bird

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the most relentless and persistent enemy of wildlife and young domesticated animals in certain areas of the country today is the golden eagle. As a destroyer of helpless lambs, goat kids, fawns, and wild turkey, the golden eagle is today ranked ahead of the coyote, bobcat, and the mountain lion.

Yet, legislation is now pending in the Congress to interfere with the right of landowners and conservationists to protect against this bird of prey. It goes without saying that any legislation that is enacted on this subject should exempt the affected areas from the penalties of the law, or at least make it the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to permit the taking of the eagle where evidence shows it to be necessary.

EYEWITNESS ACCOUNTS

In view of the fact that there are some good-intentioned people who are either misinformed or uninformed about the eating habits of the golden eagle, perhaps this is a good time to cite some eyewitness accounts of the habits of this bird and how destructive they actually are. The only valid evidence must come from people who live on the range, who observe and see with their own eyes what they report.

These birds are migratory. Large numbers of them come into southwest Texas in the fall of the year and make their homes along the Mexican border during the winter and early spring. There are not many rodents, ground squirrels, and rabbits in that area, whereas in other areas of the country the eagles seem to be able to live principally from those sources of livelihood. They also eat carrion.

While in the Southwest these birds seek havens in bluffs, cliffs, and rough canyon sanctuaries. From their roosting places they swoop down into the open valleys and prey upon young lambs, kids, and wild game. If need be they even attack live varmints.

I recently received a letter from Mr. W. J. Burns, of Del Rio, Tex., in which he stated:

I trapped 11 years for the Fish and Wildlife Service. I caught 193 coyotes and killed 265 dogs, all killing sheep. * * * I lived day and night on the range and in the ranch pastures. And I know that the men who are trying to pass a law to stop killing the eagle do not have any experience in the line I have followed. They are listening to people who don't know what they are trying to do.

I have seen the eagles fly over the pastures and dive straight down like a bullet, and rise with a lamb in its claws.

EAGLE KILLS LARGE LAMB

Arthur Davis, a prominent and highly respected ranchman of Uvalde and Real Counties, where the golden eagle is often seen during the winter seasons, writes:

I have had eagles catch and kill kids and lambs. Large flocks of hawks would follow him around and rob his kill. They would pester him for his kill until he would leave it to them, then kill another, and then another.

Just a few years ago I had an eagle killing large lambs, about 6 weeks to 2 months old. He was also feeding some boarder hawks. I was out early to try to put a stop to it, and I had some poison and was intending to get some of the boarders if not the provider. I saw the eagle, about 400 yards away, make a dive, and since he did not come up I was sure he had made a kill which was too large to carry. I galloped up to the spot and found him with his talons still clutching a big lamb by the head, both eyeballs and brain pierced. The lamb was dead. I jumped from my horse and with my knife I cut a small hole, in which I put some poison, into the lamb's heart and liver. I returned in about 2 hours * * * he had eaten his fill, then spat most of it up, but he was unable to fly.

EAGLE KILLS YEARLING GOAT

Just this last winter I was coming from Rocksprings to Leakey, and as I was passing through the Roy Leinweber Ranch I saw an eagle diving, with wings folded back and talons outstretched, off to the side of the road. I stopped and watched for him to show up with his kill. He never took flight so I stalked out to the area where I saw him go down. I came upon him in a small clearing, with his kill. I stayed concealed in a liveoak thicket and watched him. He was already eating the insides from a yearling angora goat. Several hawks were coming in to join the feast. When the hawks would crowd in he would stand on one foot and raise the other, threatening them. The hawks would back off. The eagle would then have to lower his other foot before he could lower his head to eat, and up would dash the hawks. This kept up as more and more hawks kept joining the crowd. In spite of all his efforts, the hawks were getting bites from time to time. He had had enough. He began trying to fly away with his kill. Since he could not carry it, he gave up and left it to the robber hawks. As he circled to fly, he saw me and left in in a hurry.

SAW EAGLES KILL DEER

Davis also included a detailed account of how the golden eagles robbed his traps which he had set for varmints. They killed and ate skunks, civet cats, raccoons, and ringtail cats, always striking early in the morning.

Early one morning I found a ringtail in a trap before the eagle did. I tied the ringtail up short and set some traps out in front of it. When I returned I had Mr. Eagle.

After recalling a number of other eyewitness accounts, Davis told of eagles attacking a deer:

One morning I was out early and just as I walked over a ridge I heard a deer crying, as a deer cries when caught by a panther or hung in a fence. In a short time this deer, a doe, ran nearer to me. Two eagles were attacking her. They would dive on her, sink their talons in her loin, then dive at her head and grab at her eyes. They had no chance of holding her or killing her on the spot, but they were getting the best of her. I shot one of them with my single shot .22 rifle, and he took off. The other followed. I went down to the deer. She was strong, but her eyes had been pierced and she was running in circles and running over brush. I later found her dead.

WORSE THAN RUSSIAN HOGS OR BOBCATS

Buddy Pape of Prade Ranch, Texas, writes:

We ranch in Real County. We have been bothered with the golden eagle every year. They come here during the fall of the year and leave in the spring.

We have actually seen them fly down and catch little lambs and goat kids. Several times we have scared an eagle up off the ground and went to the spot and found little remains of a goat kid or lamb the eagle had been eating.

We have a few bobcats in this part of the country the year round and also have had some trouble with the Russian hogs, but we have never had wild animals of any kind that did us as much damage or were as hard to combat as the golden eagle.

Mr. W. H. Glimp writes:

For 10 years I operated a 50-section ranch in Hudspeth County near Van Horn. With all of the trouble we had from coyotes, bobcats, and panthers, there was nothing that

hurt me as bad as the eagles * * * I saw these eagles eat a whole lamb crop while I fought them with every known means. I want to go on record that I saw these eagles attack and kill my lambs. And I know what I am talking about.

Scores of other eyewitness reports of this kind could be cited. I can supply any number of such accounts for anyone who desires to see them. Mr. Dan Auld, an eminent naturalist and conservationist of Kerrville, Tex., testified before a Senate subcommittee recently when hearings were being held on a bill to protect the golden eagle. His testimony, which appears in the printed hearings, was factual and devastating. Mr. Auld, a native of the area where the eagle spends the winter, is a prominent ranchman who raises sheep, goats, and cattle. He gave firsthand accounts of some hair-raising experiences he had had with the eagle and listed any number of instances where he had with his own eyes witnessed the golden eagle attack, sheep, goats, and wildlife.

Mr. Fritz Kahl, of Fort Davis, Tex., also testified before the Senate subcommittee.

I attribute this year in 6 of my lambing pastures 122 lambs lost to eagles. The method of kill and scavengering was evidenced in all cases. Talon marks on the back and neck, rib cage opened and lung and heart and liver gone.

I have personally observed this marauder descend and perform his kill; I have heard lambs bleat in defense which was useless.

My experience is multiplied, I am sure, many times in most all sheep and goat operations in Texas. Should any ornithologist, bird watcher, or bird conservationist wish to refute this testimony, he or she is invited to go with me to my ranch and observe the eagle.

Mr. Kahl's testimony includes a number of eyewitness accounts of the golden eagle destroying wild game and domesticated animals.

EAGLE DESTROYS ANTELOPE

Dan Auld's testimony also included the following:

More convincing evidence as to the predatory habits of the golden eagle is what happened to our antelope or pronghorn in west Texas. The pronghorns range in the highland ranch country of the Davis Mountains in west Texas, which covers a large area of good grazing land. The antelope or pronghorn became so depleted in 1903 that the game department in Texas closed the season on them, but they did not increase.

It seems that the young antelope which survived, just about balanced off the old ones which died.

For many years this Davis Mountain country was ranched altogether by cowmen, and the eagles did not give them too much trouble. Then in about 1940 the sheep and goat men started moving their flocks into this area. Immediately the eagles started killing their lambs and kids, and the ranchers started doing something about it. They hired a man to hunt golden eagles by plane. He is supposed to have killed some 1,300 golden eagles the first year. The very next year the antelope doubled its population. This proved to the game department what was happening to the antelope and they started helping the ranchers to kill off the golden eagles. In 3 years the hunting season on antelope was opened after having been closed for 41 years because there had not been enough antelope to hunt. In 1944, the first year the hunting season was open, the hunters killed 344 antelope and last year they took over 2,000. Many more antelope were trapped to replant in other parts of Texas.

It seems these facts alone should be conclusive enough to kill these bills to protect the golden eagle.

Every year since 1940 the ranchers in the Davis Mountains area have killed golden eagles; otherwise, they would have them back in such numbers that they could not profitably operate their ranches.

NO DANGER OF EXTINCTION

Mr. Speaker, the theory behind the bills that have been introduced in the House and Senate to protect the golden eagle is that this is necessary to avoid extinction. But the evidence proves there is no such danger. In fact the Department of the Interior in its report on the pending legislation stated:

This resolution states that the golden eagle is threatened with extinction. Although golden eagles have declined in number in recent years in the Eastern States, we cannot state, on the basis of our present information, that the golden eagle has reached the stage of an endangered species.

Moreover, a number of witnesses testified—and without contradiction—that the number of golden eagles appearing in certain areas of Texas during their migratory sojourn there has actually increased in recent years. More and more of them are being seen each year.

Therefore, the possible extinction of the golden eagle is not a valid justification for this legislation. There is in fact no such threat.

It is also contended that in order to protect the bald eagle in certain areas it is necessary to provide similar protection for the golden eagle because until they reach maturity both the golden eagle and bald eagle are indistinguishable. That problem does not arise in Texas because the bald eagle is never seen in that area.

While this problem is effectively met by laws in the various States which also protect the golden eagle as well as the bald eagle, if it should be the will of the Congress to proceed with Federal legislation, certainly any such legislation should not interfere with the right of landowners to protect themselves by killing the golden eagle in those areas where the latter, unlike the bald eagle, constitutes a serious menace to livestock and wildlife.

Surely no one in his right mind would condone the wanton destruction of livestock and wild game in the areas where that is practiced by the golden eagle. No true conservationist would condone such preying habits.

LET FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE INVESTIGATE

Indeed, it would seem that the more sensible and appropriate course to follow would be to postpone any action on this legislation for at least another year. In view of the confusion among sponsors regarding the eating habits of the golden eagle while sojourning along the Mexican border, sponsors could request the Fish and Wildlife Service to conduct an on-the-spot investigation of what the actual facts are.

In view of the destruction being wrought by the eagles in that area, it seems incredible to the people trying to make a living there by raising livestock, as well as to the game conservationists, of whom there are many, that the Congress would seriously consider any legislation calculated to restrict or hamper them in their defense against this evil.

If the Fish and Wildlife Service should be permitted to make such an investigation they would receive the fullest cooperation of the landowners. They can definitely obtain moving pictures and photographs of the golden eagle while actually engaged in his acts of destruction, if that is desired. That has not been done in the past because it never occurred to the people affected that this legislation would be offered and seriously considered.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT

Mr. Speaker, there are 20 counties in southwest Texas that are seasonally infested by the golden eagle. It is believed by the ranchmen and conservationists that since the eagle constitutes an annual, hibitual menace to livestock and wildlife in that area, those 20 counties should be exempted from the operation of any law that is enacted to protect the golden eagle.

But if it should be determined that some legislation affecting all areas alike should be enacted, then I have prepared an amendment to pending bills which, if properly administered, should provide reasonable protection to the people who would be adversely affected. In lieu of section 2 of pending bills, the following is proposed.

Section 2. Whenever, after investigation, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine that it is compatible with the preservation of the bald eagle or the golden eagle to permit the taking, possession, and transportation of specimens thereof for the scientific or exhibition purposes of public museums, scientific societies, and zoological parks, or for the religious purposes of Indian tribes, or that it is necessary to permit the taking of such eagles for the protection of wildlife or of agricultural or other interests in any particular locality, he shall authorize the taking of such eagles pursuant to regulations which he is hereby authorized to prescribe: *Provided*, That on request of the Governor of any State, the Secretary of Interior shall promptly conduct an investigation for the purpose of determining whether it is necessary to permit the taking of golden eagles for the purpose of protecting wildlife or domesticated flocks and herds in such State, in accordance with regulations established under the provisions of this section, in such part or parts of such State for such periods as the Secretary determines to be necessary to protect such interests;

Provided further, That whenever during such investigation there is presented to the Secretary of the Interior substantial evidence that the golden eagle destroys domesticated livestock or wild game, in any area of a State, it shall be his duty to permit the taking of such eagles in such part or parts of such State where the evidence indicates such destruction is taking place or is about to take place, and for such periods as he determines to be necessary to protect such interests, notwithstanding any other provision of this act;

Provided further, That bald eagles may not be taken for any purpose unless, prior to such taking, a permit to do so is procured from the Secretary of the Interior.

PROTECTION AGAINST EAGLE ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL

Since the Government's brush eradication program got under way some 25

years ago, brush has been removed from vast areas along the Rio Grande where the eagle spends the winter. This has exposed wild game and sheep and goats to the marauders, much more so than was the case previously.

I say categorically, knowing that what I say is absolutely correct, that without constant vigilance, including organized attacks on the invading eagles by the ranchmen in the affected areas, successful breeding operations of sheep and goats could not be carried on there. There could be no profit in it. Thousands of dollars are spent each year in fighting this menace.

Despite this deplorable problem, unless he is able to get a permit in Washington, under pending legislation a landowner would be sent to jail for 6 months and fined $500 for killing a golden eagle, even if done while a lamb, kid, or fawn is being attacked and having its eyes blinded and then slaughtered by this vicious bird of prey.

United States Sets Up Pesticides Panel To Review Their Side Effects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on August 31 I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some references to the effects of pesticides which were taken from an article in the New Yorker magazine by Rachel Carson. On the same date I saw an item in the New York Times regarding the establishment of a pesticides panel to review their side effects. This was disclosed by President Kennedy at his news confernce that the Government is examining its pesticide program.

I have attached the Times item, and, in addition, I have attached an editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of September 1, which also calls attention to the problem.

The article and editorial follow:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 31, 1962]

UNITED STATES SETS UP PESTICIDES PANEL TO REVIEW THEIR SIDE EFFECTS—FEDERAL COUNCIL OF SCIENCE TO EXAMINE GOVERNMENT'S CONTROLS ON CHEMICALS

(By Marjorie Hunter)

WASHINGTON, August 30.—The effectiveness of Government programs dealing with the use and control of pesticides is under review by a special Federal committee.

This was disclosed today after President Kennedy's assurance at his news conference yesterday that the Government is examining its pesticide program.

The President was asked if Government agencies were taking a closer look at the possibility of dangerous, long-range side effects from the widespread use of pesticides.

He replied:

"Yes. I—and I know that they already are—I think, particularly, of course, since Miss Carson's book, but they are examining the matter."

He was referring to Rachel Carson's "The Silent Spring," to be published September 27 by the Houghton Mifflin Co. Excerpts were published in the New Yorker magazine last June.

Miss Carson contends that the world "has been widely contaminated with the substances used in the control of insects." She says that such chemicals are poisoning not only pests but also humans, wildlife, soil, food, and water.

Although not calling for elimination of such chemicals, she urges reducing their use to a minimum.

SCIENCE COUNCIL ACTS

The review of Government pesticide programs is being made by a committee of the Federal Council of Science and Technology. The Council, headed by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, special assistant to the President for science and technology, was set up in 1959 to coordinate Government research activities.

Serving on the review committee are representatives from the Departments of Defense, Commerce, Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare. All of these Departments have pesticide programs.

Some of these programs have been in existence for years, others are relatively new.

The Department of Agriculture is engaged in extensive research to find other methods of controlling and eradicating pests. One of these projects involves the sterilizing of male insects, thus eliminating a breed because female eggs will not hatch.

The licensing of pesticides is also controlled by the Department of Agriculture. It requires that pesticides must be tested extensively on animals, must be properly labeled and must be proved effective and safe.

Working closely with the Agricultural Department is the Food and Drug Administration, which establishes the maximum permissible limits of contamination that will be allowed on food shipped in interstate commerce. These limits are called tolerances.

One regulation excludes any pesticide residue in milk and milk products. However, because the Agency has so few inspectors, this regulation has reportedly been violated numerous times.

The Agency once ordered 700,000 pounds of frozen spinach destroyed because the vegetable contained too much DDT residue.

Since the early 1940's, the Public Health Service has been studying the possible harmful effects of DDT and other chemical compounds on man. Currently, $3 million a year is being spent on these studies.

The National Institute of Health, the research arm of the Public Health Service is financing 80 projects related to pesticides.

Other Public Health Service projects dealing directly or indirectly with pesticides include a nationwide water-sampling network, soon to be expanded from 125 to 300 stations; educational activities designed to curtail poisoning accidents; and special studies at the Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta.

The Department of the Interior is engaged in an extensive and long-range investigation of the effect of pesticides on fish and wildlife.

Research is being done in several laboratories and field stations.

The Department of Defense has an Armed Force Pest Control Review Board. Since 1955, the Department has required that any employee, military or civilian, must take a course in the use of pesticides before being allowed to use them.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, Sept. 1, 1962]

EFFECTS OF PESTICIDES

The inquiry to be made by a special Federal panel into the effectiveness of Government programs dealing with the use and control of pesticides promises to resolve doubts which many people have entertained about the effects of sprays used for insect and weed control.

The action was precipitated by advance reading of a book to be published in late September by Rachel Carson, who contends that the world has been contaminated by chemicals which have come into wide use in recent years. Extensive tests are made with pesticides before they are licensed for use, and the Agriculture Department, Food and Drug Administration and Public Health Service maintain a watch on the effects.

Their staffs are not large enough, however, to cover every use of the chemicals.

It will be a good thing to have an official report on the extent to which contamination has imperiled wildlife, humans, soil, water and food through use of these products, to ascertain whether some may do more harm than good.

Address by the Attorney General Before American Bar Association House of Delegates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a most thoughtful and provocative discussion of the responsibilities of lawyers for promoting and improving the administration of justice was made by our able Attorney General before the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association a couple of weeks ago.

Attorney General Kennedy, among other things, pointed out the obligation of lawyers to assure fair and equal treatment of all our citizens before the law and recommended that the Congress approve the establishment of a system providing competent and paid counsel for indigent defendants. I introduced a bill (H.R. 2696) which would make this possible and I earnestly hope that it will soon have the approval of the Committee on the Judiciary. I recommend to all Members of the House the Attorney General's speech dealing with this problem as well as a number of other important issues that would improve the administration of justice. Under unanimous consent, I include the speech in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, HOUSE OF DELEGATES, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., AUGUST 6, 1962

I am delighted to have this chance to speak today before this convention of the American Bar Association. Our system of judicial administration requires the closest possible cooperation between the Department of Justice and the lawyers of the land; and as Attorney General, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss matters of common concern with the distinguished representatives of the bar who I find in this room today.

Every department of the executive branch regards its mission as indispensable to the functioning of our democracy. But I cannot help feeling that the Department of Justice has a special and urgent responsibility, for the quest for justice is the very heart of the democratic experiment.

This, in my view, is a central and continuing obligation of the Attorney General's office as it must be for every lawyer. In meeting that responsibility I am heartened by the knowledge that we have the support, not only of our whole ethical and political tradition, but more particularly of the men and women who must see that the system operates and expands in this modern society of immense and unforeseen problems, of men, like yourselves, trained in the ideals and processes of Anglo-Saxon justice.

It has never been more important that it is today that free society display its capacity for justice. For here at home and all around the globe our system stands on trial before the world—our beliefs and our actions are pitted against a determined and resourceful and disciplined adversary—while in our own land urbanization, automation, the demand for equal rights in an age of bigness, all bear down upon us with a host of new and pressing problems.

Today, the advances of technology have become so rapid that frequently they tend to outstrip our capacity to deal with their impact upon our social and industrial system. Land urbanization has intensified a host of old problems, besides introducing new ones.

Automation is causing a situation in many areas of our country similar to 19th century England when the handicraft of a feudal age was replaced by the machine-craft of the industrial age. The rise of associational activity has brought its special problems into the field of monopoly and restraint of trade, into the organizational activities of labor unions, and into the dark and dirty world of crime.

The very complexity of modern life makes it easy for individual liberties to be disregarded. More and more the American people must rely on the law for the protection of these liberties.

It is here that you and I have such a heavy responsibility. For it rests on us to be certain that the legal protections so necessary for the individual do not become merely fine declarations in the lawbooks but that they actually have some real and genuine meaning for the human beings to whom they have been granted. This task requires the care and attention of the whole legal profession.

At the Department of Justice, we are just part of this effort and as such have our limitations.

We recognize for instance that the line between what the Federal Government can and should do and what State and local authorities can and should do is often shadowy. Frequently it is the sum total of these efforts that counts. For this reason it is vital that we work closely and continuously with local authorities in achieving our common objectives.

No issue brings the role of the individual into sharper focus than that of civil rights. I am proud of the record of the Department of Justice in recent months in striving to assure all citizens the full rights guaranteed them under the Constitution of the United States.

Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall and his aides are performing a distinguished service in this respect—a service which goes far beyond instituting and prosecuting cases in the Federal courts. We have not filed a single civil rights case without first going to the local authorities. We have informed them of what appears to us to be a violation of the law, for, the Constitution being the law of the land, the local authorities—judges, prosecutors, and lawyers—have an equal obligation to protect and defend it.

In the majority of cases, the local officials have taken action and nothing further has been required of the Federal Government. There are no front page news stories, but there are changes; there are results and they are brought about by local officials—not the Government in Washington. In the long run this is what is of real importance in this country.

Sometimes the local authorities have disagreed with us about the law, and we have gone to court. On other occasions, local authorities were unwilling to remedy the situation, or could not because of what they believed to be the political facts of life, and so court action was necessary.

In all this effort Burke Marshall has been in the forefront, negotiating, prodding, advising, persuading—working with explosive problems and devising solutions which fulfill the law of our land and the ideals of our Nation. This is the historic role of the lawyer in the fullest sense.

I am proud, too, of those Federal judges who have seen and done their duty under difficult circumstances. A judge's popularity or unpopularity is of no proper concern to him in the performance of his judicial duties. Yet to do that duty—to give an honest reading of the Constitution and of the law of the land—may and often does require great courage.

I might add that this is also the sworn obligation of every lawyer. If the bar has done much to assist in the orderly realization of constitutional rights, I would be less than candid if I did not tell you that I believe more can and should be done.

Another area of concern to every private citizen—and to every lawyer—is the war against organized crime. Crime is not only a cause of economic waste, but far worse than that, it is a reproach to the moral pretensions of our society—and advertises to the world the gap between our pronouncements and our performance.

The battle against crime must have a top priority in protecting individual rights. We have heard much about the rights of the individual and with this I have no quarrel—but the general public also has some rights that need to be protected. We have made some encouraging gains in the last 20 months.

The Criminal Division for the first time is spearheading a coordinated drive by all Federal law enforcement agencies to reduce the entrenched power and wealth of organized crime to the point where it can be controlled by local authorities. Desperately needed legislation has been enacted in a bipartisan effort. Intensive investigations are being conducted into the corruption of public officials where unfortunately the inroads of organized crime are particularly frightening. We are moving forward in a systematic way but we have far to go.

A third field of prime consequence to individual rights is the protection of the competitive forces in our system of private enterprise. This is, perhaps, the most technical and complicated field with which the Department is concerned.

Obviously, there are certain areas of the antitrust law where the guidelines have been set so definitively that no excuse for transgressing them properly can be made. This is true, for example, of conspiracies to fix prices or to apportion territories. In such cases there can be no hesitancy on the part of the Government to act.

In many other areas, however, there are complex economic situations which require deep study and understanding when action is contemplated. The antitrust laws should be vigorously enforced but they are weapons which should be utilized to help the consumer, the businessman both large and small—and to protect and preserve the free enterprise system. That is our intention. That is our effort.

In all of these matters, as well as the many others that come within our mutual area of responsibility, I cannot help but be concerned as to whether, despite the efforts of dedicated public officials and conscientious lawyers—there is in fact equal justice before the law here in the United States. I am speaking now of a concern for whether there is true equality in the administration of justice.

I ask you—do members of ethnic or political minorities or people who speak our language imperfectly or who have low mentality or disturbed minds; or the largest group, those who are poor, really receive the same protection before the courts as the rest of our citizens? I say that all too often they do not.

I need hardly say to this audience that everyone in this land—whether immigrant or pauper, alleged crook or Communist—is innocent until proven guilty and is entitled to as fair a trial and as competent representation as, say, leading citizens accused of price fixing in business or of corruption in labor.

It seems to me that our obligation—your obligation as attorneys in private practice and my obligation as Attorney General—is to make the assurance of fair and equal treatment to all before the law one of our first concerns.

Judge Learned Hand, speaking at the 75th anniversary of the Legal Aid Society of New York, said if we are to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment: "Thou shalt not ration justice."

Let me discuss with you just a few of the areas which must cause us all concern. One is the problem of the representation of indigent defendants. This is not a problem of charity, but of justice.

Mr. Justice Black points out in *Griffin* v. *Illinois*, "there can be no equal justice where the kind of trial a man gets depends upon the amount of money he has."

This is true not only at the time of trial, but during the entire range of legal procedure until the last issue is resolved.

Over a year ago, I asked a distinguished committee headed by Prof. Francis Allen, of the University of Michigan Law School, to study what could be done to protect the rights of indigents in the Federal courts. The committee has found that much is being done in certain areas of the country. But its study shows that much, much more needs to be done.

Last year, almost 30 percent of the defendants in the 34,008 criminal cases in Federal court could not afford counsel. In the District of Columbia, where the Federal District court hears all felony cases, over half the defendants had to be assigned attorneys. The situation in the States is comparable.

Federal and most State jurisdictions now hold that the right to counsel at trial is an affirmative right which must be extended by the Government when the defendant cannot provide his own.

Last June, the Supreme Court called for argument upon the question of right to counsel and whether the decision in *Betts* v. *Brady* should be overruled.

The recent decision in *Mapp* v. *Ohio* suggests by analogy that a majority may now hold that the 14th amendment requires States to provide counsel for indigent defendants in all cases involving serious crimes. And a recent decision by the Oregon Supreme Court had held that in serious crimes the State must not only provide counsel but experienced, competent counsel.

The provision of counsel is indispensable to a democratic system of justice. But translating this principle into practice is difficult. As with most problems, one of the stumbling blocks is lack of money.

And as Professor Allen's committee discovered the problem does not end by merely providing an attorney. There are the added frequently expensive problems such as bail, pretrial investigations and appeal.

The problem of bail for instance is one that has received too little attention. Professor Allen's committee has established conclusively that the question of whether a

man will be kept in jail pending trial or be free is directly influenced by how wealthy he is.

A study of cases in the southern district of New York indicates that over one-third of those required to post bail of $500 or less could not do so. When the bail was set between $500 and $1,500, over half were unable to post it. And there is reason to believe that many of those unable to provide bail presented no substantial risk of nonappearance. Their poverty deprived them of their liberty.

Further, the problem of establishing innocence during the crucial pretrial period was made that much more difficult.

Bail protects the interests of society in assuring a defendant's appearance at trial and it also protects the interests of the individual in allowing him to be free to establish his innocence.

But the indigent defendant who cannot offer security for his appearance is denied this opportunity. He cannot provide for his family and for his defense, and cannot take an active part to prove his innocence.

Preliminary studies in the southern district of New York also indicate that those who cannot make bail are more often convicted and receive stiffer sentences than those who can.

The rights of the indigent after the trial is over—in the appeal stage—is equally a matter of concern.

A series of court decisions in the last 20 years has greatly expanded the responsibility of society to help the indigent perfect his appeal. He is now pledged virtually the same treatment as one who can pay, and this is as it must be.

But, again, the problem of translating this right into reality is difficult. Appellate work is time consuming and requires the highest professional ability.

It usually is an undue burden to call upon counsel, who has contributed his services at trial, to continue on appeal without compensation. Competent new counsel is sometimes difficult to obtain. In this connection I wish to congratulate the bar of the city of San Francisco on what effort it has made in providing counsel for indigent persons on appeal.

We have come a long way since 1876 when a group of German immigrants banded together in New York to form the first Legal Aid Society, but we have not come far enough.

Since 1937, the Department of Justice and for many years the American Bar Association have supported legislation which would appropriate funds to help indigent defendants in Federal courts.

Now 25 years later it is still pending before the judiciary committees of both Houses of Congress. The time to translate good intentions into law is long overdue. I ask for your help as a group and as individuals in working for its enactment.

I recognize that much has been done in many local areas to cope with this problem. I congratulate you on what you have done. Yet, the problem is far from solved. Whatever device is used, it is to the bar that society must turn for legal services to be provided for the indigent. It is inescapably a responsibility of the legal profession—a responsibility that none of us can avoid.

Another problem which is closely related and in some ways is even more difficult is the defense of those who do not fall in the category of indigent but who have limited resources available for their defense. Over 40 percent of our families have incomes of less than $5,000 a year. These families cannot bear the cost of a complicated and extended trial and appeal which could easily equal their annual income.

Indeed, it can be the case that an indigent defendant, through the services of a first-rate volunteer attorney, may receive a better defense than one who pays a small fee and gets incompetent or indifferent counsel.

Legal services, particularly defense in criminal cases, are not like houses or automobiles where those with more money can buy better products without affecting the basic functioning of society. When one defendant cannot afford a complete defense, justice is being rationed.

Today the cost of adequate defense can be high. Psychiatric and highly technical issues require expensive research, investigation, and expert witnesses for the defense as well as for the Government.

In a recent case in which the Government was involved the defendant spent nearly $500,000 in legal and accounting fees in defending himself. He is now in prison. But the point is that we must be certain that the average citizen of a family income of $5,700—the national median—can afford comparable efforts to protect his freedom. There is no question that a man prepared to spend $500,000 is far more likely to retain his freedom than a man who can afford only a few thousand dollars.

The amount of money which can be expended on defense should not affect the outcome of the trial. If justice is priced in the marketplace, individual liberty will be curtailed and respect for law diminished.

There is no easy answer to this problem; again, it lies with the bar itself. Professor Allen's committee is continuing its study of the problem and will have recommendations to make before the end of the year. I would like to ask for recommendations and ideas from the bar. I think they could be most important, and from all of this I would hope that we would develop methods whereby our finest legal talent would not be reserved solely for those who could pay without difficulty and an occasional indigent defendant.

I would hope from this effort that leading lawyers and legal scholars would be in court on a regular basis pleading for defendants of moderate circumstances. As long as a man is handicapped before the bar of justice because of his poverty, our task as lawyers is not done.

I thank you for this opportunity to speak.

Fortunately, no generation of lawyers as yet has lost that desire for a just society that will preserve the dignity of man and his individual right to search for happiness.

This association and its kindred associations in our 50 States and hundreds of counties and cities will, I feel sure, keep that desire aflame.

Let us as lawyers—as Americans—as Theodore Roosevelt said, "Boldly face the life of strife, resolute to do our duty well and manfully; resolute to uphold righteousness by deed and by word; resolute to be both honest and brave, to serve high ideals, yet use practical methods. Above all, let us shrink from no strife moral or physical."

A bar dedicated to the preservation of our basic freedoms, pledged to the search for truth, is a main bulwark of our democratic society which can aid mightily to achieve what President Kennedy recently described as a "world of law and free choice, banishing the world of war and coercion."

Aggression Proclaimed Respectable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, there has been much conjecture as to the feeling of the people of Australia concerning the so-called settlement between the Dutch and the Indonesians on the question of West New Guinea. Many of us have warned that we are forcing Australia to accept her own Cuba, in the form of domination of West New Guinea by a power which is at least friendly to communism. I am including an editorial from the Sydney Morning Herald, of Friday, August 17, 1962, which shows the feeling of at least one segment of the Australian people concerning this so-called settlement in New Guinea. The editorial follows:

AGGRESSION PROCLAIMED RESPECTABLE

Wednesday, August 15, 1962, ironically the anniversary of the end in the Pacific of the long and grievous struggle against military aggression, was a historic day. On that day, the United Nations, through its Acting Secretary General, endorsed military aggression as a legitimate method of enforcing national claims. On that day, the United States praised surrender to aggression as a means of keeping the peace, and congratulated itself on having contributed to that surrender. On that day, Australia was formally presented to Asia as a nation without the will or the means to assert its national interests and without the courage to stand beside a friend in danger.

It was the day on which the Netherlands, forsaken by its allies and betrayed by the United Nations, gave up its lonely struggle to safeguard the right of the Papuans of West New Guinea to determine their own political future and signed a capitulation to Indonesian military pressure. The recent past offers no more nauseating example of hypocrisy in high places than U Thant's statement congratulating the two Governments on their "willingness to settle this question by peaceful negotiation and on their spirit of give and take."

The peaceful negotiation extolled by U.N.'s Acting Secretary General included a succession of airborne and seaborne assaults on Dutch territory, culminating in an attack by some 500 paratroopers launched only 3 days ago, and repeated threats of all-out war by the Indonesian Government. It was left to the Dutch Prime Minister to cut through the polite pretenses and the diplomatic shams with his bitter statement that his country had agreed to transfer control of West New Guinea to Indonesia because continuing Indonesian aggression threatened to inflate local conflicts into a full-scale war and because the Netherlands could not count on the support of its allies.

Yet the Australian Minister for External Affairs can still bleat: "I am happy to say an agreement has been reached which does represent a peaceful resolution of this dispute. Sir Garfield Barwick has at least assured himself a place in Australian history as the Minister who presided with unabated self-satisfaction over the liquidation of his country's interests and the loss of his country's good name, as a man too small for the responsibility he never even perceived.

The blame is not Sir Garfield Barwick's alone; it rests on the Prime Minister and his government, the government that sponsored the ignominious policy of retreat and evasian and appeasement which has left Australia today where Holland stood yesterday. If there are those in that government who still believe that a policy of abasement was the necessary purchase price for Asia's good will and respect, they are due for disillusion. Asia, and Indonesia not least, will have drawn only one conclusion from Australia's timidity—that Australia is not prepared to stand up alone for its national interests and that those interests may be flouted with impunity, provided that Australia can be maneuvered, as Holland was, into a position of isolation.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*.
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss*., 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*., 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*.
Albert, Carl, *Okla*., 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N.C*.
Alford, Dale, *Ark*.
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*.
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*., 4501 Conn. Ave.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*., 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N.Y*.
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*., 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*.
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*.
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*., The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N.J*., 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*.
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*.
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*.
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*.
Barry, Robert R., *N.Y*., 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N.H*.
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*.
Bates, William H., *Mass*.
Battin, James F., *Mont*., 217 Slade Run Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Becker, Frank J., *N.Y*.
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*.
Beermann, Ralph F., *Nebr*.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*.
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*.
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*., 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*., 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*., 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*.
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*.
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga*.
Boggs, Hale, *La*.
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*.
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*., 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio*., 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C*., Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*., 4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*., The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind*.
Bray, William G., *Ind*.
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*.
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*.
Bromwell, James E., *Iowa*.
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich*.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*., Alban Towers
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*.
Bruce, Donald C., *Ind*.
Buckley, Charles A., *N.Y*.
Burke, Frank W., *Ky*.
Burke, James A., *Mass*.
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*., 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa*.
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*., 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N.J*.
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*.
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*.
Casey, Bob, *Tex*.
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*.
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*., The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich*.
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*.
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*.
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*., 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill*., 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*., 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*.
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*., 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*.
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*.
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*., 5540 Colfax Ave., Alexandria, Va.
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C*., 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*.
Corman, James C., *Calif*.
Cramer, William C., *Fla*., 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*., 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*.
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*., 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*.
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*.
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*.
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*.
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*., 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga*.
Davis, John W., *Ga*.
Dawson, William L., *Ill*.
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*.
Dent, John H., *Pa*.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*.
Derounian, Steven B., *N.Y*.
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*.
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*., 800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*.
Dole, Robert, *Kans*., 2816 N. Jefferson Arlington, Va.
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*.
Dooley, Edwin B., *N.Y*.
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*.
Dowdy, John, *Tex*.
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*.
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*., 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*., 1719 New House Office Building
Durno, Edwin R., *Oreg*.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J*.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*.
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*.
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*.
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*., 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*.
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*.
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*.
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*.
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*., 3725 Macomb St.
Findley, Paul, *Ill*.
Finnegan, Edward R., *Ill*.
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*.
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*., Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*., The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*.
Fogarty, John E., *R.I*., 1235 New House Office Building
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*., 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*.
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*., The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn*., The Congressional
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N.J*., 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*.
Fulton, James G., *Pa*.
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J*.
Garland, Peter A., *Maine*.
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*.
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*.
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*.
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*.
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*.
Glenn, Milton W., *N.J*., Capitol Park Apts., 800 4th St. SW.
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*., 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*., 3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa*.
Grant, George, *Ala*., 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*.
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*.
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*.
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich*.
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*.
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*.
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*.
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*.
Haley, James A., *Fla*.
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*.
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*., 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*.
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash*.
Harding, Ralph R., *Idaho*.
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*.
Harris, Oren, *Ark*., 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*.
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo*.
Harsha, William H., Jr., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*.
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*., 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N.Y*.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*., 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*.
Hemphill, Robert W., *S.C*.
Henderson, David N., *N.C*.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*.
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*.
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*., 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill*.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*.
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*.
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*.
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*.
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo*.
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*.
Jarman, John, *Okla*.
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*.
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*., 2120 16th St.
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*.
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*.
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md*.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*.
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*., 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*.
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*., 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*.
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*.
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis*.
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*.
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va*., Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*., 5906 Harwick Rd.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*.
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y*., The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N.Y*.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*., 4807 Newport
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*.
King, Cecil R., *Calif*.
King, David S., *Utah*.
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*.
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N.C*.
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*.
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*.
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*.
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn*.
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*.
Kyl, John, *Iowa*.
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*.
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*.
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*.
Langen, Odin, *Minn*.

Appendix

Quotas and Tariffs on Lumber Imports From Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 5, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of August 15 expressing concern over the attempts that are being made to apply quotas and increase tariffs on lumber imports from Canada.

This editorial reminds us that Canada is one of our best trading customers and that if we should proceed to reduce Canadian lumber imports, this would probably mean smaller purchases by Canadians of other U.S. manufactured products. As the editorial points out, "Other industries might lose more than the U.S. lumber industry would gain. And consumers here might pay more for their lumber."

I wish to commend the Minneapolis Tribune for this thoughtful editorial on a subject which is of concern to all of us who are in favor of reciprocal trade and the lowering rather than the raising of trade barriers.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADIAN COMPETITION

Lumber interests in this country are trying to get the United States to apply quotas and increased tariffs on lumber imports from Canada. They claim the domestic market has been in its most depressed condition since the early 1930's. They also note that Canadian imports have risen from 4.3 percent of U.S. production in 1949 to 12.7 percent in 1961.

The National Lumber Manufacturers Association has suggested a 10-percent tariff on all softwood lumber imports in excess of 10 percent of U.S. production. The U.S. tariff on Canadian softwood lumber now ranges from 25 cents to $1 per thousand feet. The Canadian tariff on U.S. lumber is higher, but little lumber moves across the boarder from this country.

However, in an attempt to correct its dollar deficit Canada is boosting many of its tariff rates, and some Washington officials fear protectionism is on the rise in Canada. This, plus pressure from the Pacific Northwest, where some mills have shut down, is causing President Kennedy and Congress to consider restrictions against imports.

There are several good reasons why they should not act. Canada buys about a billion dollars more in goods from the United States than it ships here. Quotas and higher tariffs would restrict international trade at a time when freer trade is the national policy. The United States is cutting more softwood for lumber than it is growing, and this deficit is expected to increase steadily.

The U.S. Forest Service reports that net softwood growth is now 28 billion board feet, while the cut is over 36 billion feet. The old growth softwoods—85 percent in the Western States—are being cut off rapidly and the new growth is in small sizes of lesser quality.

It is unfortunate that a number of western mills and their employes are suffering from the current weak demand for lumber. But the lumber industry long has been subject to wide variations in demand. And some lumber producers in this country report their 1962 business is good.

Arbitrarily reducing Canadian lumber imports probably would mean smaller purchases by Canadians of other U.S. manufactured products. Other industries might lose more than the U.S. lumber industry would gain. And consumers here might pay more for their lumber.

This Citizen Says a Mouthful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following from the editorial page of the August 3, 1962, issue of the Jackson Daily News, which I commend to the House:

THIS CITIZEN SAYS A MOUTHFUL

The Daily News, as regular readers already know, does not publish letters from anonymous sources or letters with fictitious names.

We would have been tempted, however, to print the letter recently received by Paul A. Terry, director of education of the Copley newspapers, had it been sent to this office.

The letter, written by a San Francisco, Calif., resident, was signed "Fed-Up Citizen."

Just in case any of our readers feel like sick Americans, who might feel a little better after reading "Fed-up's" message, here it is:

"I am one of the Americans who heard Mr. Khrushchev tell our Nation that my great-grandchildren will grow up in a Communist world. For some time now, this has bothered me. I am not a brave man—not even a big one. I suppose I would have to admit that I am, along with my own neighbors and in my own culture, the typical, average well-educated, genteel suburbanite, to whom family, the mortgage, and security have been the all-important items.

"I am now 50, and soon my wife and I will see the first of our three children married. I paint my own house, repair my own car, grub my own devil grass, and nurse a modest savings account at the Bank of America. I am a law-abiding man on the quiet side, and dissension makes me terribly nervous. Frankly, I am the kind who simply doesn't have it in him to fight anyone ever.

"My wife had been cleaning out an old trunk in the storage room the other day, and I ran across the huge old family Bible that I hadn't thought about for years. My great-grandmother had kept a journal of the trip across the Great Plains with a wagon and oxen when she and great-grandpa were youngsters coming out to settle in California in the great migration. Great-grandma wrote about it as the wild, new land, rich and abundant in mythical proportions.

"On the trail she wrote of sickness and hunger, and heat and cold, and dust, and thirst, and the deaths and births like beads strung together on a thread of hope—hope of freedom and a land of plenty for their children yet unborn. And when she viewed the new land, she wrote in simple word pictures of the cities and farms and schools, and happiness that would some day bloom in the greatness of the vast new land. She wrote of her tomorrow and my today.

"The ink was badly faded, but the message was clear. As I read, I began to think about America and being an American and what it all stands for; and I thought about our enemies and what they intend to do to America, to those rich lands and farms, to the cities and the people, to its freedom and its hope.

"And, suddenly, I realized that I am a sick American. I mean really sick. I am sick of panacea and of backing up. I am sick of reaction where there should be initiative. I am sick of bureaucrats who tell me that my enemy is not really my enemy and that I should live together with murderers and tyrants. I am sick of government that hasn't the guts to clean traitors out of its own offices. And I'm sick of my country being ridiculed all over the world. I am sick of pink-fingered diplomats and lily-livered politicians who place personal career above the fate of the flag.

"I am sick of 40 years of relentless, creeping, cancerous, communistic godlessness that never once has wavered from its avowed purpose of conquering the flag and seeing it trampled in the mud under Russian boots. I am sick of my genteel desire to stand pat and pray while the enemy advances.

"I am sick of educators who teach tolerance of subversion and of clergymen who would have me quail at the specter of battle and turn my cheek in fear of what our enemies might do.

"In all honesty, the thing of which I am most sick is the man who let these things come to me: myself.

"And by the living God who made me, sir, I am a sick American who intends to get well.

"(Signed) FED-UP CITIZEN."

Major U.S. Economic Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 5, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a nation in a world of great need and greater challenge we are dependent upon our

free enterprise system to provide us with the goods, materials, and equipment to meet the needs of a fast-expanding population and promote progress, to create the jobs for U.S. workers, and to support a mighty defense.

In a weekend broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to review major challenges confronting our free enterprise system. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR U.S. ECONOMIC GOALS

As a nation—in a world of great need and greater challenge—we are dependent upon our free enterprise system to provide us with the goods, materials and equipment to meet the needs of a fast-expanding population and promote progress; to create the jobs for U.S. workers; and to support a mighty defense.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMIC PICTURE

Nationally, the economic picture reflects gigantic—almost incomprehensible—progress. Currently, the value of goods and services amounts to about $552 billion annually.

Despite such progress, we recognize that there are still serious problems in our system. The challenges include the following: Improving economic opportunities for success in small business—with a casualty rate of over 17,000 annually; improving the agricultural economy; creating jobs for the 4 million—including 60,000 in Wisconsin—still regrettably unemployed; and maintaining a good rate of progress to meet the needs of our people—and to further outstrip the Communist system—challenging us on the economic front.

In evaluating the national economic picture, we must always remember that free enterprise—not the Government, despite a $93 billion Federal budget—creates the "giant's share" of U.S. jobs and goods and services.

In reality, Government spending is not a measuring stick of progress. To the extent that it involves participation in normally nongovernmental economic-human welfare programs, rather, this represents a failure of our system to fulfill needs of the people and the country.

To help promote greater progress, then, we should shoot for the following goals:

1. Reestablishing confidence of the people in our economy. Lack of such confidence results in restrictive buying, overcautious investing, limited business and industries expansion by job creating enterprises; and other economic "holdbacks."

2. Economically, also, Uncle Sam needs to adopt a more realistic policy based upon a philosophy of "pay as you go"—not "go in debt as you go."

3. The Nation also needs a reform of its tax system. With skyrocketing costs of Government—particularly for defense—there is a special need for fair and equitable treatment of the taxpayer.

Generally, patriotic citizens are ready and willing to pay taxes; however, they are not willing, and should not be required, to pay for reckless spending; mishandling of funds; unfavorable tax treatment of themselves, or too favorable tax treatment of others; or other inequitable practices that "foist" an unfair share of the tax burden on any individual, business or other segment of the economy.

For the future we need also to accomplish the following:

1. Better educating our citizens, adult and in school, of the significance, and working principles of our economic system.

2. Encouraging more people, not only to understand and appreciate, but also confidently invest in enterprise, small and large, serving as a hub of economic life for a community.

3. Encouraging community support of community development programs, such as the establishment of corporations to provide financing for necessary projects.

4. Cooperative efforts to foster new enterprises under the area redevelopment program, now beginning to get underway in Wisconsin and elsewhere.

5. By reawakening our citizens' "enterprising spirit" full of faith and confidence, to improve the economic status of existing, and creating new, enterprises for a strong, free economy.

For security and for progress and peace we need, then, to maintain a sound, strong and vigorous economy.

Who Pays a Freeman's Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Phoenix, Ariz., Gazette of August 25, 1962, sets forth a very basic truth in language everyone can understand:

WHO PAYS A FREEMAN'S WAY?

They were rioting in Algiers. They were screaming for some new kind of government, although there had been no real test of the "old" government they had had for a few weeks. A reporter stopped one of the mob.

"We've had enough words," the UPI quoted the man as saying. "Now we want action. We want bread, we want work, and somewhere to live. I spent 5 years in jail under colonialism and that did not put me in any mood to undergo such disappointments as I have done since July 1."

From the government, he wants work.

From the government, he wants bread.

From the government, he wants somewhere to live.

Once he went to jail because he did not like what the government offered him. Now he riots against his new government because it does no better.

How many of the rest of humanity have come to think that bread, work and housing come from government? How many think the government is some pagan deity of plenty which can turn on a spigot out of which will pour material goods in great abundance?

It is not hard to know the truth about bread, work and housing. Before there can be bread, someone must plant and grow the grain, and someone must grind it and bake it. Human hands, not government edicts, provide bread. Before there can be work, there must be a will to work—to break the soil, or build a factory, or open a store. Human ingenuity, not government decrees, must discover work. Before there can be housing, the house must be built. It will not arise on its foundations because government orders it so.

Before the manifold products of labor become available to man, there first must be the labor. Only man can do the labor. Government cannot.

Government can utilize the force of the majority to seize the result of one man's labor and give it to another—but before there was anything to seize, there had to be the one man's labor. Government can even force men to labor, as it does in the Soviet Union, but even then, forced or not, there is labor before there is material wealth.

The man in Algiers can have work, he can have bread, he can have somewhere to live—but he cannot have them from government. He can have them only from his own production, or the production of his fellows.

Rioting won't solve his problems. Neither will government.

Basic Western Solidarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 5, 1962

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, there are times when bare facts offer a more penetrating view of the world's troubles than does long and elaborate commentary and editorializing. Two articles in today's New York Times appear to me to do just this. The first article deals with Berlin, the second with the first day of President de Gaulle's visit to West Germany.

The Berlin article describes in simple terms the extravagant measures taken by the Soviet Union to force divisiveness and disunion onto the German people. The Soviet rulers realize well that in spite of their drastic measures the people of East Germany and East Berlin still long for reunification in freedom with their countrymen on the other side of the wall. The Soviets know that the basic feeling of unity among people cannot be eradicated by the arbitrary imposition of different economic systems.

While the Soviets do their utmost to spread disunion among people, the leaders of the free Western nations have successfully taken measures to intensify the feeling of unity between the people of their various countries. Within a period of a few short months we have witnessed two historically amazing innovations. The first was Chancellor Adenauer's trip to France. The second is President de Gaulle's trip to West Germany starting today. In light of the history of Franco-German relations, the sincere ovations given to Adenauer by the French people and to De Gaulle by the Germans appear as a welcome sign of basic Western solidarity.

Thus, on the one hand, we have disunity arbitrarily imposed and, on the other, a heartfelt reaffirmation of basic European solidarity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two mentioned articles be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DE GAULLE STARTS VISIT TO GERMANS—CROWDS CHEER HIM

(By Robert C. Doty)

BONN, GERMANY, September 4.— President de Gaulle arrived here today for a 6-day state visit to West Germany designed to put the seal on a French-German reconciliation that

is the keystone for construction of a united Europe.

The first state visit by a French chief of state to Germany in modern times will be devoted almost entirely to the goal of burying publicly the legacy of rivalry and hatred left by centuries of French-German warfare.

The crowds that welcomed him were both bigger and more enthusiastic than those encountered by Dr. Adenauer during his official visit to France in July.

ONE TALK SCHEDULED

Only one purely political consultation between the French President and Chancellor Adenauer is scheduled—for tomorrow morning.

At that time they are expected to discuss the state of negotiations for British entry into the European Common Market and the prospects for making progress toward their joint goal of setting up a political union with Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg, their present partners, and perhaps ultimately with Britain and other European states.

But the main purpose of the visit is to let General de Gaulle show himself to and be cheered by as many West Germans as possible along the 1,200-mile route he will follow from Bonn through the Ruhr to Hamburg, Munich, and Stuttgart between now and Sunday.

The French President, object of the murderous hatred of rightwing extremists in his own country, presents a difficult security problem to his hosts. They met it by putting more than 4,000 uniformed and plainclothes policemen in this north Rhine-Westphalia region.

In their green uniforms, jack boots, and shiny black inverted coalscuttle helmets, they stood every 20 or 30 yards along both sides of the routes followed by the car carrying General de Gaulle and President Heinrich Luebke of West Germany.

Other policemen, with dogs, patroled fields beside the route and surveyed roofs and windows that could shelter French dissident snipers. Two helicopters hovered over the long official convoy and ambulances were spotted at strategic points along the way.

ENTHUSIASM UNDAMPENED

But these precautions did not dampen the enthusiasm with which hundreds of thousands of Rhinelanders welcomed the French President on the road between the Wahn airport, outside Cologne, and the Bonn region, where he is staying in the French Embassy chateau.

General de Gaulle, Mme. de Gaulle, their son Philippe, a naval captain, and Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville were met in warm, overcast weather this morning by President Luebke, Chancellor Adenauer and virtually the entire West German Cabinet.

The only lapse from the characteristic German efficiency with which the arrival was handled was the misfiring of 2 of the 21 blank cannon shells greeting the visitor. They produced showers of sparks and a sort of dull "foof" instead of the desired sharp crack.

In his welcoming speech President Luebke called President de Gaulle a man who had pioneered in the cause of French-German reconciliation.

Replying, General de Gaulle said he had brought with him the friendship and support of the French people for a Germany "menaced because you are in the advance guard of the free world."

DIPLOMATIC CORPS RECEIVED

The two Presidents met this afternoon with their suites in the West German "White House" in Bonn. Later General de Gaulle received the Bonn diplomatic corps.

President de Gaulle evoked the principal political themes of his visit tonight in his reply to President Luebke's toast at a formal dinner and reception at the 18th-century chateau of Bruehl near Cologne.

French-German unity is imperative, he said, because the "reciprocal engagement of Europe and America in the end can preserve its assurance and solidity only if there exists on the old continent a dike of power and prosperity of the same order as the United States constitutes in the New World."

The French President reiterated his belief that in the long run the Soviet Union could be led to abandon its aggressive subversive tactics and recreate a peaceful united Europe from the Urals to the Atlantic.

BERLINS DIVIDED LIKE 2 COUNTRIES—BARRIERS BETWEEN SECTORS CUT ALMOST ALL CONTACT

BERLIN, September 4.—The two Berlins, East and West, are hewn from one city, but they are virtually separate countries as far as utilities are concerned.

West Berlin has 2,200,000 people, East Berlin 1,200,000.

When the East German regime put up the wall August 13, 1961, West Berlin's bus and streetcar systems were independent, but the wall cut Berlin's other means of public transport.

The elevated trains, operated by the East Germans and ringing the entire city, stopped running between East and West except for one line ending in East Berlin's Friedrichstrasse station.

The elevated trains in West Berlin, boycotted by many West Berliners, run on power from the East. The station platforms are illuminated by West Berlin power.

SUBWAY WAS SEVERED

The wall also severed subway links between East and West Berlin. The subway used to be a common route for East Germans escaping to the West. Two West Berlin subway lines still traverse East Berlin, but only one makes a stop—at Friedrichstrasse. Persons authorized to enter East Berlin may leave the train there.

Traveling by subway through East Berlin, one can easily detect the division of the city. When the train crosses the border the lights go off for a fraction of a second, then go on again, somewhat dimmed. That is when the train switches from West Berlin to East Berlin current, officials explain.

Each half of the city has its own water and gas supply, but sewerage is an exception—90 percent of West Berlin's sewage flows under East Berlin.

One cannot telephone a friend in the East from West Berlin. Nor can East Berliners call friends in West Berlin.

Since the wall went up, West and East Berliners cannot visit one another.

DIVISION BEGAN IN 1948

But the division did not start with the wall. It dates back to the Communist blockade of 1948–49. Since then the Western part of Berlin has striven to make itself independent of the East.

A small part of West Berlin's power consumption is supplied from the East and is paid for under a general trade agreement. A small fraction of the gas consumed by West Berliners comes from the East, to illuminate some border streets.

Not a drop of the 100 million gallons of water West Berlin uses daily is supplied by the East, nor do West Berliners sell water to the Communist-ruled part of the city.

In 1952 the East Berlin postal authorities cut telephone communcations with West Berlin.

West Berlin telephone officials say they have one service line into East Berlin, but it is not for public use.

SOME LINES REMAIN

The three Western Allies have a telephone line to the Soviet Embassy, and the Russians have lines to the Berlin Air Safety Center and Spandau Prison in the West, where some former Nazi leaders are serving life sentences.

Mail was exchanged fairly freely between East and West Berlin before the wall. Now it is restricted to a few deliveries by truck and rail each day.

An intricate network of sewer pipes crisscrosses the city, East and West. Sewage flows to low-lying sumps whence it is pumped to sewage fields in East Berlin and the nearby countryside.

Many people escaped to the West through the sewers soon after the wall was put up. Now all sewer pipes between the halves of Berlin are blocked by steel bars.

Congressman Wilson's Procurement Study Applauded by Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 8, 1962

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for 18 months I have been conducting an intensive study into the wasteful spending practices of our military procurement people. I have learned through my study that literally billions of dollars are wasted annually.

Thankfully, the Nation's newspapers are alerting the people to this national disgrace and it now appears we are making headway toward stopping the squandermania by the Junkers class in the Defense Department.

I insert at this point in the RECORD, an editorial from the White Plains, N.Y., Reporter-Dispatch which supports my study and which condemns the shutting off of information to me by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

[From the White Plains (N.Y.) Reporter-Dispatch, Aug. 21, 1962]

A BLOW AT FREEDOM

When information is used as a tool to crimp their spending style, the tendency of bureaucrats is to stop the information rather than end the waste.

An example of this has cropped up in the treatment received by Representative EARL WILSON from Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

Mr. WILSON, a spending critic whose investigations of procurement actions over 18 months are reported to have resulted in cuts of as high as 50 percent in the cost of multimillion-dollar contracts, has had his name removed from eight mailing lists through which he has obtained much of his information.

The lists are those of procurement agencies that send out notices of contracts to be let by public bidding. Mr. McNamara has confirmed that he ordered Mr. WILSON's name deleted and also that information on nonclassified contracts to be let through negotiation be withheld from the Congressman.

Of course the Defense Secretary had an explanation.

Continuing to send the critic the lists would be too great an administrative burden on the Defense agencies, Mr. McNamara said, and anyway the Department is reporting its actions with a quarterly compilation of procurement statistics.

The Congressman's answer is that he wants advance notice of procurement actions so he can spot waste ahead of time and not cold statistics after the waste is made.

As to the "administrative burden," Representative WILSON, in response to Mr. McNamara's statement that he will answer only specific inquiries, vows that he will send a specific inquiry about every contract listing he can turn up—a practice which can only add to the burden.

The listings which are denied to Representative WILSON continue to carry the names of thousands of others so that Mr. McNamara might properly argue that he has not cut off the flow of free information.

He seems to be acting out of childish pique.

The danger here is one that is of prime concern to all the citizens of the United States. If information can be restricted for any but the most sensitive of national security reasons, it can be cut off entirely at the whim of an appointed office holder.

What Mr. McNamara doesn't want Representative WILSON to find out today, he may decide he doesn't want anybody else to learn tomorrow.

Waste, and worse, go hand in hand with secrecy in Government. Neither can be tolerated.

Several times in the past I have referred to the reportorial work done by Charles Nicodemus, of the Chicago Daily News. Mr. Nicodemus is a strong supporter of economy in procurement and has aided me in uncovering numerous examples of waste. A good newspaperman, Mr. Nicodemus details in the following Daily News stories the way in which my study is progressing:

ARMY RETALIATING, SAYS BRIBE WITNESS—SNOYER ACCUSES SIGNAL CORPS OF HARASSING HIS BUSINESS

(By Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON.—A businessman who is key witness in a Justice Department probe of rigged Army Signal Corps contracts has charged that the corps is striking back by trying to harass him out of the defense procurement field.

In sworn statements to the FBI and letters to Congress, Robert Snoyer, 38, spelled out details of what he describes as the Signal Corps retaliation for his action.

Snoyer said corps officials have coerced other firms into breaking subcontracting agreements with his firm, Consad Corp., of Santa Monica, Calif.

And he charged that the Signal Corps has attempted to force his firm into defaulting on other Signal Corps contracts with a flood of unusual administrative actions designed to stall production.

Snoyer, who was solicited in June for a $48,000 payoff on a $2,400,000 contract, cooperated with the FBI and the Daily News in an investigation that brought the arrest of two high Signal Corps officials and a manufacturers representative on charges of bribery and conspiracy.

Justice Department sources have since disclosed that the probe has widened to include other officials and other contracts.

Gen. H. L. Scofield, Chief of Signal Corps Procurement, refused to comment on Snoyer's charge of retaliation, saying, "I can't say anything except through channels."

Snoyer said he took his problems to Scofield personally more than 2 weeks ago, but said Scofield gave no indication he would act in the case.

Meanwhile, FBI agents, acting on the complaints, have begun examining files and interrogating officials in the corps' west coast office at Pasadena, the Daily News learned.

A frequent critic of Defense Department procurement procedures, Representative EARL WILSON, Republican, of Indiana, alerted to the situation by Snoyer, called the Signal Corps actions profoundly disturbing.

In a House speech extended in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, WILSON charged that the corps' maneuver is "a brazen, callous reprisal" against a firm "that dares to expose its (Signal Corps) corruption."

"It's the old story of 'close ranks and protect your own'—even if 'your own' are crooked," he declared.

WILSON said he was requesting that Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara give a full explanation for the Signal Corps behavior, and particularly the attitude of Scofield.

Snoyer told the Daily News his troubles began Monday, July 16, just 2 working days after the Signal Corps arrests were publicized July 12.

He said he was called into the corps' Pasadena office and asked about the status of four minor contracts he had pending to produce Signal Corps cable assemblies.

When Snoyer disclosed that he planned to subcontract the work, he said Signal Corps officials demanded that he send the subcontractor in for a talk.

After the talk, Snoyer said, the subcontractor asked to be relased from his contract, saying the Signal Corps had made unusual production demands that he feared he would be unable to meet.

Snoyer said he lined up a second subcontrator, but that this one was called by a Signal Corps official who warned that the "contracts are in danger of default."

Snoyer said that subcontractor also backed out.

Consad finally lined up a third highly reputable subcontractor who has begun work on the projects, but whom the Signal Corps has not yet officially approved, Snoyer said.

Meanwhile, he said the Signal Corps has:

Required that even routine Consad communications with the corps, which firms ordinarily handle by telephone, be in writing.

Failed to answer key correspondence and rejected other letters and forms for minor technical reasons, slowing production planning.

Imposed administrative requirements never utilized before, slowing work further.

WILSON noted that "the stake that remaining corrupt officials have in discrediting this firm is obvious.

"If this firm can be harassed out of the procurement field, it will stand as a lesson to all other contractors. If you blow the whistle on the Signal Corps—or other corrupt procurement officials in any service—then you'll get it in the neck."

WILSON also suggested that honest officials may be retaliating against Consad "because this manufacturer has helped prove" that the corps' procurement mechanism "can be perverted for corrupt ends."

WILSON stressed that Consad should not be "rewarded for the brave action it took, nor does this firm except a reward." But it should not be penalized either, he declared.

BRIBE HARASSMENT INQUIRY PROMISED—SIGNAL CORPS BRASS FINALLY ACTS ON INFORMANT'S CHARGES

(By Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON.—Top brass of the Army Signal Corps Saturday vowed to investigate a businessman's charges that lower level officials are harassing him for cooperating in an FBI probe of Signal Corps defense contracts.

Maj. Gen. H. L. Scofield, acting deputy chief signal officer and head of procurement, said, "We will give the matter a thorough airing."

The businessman, Robert Snoyer, 38, of Santa Monica, Calif., personally informed Scofield of the problem 3 weeks ago. But Scofield acknowledged Saturday that he had taken no action on the complaints then.

Scofield's office moved on the matter after the harassment was disclosed by the Daily News and spotlighted in a speech by Representative EARL WILSON, Republican, of Indiana, veteran critic of defense procurement procedures.

Snoyer is cooperating with the FBI in a probe that brought the arrest of two high Signal Corps civilian officials on charges of seeking a $48,000 bribe to steer a $2,400,000 contract to Snoyer's firm.

Snoyer charged Friday that since the arrests other corps officials have sought to force him to default on his remaining Signal Corps contracts by scaring off subcontractors and harassing him with unusual administrative procedures.

A spokesman for Schofield's office said the general had not ordered an investigation earlier because:

Snoyer had not given him sufficient details to go on. Snoyer disputed this, contending he named names and showed Scofield copies of correspondence involved in the alleged harassment.

Scofield had thought it better to have Snoyer "go through channels" since "there was still sufficient time to head off any adverse action, if his compaint did have substance."

Schofield's order for action now comes just 1 week before initial deliveries are due under the first of the four contracts on which Snoyer charges the lower level officials apparently are trying to force a default.

Representative WILSON, in lashing the Signal Corps for its action, stressed that Snoyer's firm, Consad Corp., "is not entitled to any rewards for its brave action" in helping expose Signal Corps corruption.

"But it should not be penalized, either," he said.

He charged that the alleged harassment, which is now also under investigation by the FBI, was "a brazen, callous reprisal" and an "attempt to make an example of Consad" for "doing its civic duty."

CRITIC ERASED FROM DEFENSE MAILING LIST—REPRESENTATIVE WILSON TERMS MCNAMARA ACTION REPRISAL FOR PROBINGS

(By Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON.—Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has moved to cut off sources of public information used by an Indiana Congressman in his criticism of waste in defense procurement.

McNamara, in a letter to GOP Representative EARL WILSON, confirmed that he had ordered WILSON rubbed off the mailing lists of procurement agencies sending out notice of contracts to be let by competitive bidding.

The Secretary ordered that information on nonclassified contracts to be let through negotiation also be withheld.

Remaining on the lists from which WILSON's name was sponged are numerous electronics publications, manufacturer's representatives, other public officials, and agencies as well as contractors.

WILSON termed the action "a clear reprisal" for his continued criticism of defense buying procedures.

"It's ridiculous," he said. "If it weren't such a serious indicator of the mentality and attitude we have in the Pentagon, it would be amusing."

WILSON'S 18-month investigation of procurement actions—particularly by the Navy—has brought slashes running as high as 50 percent in the cost of multi-million-dollar contracts.

His recent investigation of the Navy radio contract led to the discovery of irregularities cited by the House Armed Services Committee in its successful bid for Senate approval of legislation tightening up some areas of defense buying.

McNamara's office explained the information cutoff—unprecedented in the memory of Capitol Hill experts on contracting—on two grounds:

Although WILSON had been on most of the eight mailing lists for more than a year, McNamara said that sending him the material would be too great an administrative burden on the various defense agencies.

He also said the Defense Department is reporting its actions with a quarterly compilation of procurement statistics.

So "I do not feel that a separate reporting system, such as you requested, is justified," McNamara wrote.

WILSON pointed out that advance notice of procurement actions "so we can spot this waste ahead of time" is what he desires, "not cold statistics, after the waste."

He said McNamara's cutoff was the "same sort of reprisal exercised by the Signal Corps" against west coast businessman Robert Snoyer, key witness in an FBI investigation of Signal Corps contract rigging.

WILSON said, however, that McNamara's action would not halt his investigations.

"The Secretary said he would answer only specific inquiries," Wilson noted. "So we're going to send him a specific inquiry about every contract listed in the Commerce Journal, the various electronics news, everywhere.

"Before, our name was just one of mailing lists with thousands of names. Now, someone will have to handle each separate inquiry individually. Now, the Defense Department will really have an administrative burden—if that's the way they want it."

BRIBE WITNESS' CONTRACTS TAKEN FROM SIGNAL CORPS—ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT TO SUPERVISE WEST COAST FIRM'S WORK

(By Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON.—The Pentagon Tuesday took away from the Signal Corps control over four defense contracts being worked on by the key witness in an FBI probe of Signal Corps corruption.

The action came after the witness, west coast businessman Robert Snoyer, charged that lower-level Signal Corps officials were harassing his firm in retaliation for his cooperation with the FBI.

Paul R. Ignatius, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installation and Logistics, ordered that administration of the four contracts held by Snoyer's firm, Consad Corp., Santa Monica, Calif., to be transferred to the Army Ordnance Department.

Maj. Gen. Frank S. Besson, head of the new, centralized Army Supply Agency, said the move was made to assure the contractor there was no further possibility for reprisals of the type alleged.

Besson also said that "an investigation will continue to determine the justification of the charges" of harassment.

Snoyer agreed to cooperate with the FBI and the Daily News in the procurement probe after he reported that he had been solicited for a $48,000 kickback in return for a guarantee that his firm would get a $2,400,000 Signal Corps radio contract.

As a result, two high Signal Corps officials and a manufacturer's representative were arrested July 12 with marked bribe money, and have been held for action by the Federal grand jury at Newark, N.J.

The investigation since has broadened to include other Signal Corps personnel and procurement officials of other defense agencies.

Igantius stepped into the case after the Daily News disclosed Snoyer's charges of harassment Friday.

Snoyer contended that, as a result of his cooperation, Signal Corps officials on the west coast, in Chicago and at the corps installation at Fort Monmouth, N.J., were attempting to discredit him by seeking to force his firm into default on its remaining Signal Corps contracts.

Representative EARL WILSON, Republican, of Indiana, who has been hammering at Pentagon waste and corruption in procurement for 18 months, called on Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara to investigate the charges and explain the Signal Corps action.

Ignatius telephoned Snoyer Saturday morning in Santa Monica and asked him to come to Washington for a talk "to get to the bottom of this situation."

After Snoyer had a 1½-hour talk Monday with Ignatius, Besson and two other generals, an Army spokesman announced the contract transfers.

WILSON, informed of the action, said he would "watch with interest" to see if:

"The Ordnance Department takes up the harassment where the Signal Corps left off."

"The Army makes a genuine effort to get to the bottom of the reprisals already inflicted and punishes those responsible, so that any other contractor who does his patriotic duty in the future isn't harassed as a result."

"This transfer is laudable if the retaliation ends," he declared.

"But it must not merely be a method of slamming the door on, or whitewashing, any investigation of the Signal Corps actions already taken," he warned. "They were disgraceful."

MCNAMARA UNDER FIRE FOR PURGE—HOUSE GROUP PROBES CUTOFF OF MEMBER FROM CONTRACT LIST

(By Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON.—The House "Freedom of Information" Subcommittee Wednesday began an investigation of the "purging" of an Indiana Congressman from the Defense Department's public mailing lists on contracts.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara personally ordered that the GOP congressman, EARL WILSON—who has been unearthing waste in defense contracting—be dropped or barred from 11 mailing lists containing notice of nonclassified contracts being advertised or negotiated.

"The 'freedom of information' unit is Representative JOHN E. Moss' subcommittee on Government information, a branch of the House Government Operations Committee headed by Representative WILLIAM DAWSON, Democrat of Chicago.

A committee spokesman said Moss, Democrat of California, was "most concerned at the prospect of a Member of Congress being denied public information, particularly when it is available to other agencies and officials and members of industry and the public."

Moss' chief investigator, Jack Howard, said the subcommittee moved into the case "on the double" because of standing orders from Dawson that top speed be used when a Member of Congress is involved.

Howard obtained from WILSON'S office copies of letters from McNamara and his aids acknowledging that WILSON was to be refused the information.

Committee staff investigators planned to interview Pentagon officials about the matter later Wednesday.

McNamara said WILSON'S continued requests for information would be too much work for defense procurement agencies. He also said the Department publishes statistics and reports of its activity which—in McNamara's estimate—should be adequate for WILSON'S needs.

McNamara stuck to that position Wednesday despite urging by high officials in the General Accounting Office that he back down.

McNamara's boss of procurement, Thomas D. Morris, assistant secretary for installation and logistics, said McNamara is "adamant."

WILSON has been working with the GAO for more than 18 months in analyzing defense procurement and attacking noncompetitive buying.

The WILSON-GAO criticism has forced the Defense Department to open a number of contracts to competitive bids, leading to cost reductions as high as 50 percent and savings of millions of dollars.

WILSON also played a key role last week in spotlighting the plight of west coast businessman Robert Snoyer, who charged that Army Signal Corps officials were harassing his firm for helping the Justice Department crack a contract bribery ring in the corps.

The Indiana Republican Tuesday fired off another letter to McNamara demanding "punishment or severe censure" for Signal Corps officials participating in the alleged harassment of Snoyer's firm, Consad Corp., in the performance of four Signal Corps contracts.

The Secretary of the Army disclosed Tuesday that the contracts were being transferred from control of the Signal Corps to Army Ordnance.

WILSON'S letter said that the contract transfer "is a tacit admission" that the harassment had occurred.

To implement the transfer, the Army's supply chief, Maj. Gen. Frank Besson, Jr., had Ordinance's west coast head, Col. Burleigh Drummond, fly to Washington overnight to receive a personal briefing on the "necessity for absolutely fair treatment of this contractor."

CRITIC OF NAVY CONTRACT ACCUSES ADMIRAL CORP.—CHICAGO FIRM UNDERSTATED PROFIT 100 PERCENT, WILSON SAYS

(By Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON.—A congressional critic of waste in defense purchasing charged Thursday that Chicago's Admiral Corp. reaped 100 percent more profit than it admits on a Navy contract for radio components.

Representative EARL WILSON, Republican, of Indiana, said the profit also was 10 percent higher than the maximum the contract was supposed to allow.

WILSON based his charges on an extensive audit of the $2,500,000 contract. The audit was conducted at his request by Congress' fiscal watchdog, the General Accounting Office.

The GAO concluded that Admiral made a 14-percent profit of $355,055 on the job. It said Admiral at first contended profit totaled only 3.9 percent, then revised that to $179,563, or about 7 percent.

WILSON, in remarks extended in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said he is turning the case over to Attorney General Robert Kennedy, with the recommendation that the Justice Department take civil action to recover the overcharges and excess profits.

An Admiral spokesman in Chicago, informed of the GAO report, denied that the firm had made excessive profits.

"Their (the GAO's) conclusions are based on accounting procedures that we dispute," the spokesman told the Daily News. "The profit rate is a matter of judgment, not of fact.

"However, we cannot comment further until we see the report," he said.

Under the contract, completed in 1959, Admiral produced 7,000 components (power supply units) at $360 each for the ARC/27 radio, which the Navy was buying for Air Force use.

WILSON kicked off his probe after learning that Admiral had bid to produce 6,500 of the identical units for the Navy at $181 each—half the previous price—just 2 months after the first contract was signed.

The Navy handed Admiral the 7,000-unit job as a "sole source" contract (without competitive bids) at Admiral's demanded price, on grounds that the Air Force had an emergency need for the components.

GAO points out, however, that Air Force records show the emergency could justify a sole-source contract for only 2,000 of the 7,000 units needed, but that Admiral was given the entire batch at $360 each anyway.

The $181 price was offered by Admiral while competing unsuccessfully on a contract for a second batch of the components which industry pressure forced the Navy to buy through competitive bidding.

The low price was $180 each, bid by Crescent Communication Corp., New London, Conn.

WILSON, one of Congress' most outspoken opponents of soul-source contracts, said the Justice Department should investigate the possibility of recovering the excess profits for two reasons:

The contract provided that Admiral could take a maximum of 10 percent profit, while the GAO computes the profit actually earned at 14 percent, or more than $100,000 too much.

The GAO notes at two points in the 23-page report that several accounting procedures used by Admiral in reaching its 7 percent profit estimate fail to comply with the Armed Services Procurement Regulations.

WILSON'S blast at Admiral and the Navy—his most frequent service target—comes less than a week after the disclosure that Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has attempted to cut off sources of information used by the Indiana Republican in his investigations.

The Secretary personally ordered WILSON purged from all defense agencies' public mailing lists through which notices are sent out of contracts to be let.

WILSON called the action a "clear reprisal" for his success in earlier criticisms, some of which helped push legislation tightening procurement practices—legislation McNamara's staff openly opposed.

In Thursday's remarks, WILSON also dubbed the Navy as "incompetency incorporated" for failing to investigate the Admiral contract on its own initiative.

BACK TIGHTER CURBS ON SALES TO MILITARY—FORCE EX-OFFICERS TO WAIT 3 YEARS, SENATE GROUP ASKS

(By Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON.—The Senate Armed Services Committee has moved to tighten restrictions on former military officers who seek to trade on past connections by becoming salesmen to the military after they retire.

The committee proposed boosting from 2 years to 3 the length of time after retirement that an officer must wait before he can take part in sales to the military.

Strangely enough, the proposal was attached as an amendment to a Navy-sponsored bill—reported out favorably by the committee—which loosens the restrictions on sales to the Navy by former Navy officers.

The Navy proposal would repeal an 1890 law calling for forfeiture of a former Navy officer's retirement pay any time he is found selling to the Navy.

Chairman RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, who opposed the bill, asked Navy Under Secretary Paul Fay, Jr., why the Navy's bill was necessary.

RUSSELL pointed out that Federal criminal law forbids any retired officer to sell to his former service at any time, although he can now sell to another service after waiting the required 2 years. So why worry about forfeiting pay in such cases? RUSSELL asked.

Fay disclosed, in answering, that the Navy plans next year to ask Congress to repeal the criminal law, too, so that ex-officers would be able to sell to their own service as well as to others.

Fay also pointed out that there is no law providing for forfeiture of retirement pay by former Army or Air Force officers caught selling to their former service.

So this is "discrimination" against the Navy, he argued.

Fay stressed that it "is harder to win a criminal conviction" than it is for the Comptroller General to cut off a former Navy officer's retirement pay "through an arbitrary administrative procedure, for what may be a mere technical violation."

RUSSELL asked why it wouldn't be better to end the "discrimination" by also providing for forfeiture by retired Army and Air Force officers, instead of ending it for the Navy.

"Why not even things off by strengthening the law, not weakening it?" he asked.

RUSSELL pointed out that a pending bill sponsored by Senators PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and JACOB JAVITS, Republican, of New York, would do just that.

(A spokesman for DOUGLAS' office said later that DOUGLAS and JAVITS almost certainly would oppose the Navy bill when it gets to the floor.)

Under questioning by RUSSELL, Fay and Rear Adm. William C. Mott, Navy Judge Advocate General, acknowledged that in nine cases in recent years the Comptroller General ordered retirement pay cut off.

Only one case has been referred to the Attorney General for prosecution, Mott said. Nor has any other service recommended prosecution of any retired officer for improper selling, it developed.

"You tell us we should depend on the criminal law, and yet nobody in the Department of Defense is enforcing it," RUSSEL observed.

Mott's office said later that the eight other cases where retirement pay cutoffs had been ordered involved "technical violations" that the Navy Department did not believe merited criminal prosecution.

This is just a sample of the way in which the people are being alerted to waste in procurement. There are more examples and more examples of waste which I shall continue to bring to the attention of my colleagues. I truly feel that the American people want this profligacy stopped and I intend to continue to fight to get a dollars' worth of defense for a dollar.

Consumer Protection Proposals—Truth-in-Lending Legislation Urgently Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 5, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as President Kennedy said in his historic message on consumers' protection sent to Congress last March 15, consumers by definition include us all:

They are the largest economic group in the economy, affecting and affected by almost every public and private economic decision. Two-thirds of all spending in the economy is by consumers. But they are the only important group in the economy who are not effectively organized, whose views are often not heard.

One of the most important consumers' protection proposals is Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' bill, S. 1740, the truth-in-lending bill, which I have joined in sponsoring. Unfortunately the Banking and Currency Committee on which I serve has not reported the bill favorably to the Senate. Senator DOUGLAS has held extensive hearings on this proposal, which has evoked widespread support among consumer groups. I praise the able leadership of my distinguished colleague from Illinois in developing and pressing for action on this legislation.

President Kennedy called specifically for the enactment of truth in lending legislation in his consumers' message. He declared:

Excessive and untimely use of credit arising out of ignorance of its true cost is harmful both to the stability of the economy and to the welfare of the public. Legislation should therefore be enacted requiring lenders and vendors to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amounts and rates which they will be paying for credit. Such legislation, similar in this sense to the truth-in-securities laws of 1933–34, would not control prices or charges. But it would require full disclosure to installment buyers and other prospective credit users, and thus permit consumers to make informed decisions before signing on the dotted line. Inasmuch as the specific credit practices which such a bill would be designed to correct are closely related to and often combined with other types of misleading trade practices which the Federal Trade Commission is already regulating, I recommend that enforcement of the new authority be assigned to the Commission. The Government agencies most concerned in this area have been cooperating with the subcommittee in developing the information necessary to prepare a workable and effective bill; and in view of the exhaustive hearings already held, I hope that the Congress can complete action on this important matter before it adjourns.

An excellent article on the consumer credit problem and on the need for truth in lending appears in the September issue of Frontier magazine. The article, "A Complicated Maze Puzzles the Consumer," was written by David Hamilton, professor of economics at the University of New Mexico.

As Professor Hamilton concludes his article:

The present confusion in the consumer credit market leaves the customer hunting for the pea under the shell. A free market in credit cannot exist when one party to the transaction doesn't know the full sale price.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Professor Hamilton's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COMPLICATED MAZE PUZZLES THE CONSUMER

(By David Hamilton)

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, whose Senate bill, S. 1740, would have required that interest rates on consumer credit be stated as a true annual rate, is having trouble injecting a bit of truth into the moneylending business.

A basic notion of any free market is that the buyer or consumer is properly informed. This notion was stated as a consumer right by President Kennedy in his March message to Congress which dealt with the consumer interest. The President stated that the consumer has a "right to be informed—to be protected against fraudulent, deceitful, or grossly misleading information, advertising, labeling, or other practices, and to be given the facts he needs to make an informed choice."

The conditions which exist in the market for credit depart a long way from this expressed ideal. Even an astute consumer has difficulty securing "the facts he needs to make an informed choice" in the credit market. The buyer is confronted by innumerable methods of quoting credit charges; some make it impossible to compare alternative credit sources and some completely obscure the credit charge.

Consumer credit is big business. The June issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin indicates that in April 1962 consumers owed

creditors $56.65 billion. Of this, $43.285 billion was installment credit; the remainder was noninstallment, short-term credit. (The Federal Reserve figures, however, do not include mortgage debt and thus underrepresent the total amount of debt which consumers owe by about $150 billion. The total consumer debt is closer to $200 billion.)

Rates on mortgage debt are usually clearly stated as a true annual rate. It is in nonmortgage debt that confusion reigns. Even though this type composes only about one-fourth of total consumer debt, it is sufficiently large to place a heavy burden on the consumer. The average cost, to the consumer, of this credit is as high as 15 percent; consumers are paying approximately $8.25 billion per year in carrying charges. (This is not much less than the annual cost of servicing the national debt.)

Nonmortgage consumer debt has grown rapidly in the last 10 years. In 1952, consumer credit of all types, exclusive of mortgage credit, amounted to $27.52 billion. In 10 years, the amount of outstanding debt just about doubled. There are several reasons for this mushroomed use of credit. An elaborating technology has made the modern home a small factory of machines driven by the electric motor. Just to set up housekeeping forces the average consumer into considerable debt. In addition, cities, a large part of which have been built since the automobile, are so planned that an automobile is now a necessity. Very few consumers, however, are able to muster enough cash in advance to pay for the "modern conveniences."

But the growth of consumer credit, especially in the past 10 years, is also a product of the ease in which credit may be obtained. The ingeniousness of the credit huckster seems to be unlimited. Within 10 years the credit card has become a part of the American middle-class way of life and revolving credit reaches almost every level of the status structure. Banks are extending check credit which is a form of generalized revolving credit. Revolving credit is simply a scheme whereby a consumer may maintain a permanent amount of debt on which he meets the interest charges. Theoretically, the principal is reduced by some fixed fraction, usually one-twelfth, each month. But since at any time the consumer also can add to the debt up to the ceiling amount, it is possible to remain permanently in hock.

VARYING TYPES OF CREDIT ARE AVAILABLE

The consumer is faced by William James' "blooming, buzzing confusion" in the credit market. To the different types of credit offered may be added the different sources of credit. The small loan company is augmented by the commercial bank, the credit union, the sales finance company, and the merchandizer who has now entered this lucrative business. All of them have their own ways of computing credit charges and compounding the confusion.

Sometimes credit charges are stated as the true annual rate. This simply means that a consumer who borrows $120 for 1 year at 6 percent will owe the principal, $120, plus $7.20 interest at the end of 1 year. To most consumers this is quite clear, simple, and conventional, but this type of credit lending is today the exception rather than the rule.

Most credit now provides for installment payment of the principal. When such provision is made a 6 percent rate may turn out to be closer to 12 percent on a true annual basis. If, for example, the consumer borrows $120 with the provision that he repay $10 of the principal each month, the principal sum which he possesses declines $10 monthly. The first month he has $120, the second $110, and the third $100 and so on to the last month when he has only $10. The average amount he borrowed is found by adding the declining balance each month and dividing by the number of months: In this case he had an average amount of $65. If his interest is figured as 6 percent of $120 or $7.20, as it most certainly will, his true annual rate will be approximately 11.1 percent.

However, sometimes credit charges are stated as a certain percentage per month on the unpaid balance. When this is the case the true annual rate is determined by multiplying the monthly percentage charge by 12. Thus, a 1 percent per month charge is, in fact, a true annual rate of 12 percent. A rate of 1.5 percent per month is 18 percent true annual rate and a rate of 2 percent per month is 24 percent true annual rate.

The relatively few consumers who may be able to rapidly convert such methods of interest charging to true annual rates are sometimes thwarted by the simple device of stating the cash price plus a dollar amount for interest. No interest rate is shown. In still other cases the consumer is merely told the amount of his monthly payment which includes both interest and an amount for principal retirement.

MANY DIFFICULTIES FACE THE BORROWER

With these varied ways of stating credit charge, it is increasingly difficult for the consumer to do comparative shopping for credit even when it is worth while to do so. The usual rates of credit sources vary significantly. Credit unions usually lend at rates which range between 8 and 12 percent, banks from about 8 to 18 percent, small loan companies, depending on the State, from 18 to 42 percent, and installment purchase credit lenders from about 12 to 24 percent.

A consumer purchasing a $300 refrigerator on time would find quite a variation in the total cost depending upon the source of credit. By paying for the refrigerator in 1 year, the total cost would be from $324 to $336 if he financed through a credit union, from $324 to $354 if through a bank, from $330 to $372 if by installment purchase credit, and from $354 to $426 if through a small loan agency.

Unless the consumer can convert credit charges to a uniform rate he cannot compare alternative costs of credit. Senator DOUGLAS' bill would require only that credit costs be stated as a true annual rate so that consumers could more easily compare actual credit rates. His bill would not regulate credit charges. The truth-in-lending bill offers the consumer protection analogous to the Securities Act of 1933, which required that the truth concerning new security issues be made available to potential security purchasers.

So far the career of his bill, a veteran of two Congresses, has demonstrated that it is the consumer who is least represented in Congress. Few bills have such massed opposion. Organizations as diverse as the American Bar Association ("Our study, in fact, indicates that a better argument can be made against the constitutionality of this bill than for it."); National Small Businessmen's Association ("Passage of this bill would mean an end to recolving credit and place all credit selling in jeopardy."); Montgomery Ward ("The bill is unworkable."); the National Association of Manufacturers ("We believe this proposal will have a 'boomerang effect,' creating more confusion and deception than it stops."); the National Retail Merchants Association; the National Automobile Dealers' Association ("The bill is unnecessary.") oppose it.

The arguments of its opponents are the usual sophistries heard in committee hearings on consumer legislation. It will not work—but if it will work it would have ill effects on the consumer, the economy, the business climate, and free enterprise.

One thing is clear. The present confusion in the consumer credit market leaves the customer hunting for the pea under the shell. A free market in credit cannot exist when one party to the transaction doesn't know the full sale price.

Another Honest Mistake?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, many of us have predicted that the coalition government in Laos would eventually become Communist. Why? Because of the lessons of history.

This editorial, from the Mesa, Ariz., Tribune of August 27, 1962, chronicles these "mistakes" of the past, present, and unless we learn our lesson soon, the future.

ANOTHER HONEST MISTAKE?

Here is a story about a little girl. This little girl has been taught by her parents that accidents such as dropping a dish, or knocking over a glass of milk are honest mistakes—thus she is not punished when she has an accident. This is proper training. But all children are a little mischievous, and every once in a while this little girl, when her baby brother is getting a little too much attention, will correct the situation by simply dropping a dish and breaking it into smithereens. Then, with all the charm of little girls, she will look up at her mother or daddy and say, "It was an honest mistake."

Let's make an application. Right after World War II, the policy of the United States encouraged a coalition government in Poland which included Communists. It didn't take long before there was only a Communist government and Poland went behind the Iron Curtain. The same policy was followed in Hungary, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and several other East European countries. Russia had been our ally in the war against Hitler, and we believed that these could be called honest mistakes. But then there was trouble in China and we were officially, by agreement and treaty, supporting the non-Communist government. Suddenly, our policy changed and we began urging a coalition government of the Nationalists and the Communists. Chiang Kai-shek would not agree—so, we stopped our military support and 650 million Chinese became the slaves of communism.

It was another "honest mistake."

Then there was a strong anti-Communist dictator in Cuba. He was, perhaps, many things—some of them very bad—but his country did enjoy one of the highest standards of living of any country in this hemisphere outside of the United States. The official policy of our Government came to be the support of Fidel Castro, and within 90 miles of America a "bastion of Communist strength" was established. The record of Castro was available to our State Department, just as it was to those of us who warned that he was a Communist. But our State Department made another "honest mistake."

For years we have poured millions of dollars into Laos, supporting the anti-Communist government and paying the army. Suddenly, last February, we cut off all economic aid to that country and began urging a coalition government with the Communists. It has been established. Have we made another honest mistake?

In Berlin, by treaty and by example, we have said we are going to make the Communists live up to their agreements—that we will not abandon Berlin. But in Europe you can no longer make the average man on the street believe that our State Department policy has not already officially changed

to accommodate another coalition government, even though we might call it an international commission. Are we about to make another "honest mistake" and surrender Berlin? And where do we stop making mistakes? When do they cease being "honest."

Wisconsin Historymobile II—Newspapers Make History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 5, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Historical Society of Wisconsin annually has undertaken a program of Historymobiles: A mobile museum traveling throughout the State featuring subjects of major significance to Wisconsin's history.

Historymobile I spotlighted the importance of the St. Lawrence Seaway to Wisconsin and the Nation. As a sponsor of the seaway law I have been particularly gratified by this project.

Historymobile II features the tremendously significant story of Wisconsin's newspaper history from territorial days to the present.

As a free people, we depend tremendously upon newspapers—as well as on other media—to keep a well-informed citizenry. In a fast changing, rapidly advancing age, this is of ever-increasing value to our Nation.

The history of newspaperism in Wisconsin—as well as throughout the Nation—then takes on ever-greater significance.

Recently, the Wisconsin Press Association—a major sponsor of Historymobile II—published an informative article on the museum. Reflecting upon this spendid endeavor to further keep our citizens updated in thinking on major features of State-National life, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the arctile was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORYMOBILE II—NEWSPAPERS MAKE HISTORY, 1833–1962

(By Justin Schmiedeke)

(Traveling museum tells Wisconsin's newspaper history from territorial days until today. Schedule laid out to include stops at nearly every town having a newspaper member of the Wisconsin Press Association.)

Wisconsin newspaper publishers will have a look at their own history when Historymobile II calls on them this coming year. The huge new mobile museum, traveling this year under the sponsorship of the State's papers, tells the story of newspaper publishing in Wisconsin from 1833 up to the present time.

The Wisconsin Press Association, with a gift of $2,250 to the State Historical Society, is one of the major sponsors of the tour. Daily newspapers throughout the State made individual contributions, the mobile home builder donated the trailer unit and International Harvester Co. supplied the tractor truck. These, with contributions from many other sources, were sufficient to enable the society to place the unit on the road at almost no cost to the taxpayers.

Departing from the former policy of operating the traveling exhibit only during the mild weather months, Historymobile II will be "in business" continuously throughout the winter and well into next summer. An itenerary accompanies this article.

The schedule of Historymobile II was laid out to include stops at every town having a newspaper that is a member of the Wisconsin Press Association plus, of course, the daily newspapers. All stops in the current tour are in communities where a newspaper is published and the hometown publisher is asked to serve as host during the stopover of Historymobile II.

Planning the itinerary of the current tour was a considerably tougher assignment than in the past. Historymobile II is such a massive unit (70 feet long and 12 feet wide) that it can be on the road only during daylight hours and distances between stops must be of reasonably short mileage. At times these limitations make it impossible to schedule the unit into a town on a date to coincide with a newspaper's anniversary or for some other local festival. Wherever possible, the schedule makers did try to meet requests of this nature.

After the travel schedule of the unit was completed, the society sent letters to the publishers in each town where a stop was scheduled. This letter informed the editor of the time Historymobile II would be in his town and asked him to act as the sponsor.

So far as Historymobile II itself is concerned, sponsorship of the unit's visit entails nothing except a small amount of time; the sponsor is asked to arrange for a suitable place to park the unit, to provide a police escort and to arrange for cooperation of municipal authorities. To make this even easier for the sponsoring publisher the society sends letters to the mayor or village president and to the local police chief informing them of the Historymobile visit, the fact that it will be sponsored by the local publisher and asks that they cooperate.

It is in the "extracurricular" activities connected with a Historymobile stopover that publishers have their greatest opportunity—and, perhaps, their greatest expenditure of work. Wherever possible, it is suggested that the Historymobile be parked adjacent to the newspaper plant. Then, if the publisher wishes, he can arrange to hold an "open house" at his plant and invite the public to visit the newspaper shop along with seeing the historical exhibits in the trailer. Most of the sponsoring publishers have indicated that they intend to do this. Some are planning special editions to commemorate the visit of Historymobile II to their communities.

To tie in with whatever arrangements are made by the home publisher, the Historical Society has provided space for display of newspapers from each local community. Each publisher has been asked to provide a volume of his paper which can be read by visitors as they pass through the Historymobile and, if possible, a copy of a first edition or an early edition for posting in a space provided for this purpose. The volume need not be too old because the society has discovered that Historymobile visitors are fascinated by local papers of 20 to 30 years ago. Where the local publisher cannot provide this material, the society will, whenever possible, provide newspapers from its own collection. Most Wisconsin publishers have deposited a copy of each edition of their papers with the society since the mid-1850's when the Wisconsin Press Association was organized, newspapers were contributed to the society by their publishers. The society's newspaper collection, second only to the collection owned by the Library of Congress, contains, in bound volumes or on microfilm, a copy of every available edition of every newspaper ever published in Wisconsin.

Each publisher is also being urged to put up, in his own shop if he holds an open house, or in a nearby store window, a display on the history of his own newspaper to include such things as early editions of his paper; examples of early advertising, handbills, letterheads or other job printing; antique tools such as line gages, sets of composing rules, antique quoins, keys, shooting sticks or engraving tools; examples of antique wood or metal type, hand-carved wood or linoleum block cuts, border, ornaments or electrotypes; early photographs of the newspaper shop or a portrait of the founder. Each publisher is also being urged to print, in his commemorative issue or in connection with a promotion article on the Historymobile, a history of his own newspaper.

"Newspapers Make History, 1833–1962," is the title of the exhibition carried in Historymobile II. A visit to the traveling museum starts with a view of a territorial newspaper office. The principal mechanical object in the setting is an authentic Ramage press, predecessor to the Washington hand press, and this one is believed to have been used on a Wisconsin newspaper prior to 1848.

The Ramage was known as a four-pull press, which meant that the printer had to make up and print each of the four tabloid-size pages separately. After all four pages were printed the paper was folded by hand, addressed, also by hand, and the publisher was ready to start another issue—after, of course, the not-so-small chore of killing the printed pages. This method of printing papers, used even on the State's first daily, meant "pulling" an individual impression of each page or two pages, depending on the size of the press.

Ramage and Washington presses had become obsolete by the middle of the 19th century; but as the Wisconsin frontier pushed northward into the lumber lands the old hand presses continued to be used; in some shops they were used as late as the first decade of the 20th century.

Newpaper publishers sponsoring the Historymobile visits will have an opportunity to activate this territorial newspaper setting if they are able to furnish an assistant to the traveling curator. As visitors pass through the unit the pressman will be able to demonstrate operation of the antique press.

Reproductions of the historically important first editions of many Wisconsin newspapers—including volume 1, No. 1 of the first, the Green Bay Intelligencer—line the walls of the Historymobile.

Another exhibit contains important, and sometimes rare, artifacts of the printing trade, most of them donated to the Historical Society by Wisconsin weekly newspaper publishers. There are such items as "shooting sticks," and wedge-shaped quoins, which were driven together rather than locked by a key, and a set of composing rules, part of the personal equipment of every printer. There are a few hand-carved woodcuts used in early advertising.

Another setting pictures the job printing section of a newspaper shop. The principal object of this section is an 1895 C. & P. job press, identical to many a press still in use in Wisconsin newspaper shops. This job press, which is treadle powered, is an excellent means of illustrating the advances in the technology of printing as compared to the Ramage press.

Several kinds of typecases, where many a boy learned the practical application of his A B C's, are shown with the appropriate letter in each compartment. The process of setting a line of type is demonstrated step by step.

The story of editing and printing a newspaper is told through a series of pictures

donated by Wisconsin publishers. And the advances in printing machinery are illustrated in a series of drawings and sketches.

The final section of Historymobile II is devoted to one of the largest and most modern printing setups in Wisconsin, the huge three-story-high press of the Milwaukee Journal. It is accompanied by an educational step-by-step explanation and display of four-color newspaper printing using the color-separation negatives, mats, and plates that were actually used to print one color page of a newspaper.

Chances are that almost every Wisconsin resident who visits Historymobile II will feel "right at home." For the ceiling and walls, where no exhibits are fastened, are lined with reproductions of 1962 Wisconsin hometown newspapers.

There is one small section of Historymobile II that is not open to the public. That is the 9-by-12 combination living room-kitchen-bedroom-office of Jake and Irene Tschudy, curators of the Historymobile. For the past several years this couple has come to know every nook and cranny of Wisconsin through their tours with Historymobile I.

Before setting out with the "Newspapers Make History" exhibit Jake and Irene spent many an hour "boning up" on Wisconsin newspaper history and both were initiated into the mysteries of the printing craft when the various exhibit units were installed in the trailer.

This will be their first experience at operating the historical exhibit during winter and, while they do not anticipate any serious trouble, one of their greatest problems will be water. Freezing temperatures common in Wisconsin and the lack of excess space within the trailer unit meant that the unit could be equipped with only a small tank. This, in turn, meant the elimination of shower facilities. Publishers who play host to Jake and Irene during their current tour might take note of this and offer them the luxury of the bathtub.

President Walter Gleason, of the Wisconsin Press Association, took part in the dedication ceremony when Historymobile II was officially put in action at the State fair in August. Immediately following the fair the unit went on the road and will remain in operation until next May.

The historical society has prepared a special press kit for editors to use in conjunction with Historymobile II visits. These kits are being sent to individual newspapers about a month in advance of the Historymobile visit. The kit contains suggestions about promoting the visit of the unit and contains pictures, suggested ads, news stories, and possible plans of procedure. And if further help is wanted, it will be available. Some publishers who are planning rather elaborate promotion of the Historymobile may want to get the press kits earlier than a month in advance; in such cases the kits will be supplied on request.

ROUTE OF HISTORYMOBILE II

YEAR 1962

August:
20, Menomonee Falls
21, Cedarburg
22, Port Washington
23, Random Lake
24, Sheboygan
25, Sheboygan
26, Sheboygan
27, Plymouth
28, Kiel
29, New Holstein
30, Chilton
31, Manitowoc-Two Rivers

September:
1, Manitowoc-Two Rivers
2, Manitowoc-Two Rivers
3, Manitowoc-Two Rivers
4, Kewaunee, Luxemburg
5, Algoma
6, Sturgeon Bay
7, Green Bay
8, Green Bay
9, Green Bay
10, Bonduel
11, Oconto Falls
12, Oconto
13, Peshtigo
14, Marinette
15, Marinette
16, Marinette
17, Florence
18, Crandon
19, Eagle River
20, Minocqua
21, Rhinelander
22, Rhinelander
23, Rhinelander
24, Tomahawk
25, Rib Lake, Prentice
26, Phillips, Park Falls
27, Glidden, Mellen
28, Ashland
29, Ashland
30, Ashland

October:
1, Bayfield, Iron River
2, Hayward
3, Shell Lake
4, Spooner
5, Superior
6, Superior
7, Superior
8, Grantsburg
9, Frederic, Luck
10, Cumberland
11, Chetek
12, Bloomer
13, Chippewa Falls
14, Chippewa Falls
15, Colfax, Glenwood City
16, Clear Lake, Amery
17, Balsam Lake, St. Croix Falls
18, Osceola
19, Eau Claire
20, Eau Claire
21, Eau Claire
22, Menomonie
23, Stout Institute, Woodville
24, New Richmond
25, Hudson
26, Ellsworth
27, Durand
29, Pepin, Cochrane
30, Arcadia, Independence
31, Mondovi, Whitehall

November
1, Blair, Galesville
2, Onalaska, LaCrosse
3, LaCrosse
4, LaCrosse
5, West Salem, Bangor
6, Sparta
7, Melrose
8, Black River Falls
9, Pittsville
10, Wisconsin Rapids
11, Wisconsin Rapids
12, Neillsville
13, Loyal, Colby
14, Abbotsford, Dorchester
15, Medford
16, Edgar, Marathon
17, Wausau
18, Wausau
19, Mosinee, Stratford
20, Thorp, Stanley
24, Merrill
25, Merrill
26, Wittenberg
27, Marion
28, Clintonville
29, New London
30, Manawa

December:
1, Antigo
2, Antigo
3, Shawano
4, Shawano
5, Seymour
6, Waupaca
7, Amherst
8, Stevens Point
9, Stevens Point
10, Wautoma
11, Montello
12, Princeton
13, Green Lake
14, Ripon
15, Oshkosh
16, Oshkosh
17, Winneconne, Omro
18, Berlin
19, Markesan
20, Fox Lake, Randolph
21, Pardeeville, Rio
22, Portage
23, Portage

YEAR 1963

January:
2, DeForest, Poynette
3, Lodi
4, Waunakee
5, Baraboo
6, Baraboo
7, Reedsburg
8, Wonewoc, Hillsboro
9, Elroy, Kendall
10, New Lisbon
11, Mauston
12, Wisconsin Dells
13, Wisconsin Dells
14, Tomah
15, Cashton
16, Westby
17, Viroqua
18, La Farge, Viola
19, Richland Center
20, Richland Center
21, Soldiers Grove, Gays Mills
22, Boscobel
23, Wauzeka
24, Prairie du Chien
25, Bloomington
26, Cassville
28, Lancaster
29, Fennimore
30, Dodgeville
31, Mineral Point

February:
1, Platteville
2, Monroe
3, Monroe
4, Cuba City
5, Darlington
6, Argyle Blanchardville
7, New Glarus
8, Belleville
11, Black Earth
12, Spring Green
13, Muscoda
14, Sauk City-Prairie du Sac
18, Oregon
19, Stoughton
20, Edgerton
21, Milton Junction
22, Janesville
23, Janesville
24, Janesville
25, Orfordville Brodhead
26, Albany
27, Evansville
28, Sun Prairie

March:
1, Columbus
2, Beaver Dam
3, Beaver Dam
4, Hustisford
5, Juneau
6, Horicon
7, Mayville
8, Waupun
9, Fond du Lac
10, Fond du Lac
11, Hilbert, Brillion
12, Denmark
13, De Pere
14, Kaukauna
15, Appleton

16, Appleton
17, Appleton
18, Neenah-Menasha
19, Neenah-Menasha
20, Campbellsport
21, Kewaskum
22, West Bend
23, Watertown
24, Watertown
25, Hartford
26, Hartland
27, Oconomowoc
28, Dousman
29, Lake Mills
30, Fort Atkinson
31, Fort Atkinson

April:
1, Whitewater
2, Delavan
3, Elkhorn
4, Lake Geneva
5, Walworth, Sharon
6, Beloit
7, Beloit
8, East Troy
9, Waterford
10, Burlington
11, Mukwanago
15, Waukesha
16, Waukesha
17, Hales Corners
18, Union Grove
19, Racine
20, Racine
21, Racine
22, Kenosha
23, Kenosha
24, Cambridge
25, Madison
26, Madison
27, Madison
28, Madison
30, Augusta

May:
1, Cadott, Boyd
2, Carnell
3, Ladysmith
4, Barron
6, Rice Lake
8, Marshfield
9, Adams-Friendship

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Anti-Communist Leader in Western New York Warns Against Unabated Spread of International Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, Manitou Springs, Colo., was the scene last month of a lecture series presented to high school and college students by the Christian crusade. Invited to address this group on several occasions was Mr. Walter V. Chopyk, public relations director of the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of western New York. During the course of the seminar, Mr. Chopyk continually pointed up the urgent necessity for a program of bold action to counter the spread of international communism.

Mr. Chopyk also indicated his strong support for a proposal to call a "summit" meeting in Washington, of all leaders-in-exile of the captive nations throughout the world.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this time, three newspaper articles covering Mr. Chopyk's appearances at the Manitou Springs "summit" meeting.

Following this account, I wish to call the attention of the Members of this House to an article which appeared in the August 11 edition of the Buffalo Courier Express, on the subject of "Captive Nations Year."

The articles follow:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Aug. 15, 1962]

CHOPYK SAYS LAOS PLIGHT LIKE TIBET

MANITOU SPRINGS, COLO.—Walter V. Chopyk; of Buffalo, N.Y., Tuesday night chronicled the spread of Russian imperialism from the 14th century to the present, in a speech before high school and college students here.

He likened Communist expansion in Laos as comparable to "another Tibet" and warned that "holding that strategically placed country can give its holder a jumping-off base" to control all of southeast Asia. That would lead to the creation of "a wide, new base from which to try to intimidate southern India, Australia, and New Zealand," he said.

Chopyk also urged the students to support a resolution offered in the House by Representative JOHN R. PILLION, a Hamburg, N.Y., Republican, which would declare that a state of war exists between the United States and the 98 Communist parties throughout the world.

Chopyk spoke at a summer school of the Christian Crusade here. Chopyk is public relations director of the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York.

[From the Manitou Springs (Colo.) Pikes Peak Journal, Aug. 17, 1962]

CHOPYK TALKS ON COMMUNISM GROWTH AT SUMMIT MEET

The Summit, summer headquarters of the Christian Crusade has been the scene of a group of lectures the past week, which were arranged by Billie J. Hargis, head of the Christiain Crusade against communism.

Walter V. Chopyk, of Buffalo, N.Y., was the speaker on Tuesday night, taking as his subject "The Cancerous Russian Colonial Empire."

Walter V. Chopyk is a former agent of the U.S. Department of Justice, linguist, and U.S. observer to the 1955 Geneva Summit Conference, and founder of the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York, and secretary to the Erie County planning department at present. He has also served as a member of the advisory board of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

In his lecture, Mr. Chopyk carefully sketched a picture of the birth, spread, growth, and development of Russian imperialism under the guise of communism.

He likened it to a cancerous growth, mushrooming rapidly, never satiated, bound by no rules, agreements, treaties or ethics, devouring all in its way as it grinds on to its unshakeable goal of complete domination of all the world.

Mr. Chopyk, using Government reports and statistics exclusively, illustrated the expansion in territorial grabs from the 14th century Grand Duchy of Muscovy, with its 214,000 square miles to the present appalling situation where the Soviet Empire now encompasses close to 12 million square miles. This monumental swindle of other people's real estate is only surpassed by reflecting on its equivalent and concurrent enslavement of human lives. He showed that the population today is about 100 million, whereas the population of non-Russians under the lash of Russian imperalism has reached the number of more than 1 billion.

Mr. Chopyk blamed the free world for its failure to support its heavily publicized policy of "the right of self-determination" for the many non-Russian nations that unshackled the Russian Czars' chains in 1917–18 and became independent; in due time in 1922 they became prey to the Russian imperial Communists.

By using familiar devices of divide and conquer, diplomatic duplicity, puppet regimes, etc., they conquered them, stopping at the gates of Poland.

In 1940, the free world, with a naive tolerance, watched them capture Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

In 1945, the West fell for the proven Communist technique of subverting representative governments via interparty coalitions, and seized Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Mongolia, China, Manchuria, North Korea, Tibet, and North Vietnam.

Now, added Chopyk, Laos is like another Tibet. Holding that strategically placed country can give its holder a jumping-off base to Thailand, South Vietnam, Cambia, Gulf of Siam, South China Sea and eventually southern India, Australia, and New Zealand.

[From the Colorado Springs Gazette, Aug. 18, 1962]

SPEAKER OFFERS 12-POINT PLAN TO CRUSH IMPERIALISM

Walter V. Chopyk, founder of the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York, offered 12 commandments with which to "crush forever the tyranny of Russian imperialism" at a lecture at 8 p.m. Thursday at the Summit in Manitou Springs.

Speaking at the summer headquarters of the Christian Crusade of Tulsa, Okla., Chopyk's first commandment was that the United States should call a "summit" meeting of all the leaders-in-exile of the captive nations and the leaders of the free world.

He said the meeting should be held in Washington, D.C., for the purpose of constructing programs that will lead to the "total defeat of the international criminal Communist conspiracy; the liberation of the enslaved millions; the restoration of nations and the rebirth of freedom."

Chopyk, who resides in Buffalo, N.Y., went on to list open and free elections without delay "as the yoke of the aggressor is removed from the neck of each nation"; an end to the "nefarious cultural exchange programs"; resuming nuclear testing at once on an accelerated plan; an irrevocable stand against the recognition of Red China; the termination of the "endless, wasteful, useless Geneva Conference," exposing the "deceitful conduct of Russia in the United Nations.

"All who cherish freedom," he said, "must support the leaders in the fight."

The speaker went on to say these steps must be followed by the far-reaching, crystal-clear publicity designed to acquaint all with what is being done, especially the "non-Russians now languishing inside the Russian empire."

Chopyk asked that Congressmen be urged to "immediately adopt House Resolution 211 that proposes the establishment of a Special Permanent Committee on Captive Nations which would study the plight of Soviet dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the plight of the captive nations."

He further said that people should urge "the immediate passage of Senate Resolution 822, a bill to create the freedom commission and the freedom academy to research and develop an integrated, operational science to win the nonmilitary part of the global struggle between freedom and communism and to train Government personnel, private citizens, and foreign students in this science."

The speaker concluded his lecture by saying that Americans should be alerted to the "Russian imperial Communist conspiracy, for this is no longer a controversial issue. It is a matter of life and death—freedom or slavery. We cannot wait till tomorrow to liquidate the Russian colonial empire. We must do so now. Later will be too late."

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier, Aug. 11, 1962]

NOW LET US START CAPTIVE NATIONS YEAR

Captive Nations Week is past; but it would be well wor Americans to begin to observe captive nations year—or years. For it is incumbent on devotees of freedom everywhere to keep a light of hope aglow for the millions entrapped and enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

A modest beginning for a more intensive American effort in behalf of those millions can be found in House Resolution 211, introduced by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, calling for establishment of a special Committee on the Captive Nations, composed of 10 members, not more than 6 to be members of the same political party and of whom 5 would be members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The function of this committee would be to "conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms."

While the resolution would empower the committee "to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States * * * as it deems advisable," it is obvious that there would be insurmountable obstacles to holding sessions within the captive countries concerned—to say nothing of requiring "by subpena or otherwise" attendance of witnesses and production of documents therein. The fact remains, however, that the committee could obtain much useful testimony from refugees from the captive lands and from Americans and others who have had opportunity to gain information as to conditions there either by personal visits or by correspondence with friends and relatives behind the Iron Curtain.

It is significant that the resolution does not apply merely to neighboring countries overrun or subverted by the Communists but also to the captive peoples within the Soviet Union itself—those who were conquered by czarist Russia and have been held ever since. These would include the Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Georgians, and others in Europe and practically all of the Soviet republics (actually colonial possessions of the Russian empire (in Asia).

So establishment of the proposed committee would accomplish at least three important purposes: (1) Kindle renewed hope in the captive lands; (2) direct American and other free-world attention to the captives' plight, and (3) proclaim to the world the hypocrisy of the "anticolonial" pretensions of the most ruthless imperial and colonial power on earth—anticolonial" pretensions to which, unfortunately, American policy frequently has lent aid and comfort.

It is to be hoped, therefore, that the Rules Committee of the House will be reasonably prompt in releasing the resolution for action by the Foreign Affairs Committee and the whole House.

Labor Day Address by Senator Hartke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on September 3, 1962, Labor Day, my friend, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] delivered a searching message which I feel should be called to the attention of all the distinguished Members of this great deliberative body. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Senator HARTKE's 1962 Labor Day message inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANCE HARTKE, DEMOCRAT, OF INDIANA, BEFORE LABOR DAY CELEBRATION AT ANDERSON, IND., MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1962

All of us here are aware of the grave and perilous times in which we live. It is a time of great change, with new nations emerging from the old, and old nations searching for new ideals. For some it is the twilight of an era; for others it is the dawn.

It is also a time in which the world has been divided into two camps—one in which the people have the choice of freedom, the other where the freedom of choice no longer exists.

We are a strong nation. And because we are strong, and because we sincerely believe in the nobility of the individual, we have become the leader in the struggle to see that all men have the freedom to choose how and under what form of government they will live.

Such a role is not an easy one. It carries with it great responsibility. To enslave men's minds is far easier than it is to free them once they have been shackled.

Labor Day is a day of message. A message of the past, today, and the future. We could hear the message of the struggles of labor of the past—or the message of the successes of labor of the past. We could hear the messages of the struggles of labor today or—the message of the success of labor today. We could tell of the message of the coming struggles of labor or of the success which we are confident will come to labor in the days to come.

But the message I want you to hear today is a different one. The message I bring to you is of poverty.

Poverty is no longer necessary.

Poverty must be abolished.

Poverty and its causes must be exposed and eliminated.

Many efforts to end poverty have been made and organized labor deserves the credit for being a leader in this field. But we should not be misunderstood; it is not labor's sole responsibility to end poverty. The ending of poverty is the responsibility of each of us. It will require the joint effort of labor, management, churches, school, and government.

The first step in ending poverty is to be willing to acknowledge that it exists. Some say—whether sincerely or ignorantly, that is for them to say—that we live in abundance; that our farms produce more than we can eat, that our factories produce more than we can use. It is true that America is a land of abundance and this is especially so in contrast to the acute need in many other countries. It is also true that many individuals have more than they can eat each day and more things than they can use. For after all, one big steak is about all a man can hold and a man can drive only one car at a time. But the naked truth is that we in American have many individuals who have insufficient food and are suffering from malnutrition. Similarly many people would use more of the things produced in our factories if they only had the money with which to buy them.

Now it is evident that a man without money and without a job looks for a way out. It is not enough to say that any man that wants a job bad enough can get one. This is a wornout expression which just plain is not so. Possibly when this country was new and undeveloped, some concept that any man can find a job was understandable—but a way for a man to find a job today is much more complex and frequently beyond the reach of an individual's personal desire. And to some even the personal desire has been drilled or killed. We should know by now that a man who is without a job is a social liability. He doesn't support his family and pays no taxes to support his government. A man without a job may not be in poverty; but a man in poverty is almost always a man without a job.

The chief concern must be with those groups which are vulnerable or those who are at a disadvantage. For example those who are marginal workers, the underemployed—that is, those who work for less than a decent living wage—migrant workers, low income farmers, workers in industry without minimum wage laws or labor organizations, young people without a high school education, displaced employees with skills or trades no longer in demand, the overaged and women.

Poverty does not build character. A hungry stomach does not build character. Poor medical attention does not build character. Lack of schooling does not build character. All in all poverty and all that goes with it is the greatest waste in abundant America. It is the waste of man.

For these reasons it is vitally important—not only to the American people but to the entire free world—that a progressive and forward-looking legislative program be laid before the Congress.

Such a program was laid before Congress by President Kennedy in the last two sessions—last year and this. The Democratic leadership in Congress recognized its importance and acted upon it.

This is not to say that we were successful with every bill that was introduced. We weren't. The opposition used every means at their disposal to block much needed legislation in a futile effort to discredit the administration.

These men, who believe that the only advantage of having an open mind is that it can be slammed shut on certain subjects, demonstrated the narrowness of their horizons by voting against every piece of important legislation brought to the floor of either House.

But in spite of all their efforts to divert, demean, and defeat the administration's program, and in spite of their almost fanatical desire to march backward into the 19th century, all they succeeded in doing was to draw attention to their own lack of constructive ideas.

Important legislation was passed in both last year's and this year's sessions. Much of it was required by our expanding economy and the increased cost of living. A prime example is the new minimum wage law which passed in the first session.

As it stands on the books today, this law raises the minimum wage from $1 an hour to $1.25 over a 4-year period. It also increases its benefits to cover 3,600,000 persons who were previously not protected by any form of minimum wage whatever. This was the first expansion of coverage since the law was passed during the early days of the Franklin Roosevelt administration.

Another example is the extension of the Unemployment Compensation Act. In general, the economic situation of the country is good. It is true that there are pockets of unemployment in various parts of the United States, but Congress is aware of this fact and appropriate legislation is being passed to ease these unfortunate situations. And because of the steps already taken, unemployment dropped by 23 percent in the first 18 months of President Kennedy's term in office.

In round figures, this means 1 million fewer persons without jobs than there were a year and a half ago.

For those who still remain unemployed, the Federal Unemployment Compensation Act

has been extended for an extra 13 weeks. This brings to 39 the total number of weeks that an unemployed worker may receive benefits. The extension has done a great deal for those hurt by the recession. It is helping them to maintain themselves and their families until new jobs can be found.

There is, however, a more positive approach to the unemployment problem. I am referring to the Manpower Training Act of 1961—one of the most progressive pieces of legislation enacted by the Congress in recent years.

The passage of this bill has made it possible for workers whose skills have become obsolete to receive training in jobs never before open to them. For instance, the coal industry, which has suffered many setbacks in the last decade or so, has been forced to cut back on the number of miners due to automation and the closing down of certain mines.

Each miner who has been laid off knows no other profession. Generally, such a man was raised in a mining community and automatically followed in his father's and grandfather's footsteps. The opportunity to learn another trade was lost in the necessity of earning a living.

The Manpower Training Act makes it possible for these men—and others like them in other fields—to receive training in such things as mechanics, steamfitting, sheetmetal work, or in any one of a dozen related industries.

Believe me, ladies and gentlemen, it is laws such as these—introduced by the President and passed upon by the Senate and the House of Representatives—that boost our economy and make it possible for unemployment to drop in areas hard hit by automation, the migrations of industries, and the general shifts in job opportunities which are natural and normal in a healthy society.

I have mentioned a few of the approaches that government on a national level has made to end poverty. But the end of poverty cannot come from government alone. It cannot come from labor alone. The ending of poverty calls for an expanded and coordinated attack.

But just as business and employment need a healthy climate in which to survive, so does freedom and democracy. No man's mind and soul can be free as long as he is chained to the ignorance and privation of the past. His imprisonment is our imprisonment. And only by setting him free can we ever know freedom ourselves.

We have set about doing this in a manner never before attempted by man. No nation in history has ever before approached the peoples of the world in such unselfish friendship. The formation of the Peace Corps—with its volunteers from every State in the Union and from every walk of life—carry to every corner of the world the idealism and opportunity for which this country is justly proud.

Think of the impact that our young men and women have when they bring their background and skills to the peoples of other nations. This is humanitarianism in its truest form. It is also a major step toward building good will and understanding among the emerging nations of the world.

America has opened new frontiers in extending its abundance and the benefits of a free society to other countries. The forward motion of this frontier is essential to the continued vigor and security of the free world. The precious gift of liberty we enjoy must never be allowed to perish because we lacked vigilance and concern for our fellow man.

It is with this broader vision that President Kennedy presented his program to Congress. Many of the bills introduced were designed specifically to strengthen our alliances with other nations. Others strengthened our Armed Forces and made provisions for an expanded space program.

Since earliest times, man has dreamed of soaring beyond the confines of his planet. Now that dream has become reality. Within the next few years, we will be exploring the moon. A new era has been reached and its horizons are unlimited.

To further the conquest of space, the administration proposed, and the Congress passed, a bill authorizing more than $1.7 billion for our National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Out of this, $1.3 billion was earmarked for research and development. The rest will be used to pay salaries and erect new buildings.

It is impossible to overstate the importance of this race for space. In the last few years we have all seen the tremendous strides that the Soviet Union has made in this area. If we allow our space and missile program to lag at this point—if we don't do everything in our power to stay abreast of the Russians and eventually surpass them—then the race will be lost for good and we will be forced to resign ourselves to taking second place.

This must not happen. It is not simply a matter of pride. Or the desire to see the United States first in everything she does. It is a matter of hard, cold reality. Freedom will be lost the day we lose the ability to defend it. The Soviet Government knows this. We must never forget it.

Nor must we forget that while space is the world of tomorrow, freedom must be defended in the world of today. This can only be done by creating and maintaining a climate that is healthy and in which freedom can grow and mature.

One of the means by which this can be accomplished is through bills aimed at helping friendly nations grow in strength and defend themselves. A large portion of these nations lay to our south, in Central and South America.

This legislation is aimed chiefly at advances in fields which directly affect the lives of Latin Americans.

It is a program devoted to social progress. The effort is to create a social framework within which all the people of a nation can share in the benefits of prosperity and participate in the process of growth.

No country can prosper economically if social progress lets the great majority of the people remain in poverty while a privileged few reap the benefits of rising abundance. The purpose behind this bill is to overcome the barriers of geographical and social isolation, illiteracy, and lack of educational opportunities, as well as archaic tax and land tenure structures. Only by removing these can there be a broad participation in economic growth.

A bill which relates to this, and one which is outstanding in the field of humanitarian legislation, is the creation of the White Fleet Emergency Assistance Act, of which I am a cosponsor.

This resolution was unanimously adopted by the Senate in support of President Kennedy's proposal for a force of mercy ships which will stand ready to rush assistance to disaster areas in any coastal region of the world. It is also designed to carry on a regular program of logistics support in the fields of public health as well as in other areas where technical assistance will be of benefit.

The fleet will be made up of vessels no longer on active service. These ships are currently part of our mothball fleet and as such are serving no useful purpose.

Once reactivated, they will be operated by nonprofit charitable organizations of the United States devoted to providing emergency aid and assistance for the relief of human suffering.

Legislation such as this speaks for itself. Its importance is undeniable.

There are many countries throughout the world that are desperately in need of our help. If we are not willing or able to give it to them, they will have only one direction in which to turn. And if this happens, the disaster will be ours as much as it will be theirs.

For we must never forget that we live in a world in which a totalitarian cult of cynicism is at large. It breeds by sowing its poisonous seeds in the fertile soil of ignorance and poverty. And when some of these seeds take root and grow, it is left to us to reap the bitter harvest.

Because this system exists, and because it was born, reared, and dedicated to a philosophy of world conquest and domination, we are forced to live in an atmosphere of continual confusion and mistrust. The world has become an arena, and the star attractions are doubt and fear.

Dr. John H. Stambaugh, vice chancellor of Vanderbilt University said recently: "The historical cycle of this body politic indicates that man progresses from bondage to spiritual faith, from spiritual faith to courage, from courage to freedom, from freedom to abundance; then comes the waning, from abundance to selfishness, from selfishness to apathy, from apathy to dependence, and from dependency right back into bondage again."

I believe that the experiment in democracy in which we are participating in this country can break this cycle. History need not repeat itself.

But this is the challenge which has been flung in the fact of the free world. And if the world is to survive free—indeed, if mankind is to survive at all—then we must be willing to accept the challenge as free men living in a free society, and with all the advantages that such a society has to offer.

Such tyranny is like a contagious disease—it spreads if it is allowed to go unchecked. But like any other virus, it can be cured if it is caught in time and treated with the right medicine.

In this case, the time to arrest the disease is now. And the medicine to use is an unshakable belief that our cause is just, an honest appreciation of ourselves as a people and as a country, and a determined will to remain masters of our own minds and souls.

The bills which I have outlined to you today were designed specifically with this in mind. Yet they are only a few of the many that were passed by both sessions of Congress during the last year.

They represent, however, important issues and solutions. These, and others like them, will have the greatest impact on our economy and on the stability of our friends abroad.

In a few months, Congress will meet again. A new legislative program will be presented by the President, and there will be old and new problems to solve. Then, just as they are now, the nations of the free world will be looking to us for leadership. If we fail them—if we fail our responsibility to the cause of freedom—we fail ourselves and the beliefs that our fathers and forefathers were willing to give their lives for. We must not let this happen. We dare not let this happen.

Walter Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of September 2, 1962, carried a highly interesting and informative feature article on the career

of Dr. Walter Reed and the discovery that he made which was the first step in the eradication of yellow fever. The article is in profile form and as part of my remarks today I include the text of that feature.

The article follows:

WALTER REED

How would you like to be locked up in a room with an *Aedes egypti?*

The *Aedes egypti* is the yellow fever mosquito; a small, dark mosquito that was the secret villain of human tragedy for thousands of years.

Until about the turn of the century yellow fever was one of the world's most dangerous diseases. The death rate was appalling. In the 1898 epidemic in Rio de Janeiro, 95 percent of those who got sick died.

The old cemeteries of New Orleans, and the cemeteries of cities and towns along the Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico shores, are full of stones marking the graves of the victims of "yellow jack."

There has not been an epidemic in temperate regions since 1910 because of the discovery of the means by which yellow fever is transmitted from person to person.

Before that was known, doctors did not even know what caused the disease. They were helpless. There was no cure.

Walter Reed, a major in the U.S. Army Medical Corps, found the answer by proving the theory advanced by Carlos Finlay, a Cuban biologist who first said yellow fever was transmitted by mosquitoes.

It took only 6 months—and several lives—to prove Finlay right.

The luckier volunteers slept in bedding in which persons dying of yellow fever had lain. They did not get sick, disproving the popular theory that the disease was transmitted by personal contact.

Other volunteers, just as brave but not so lucky, allowed themselves to be bitten by *Aedes egypti.*

Animals could not be used in the experiments because those used for laboratory purposes turned out to be immune to the yellow fever organism injected into their bloodstreams by the mosquito.

The "lab animals" had to be human beings.

Proving Finlay was right was not Reed's only achievement. During the Spanish-American War, the public in the United States was horrified to learn that more soldiers were dying of disease than of wounds. The disease that got the blame was malaria, another mosquito-transmitted illness.

However, Reed proved that what was thought to be malaria actually was typhoid fever. Cleaning up the camps and improving the sanitation stopped the typhoid fever epidemics.

Reed was born in Virginia in 1851. His parents were Confederate sympathizers, and the most exciting thing that happened to the young boy was his capture by Union soldiers while he and a friend were hiding horses from the troops. The expected to be shot, but instead the Federals freed them—after taking their horses.

Walter Reed died in Washington in 1902.

I Am Glad I Live in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in this morning's mail I received a letter from a 15-year-old junior in the high school of Covina, Calif., which in most explicit terms sets forth his reasons for being glad that he lives in America—the land of the free.

This young man is to be commended for his knowledge and understanding of the basic principles that have made America a great nation. As long as the young people of these United States have this understanding I have no fears for the future. These young leaders of tomorrow will work to retain those principles of freedom which they know must be expanded around the world if the evils of godless communism are to be defeated.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I received be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and commend it to my colleagues as must reading for renewal of their faith in young America.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COVINA, CALIF.,
September 3, 1962.

Hon. KARL MUNDT: My name is John Jagger, and I am 15 years of age. I am vice president of Covina Junior Republicans. I get to read all of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS and I happened to see your suggestion, "A Letter For Freedom", in the August 24 edition. I think your suggestion is very excellent. So I decided I would write to you on this Labor Day.

I am very grateful that I live in America because I can, here in America, write you this letter knowing you will get it without being censored or endangering my life for sending it. I'm glad I live in America because people, young and old, have the right to speak out their wishes. I'm glad I live in America because I can go to school where I have the freedom to pick out my own classes. I am very privileged indeed to live in this great Nation of ours where all men are created equal and have an equal opportunity to make something of themselves and to help with the cause of freedom.

I believe this country will have a great future, if we do not try to take the one God who helped make and preserve this Republic and the great men and their thoughts from our minds. For this is what makes the United States of America stand out among the rest of the nations of the world. I pray to God that this great Nation under God will not perish from the earth.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN JAGGER.

National Chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the National Captive Nations Committee Testifies in Support of Section 12 of H.R. 7927 To Stop Free Delivery of Communist Political Propaganda by U.S. Postal System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, many, many organizations throughout the United States have in convention assembled and by action of the governing body endorsed section 12 of H.R. 7927, the postal rate bill which is now before the Senate. Section 12 effectively stops the free and subsidized delivery of millions of pieces of Communist political propaganda that is coming into the United States and being disseminated through the U.S. postal system.

The Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has taken testimony on section 12, and I am pleased to include a statement supporting section 12 by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University and national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the national Captive Nations Committee.

This statement follows:

STATEMENT ON SECTION 12, H.R. 7927, BY DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, CHAIRMAN OF UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA AND NATIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, my name is Lev E. Dobriansky. I am a professor of economics at Georgetown University and also the national chairman of both the Ukrainian Congress Committee on America and the national Captive Nations Committee.

The opportunity you accord me to submit this statement in behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is gratefully appreciated. The congress committee is a national organization representing the views and sentiments of over 2 million Americans of Ukrainian background, a number of whom reside in your own State of South Carolina. I myself live in the State of Virginia.

We strongly favor section 12 of H.R. 7927 and urge its necessary acceptance by your committee and its passage by the Senate. Mr. Chairman, after having read the comprehensive and incisive statement presented by Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, I can only follow the dictates of prudence by limiting myself to a few points that perhaps go beyond his remarkable presentation.

Briefly, we agree with all the substantial reasons and arguments offered by Congressman CUNNINGHAM in support of section 12 in H.R. 7927. Both from an economic and cold war viewpoint we must put the proposed amendment into effect. Since we receive more mail—much of it propaganda junk mail—from the Soviet Russian empire than what it receives from us, we find ourselves in the incongruous and even senseless position of subsidizing the enemy's propaganda in this country. The proposed amendment would rectify this incredible situation.

With its historically grounded conceptions of the cold war and the nature of the enemy confronting us the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America can justify a course of action that would go beyond the one proposed by this amendment. The justification would entail unfamiliar facts, perceptions, and judgments which can be properly digested only in time. The urgency of the present case, where the taxpayers of this country in effect subsidize Moscow's propaganda, requires only the full and immediate exercise of commonsense. Section 12 provides for this exercise.

To buttress the already well-established position on section 12, we offer for your thoughtful consideration the following additional points and facts:

1. Moscow and its subversive agencies, especially the well-known Berlin Committee for the Return to the Fatherland—once headed by General Michaylov and now headed by General Vishniovsky—has been showering American citizens with their pub-

lications in various Slavic languages, particularly Russian and Ukrainian.

2. Our checks reveal the fact that to send these publications, they take advantage of (a) old addresses in the possession of Soviet Russian agents, going as far back as 1932; (b) addresses of Slavic names in telephone books and other American mailing lists; (c) return addresses on all mail—letters and packages—sent to the Soviet Union.

3. The mailing of these Soviet publications without solicitation to addresses of American citizens places these citizens in a difficult situation: they are ashamed before their neighbors and their mailman to receive this mail; and absolutely do not wish to receive it. They therefore demand proper protection from the Government—that the post office be enjoined from delivering that which they do not want.

4. These Soviet publications are slanted by means of lies and all sorts of tricks, including threats, to induce American citizens to return to the Soviet Union, or to engage in spying and undercover work. Examples of these[1] publications and junk mail are appended to this statement.

The consensus of opinion among those who receive this unsolicited mail (there are absolutely no such people, who subscribe to it or wish to read it) is that the U.S. Government should stop this abuse of free American mail. This general opinion calls for: (a) payment by Moscow and its puppets for mail deliveries in this country; (b) the demand of the right to the same uncontrolled mailing of propaganda to the Soviet Union with the guarantee that the addresses of American publications will actually receive them and will not be prosecuted; and (c) the establishment of postal procedure whereby every piece of Soviet Russian propaganda mailed to addresses of American citizens should bear the label: Warning—Communist Propaganda—similar to the same label placed by law on every package of poison.

For these and many other reasons we sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that your committee will speedily accept section 12 and that the Senate will pass H.R. 7927 with the amendment. I thank you.

[1] (a) "News from Ukraine, No. 3"; (b) "Family Voice, No. 53"; (c) "Pamphlet on U.S.S.R. as Viewed by American Child Tourist."

The Phil Gordon Memorial Award for Public Relations in the Direct Selling Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no other segment of business in the United States better exemplifies the free enterprise competitive spirit that has been the bulwark of our economic system than the direct selling industry, those men and women who do the daily person-to-person selling of American products.

One of the most significant awards in recognition of the direct selling industry is the annual Phil Gordon Memorial Award, sponsored by Bozell & Jacobs Advertising Agency, one of the country's outstanding advertising and public relations agencies, in memory of the late Phil Gordon, a prominent advertising agency man who was a driving force in the direct selling field.

I am pleased to call to your attention and to the attention of our colleagues the following background information on the Phil Gordon Memorial Awards and a letter dated June 8, 1962, from Mr. Nathan E. Jacobs, listing this year's winners. The awards were presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Direct Selling Companies recently held in Washington, D.C.

Under unanimous consent, I include these documents herewith in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BOZELL & JACOBS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., June 8, 1962.

HON. BOB WILSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: The presentation of the Phil Gordon Memorial Awards by Bozell & Jacobs, Inc., at the recent annual meeting of the National Association of Direct Selling Companies in the Nation's Capital, is one of the best comparisons of the advantages of our American system of free enterprise with the Communist economic program.

Direct selling, which has been responsible for more successes in the famed Horatio Alger manner than any other field of business is the epitome of free enterprise, as stated by Mr. Louis W. Goldberg of Watkins Products, Inc., of Winona, Minn., in receiving an award for outstanding individual achievement in public relations for his company and for the association representing several millions of persons employed in the direct selling industry.

"Men and women from every walk of life selling their products and services in direct selling programs are the personification of the original Yankee salesman who did not have the resources of four-color advertisements in magazines or commercial jingles scattered between the million-dollar TV color programs," said Mr. Goldberg.

"The direct selling field often introduces products which become staple items in catalogs and retail outlets throughout the United States," said Mr. Goldberg. "It offers great opportunities to the so-called common man who desires independence in a business of his own and the chance to display his ability and industriousness.

"This is salesmanship that is ageless, for it begins with the youth in his teens while going to school, in order to supplement the family income. It is also a great source of satisfaction and added income to make life more pleasant and meaningful for those who have retired from their lifetime employment.

"It offers the opportunities of working in the morning, afternoon, or evenings, either every day or certain days of the week. It makes possible the utilization of spare time by hundreds of thousands of housewives to earn extra income and it also provides many thousands of students the opportunity to help pay for higher education.

"It serves its customers with nearly every type of consumer product and permits demonstrations where the product is eventually to be used."

Others who were winners of the public relations awards were representatives of the following three companies: The Electrolux Corp., of New York City, Stanley Home Products, of Westfield, Mass.; Sarah Coventry, Inc., of Newark, N.Y. These are companies which employ thousands in the direct selling divisions as well as in the manufacture of their fine products.

Bozell & Jacobs honors these men in the direct selling field for their contributions to the increase of our gross national product, as it does those who sell though the other channels of distribution and marketing.

Sincerely yours,

NATHAN E. JACOBS.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE PHIL GORDON MEMORIAL AWARD

The Phil Gordon Memorial Award was first presented in 1951 by the National Association of Direct Selling Companies to honor the member company in the direct selling industry that was doing the outstanding job of public relations at National, State, and local levels.

This award was named for the late Phil Gordon, a prominent advertising agency man who devoted much of his life to the direct selling business. Actually, this award was created to stimulate interest and activity among all direct selling companies to inform the general public, industries, and Government offices about the significance and value of the direct selling method of distribution, and particularly about the noteworthy civic achievements of people and companies in this field.

Though many companies have won this award, in the span of 12 years, one company has proved to be most outstanding in its public relations programs, and has won this Phil Gordon Memorial Award for 7 consecutive years. This is the Watkins Products Co., of Winona, Minn. In fact, their consistently fine public relations program tended to discourage the interest and activity of smaller direct selling companies, so in 1956, two additional Phil Gordon Memorial Awards were created to recognize the achievements in this industry in the following categories:

1. National public relations program.
2. Local community public relations program.
3. Special events public relations program.

Other direct selling companies who have won this award in previous years include Tupperware, Inc., of Orlando, Fla.; Fashion Frocks, of Cincinnati, Ohio; Easterling Co., of Chicago, Ill.; American Ceramics, Inc., of Santa Monica, Calif.; Emmons Co., of Newark, N.Y., Fuller Brush Co., of Hartford, Conn.; Avon Cosmetics, of New York; Coppercraft Guild, of Taunton, Mass., and the United Educators, Inc., at Tangley Oaks Educational Center, Lake Bluff, Ill.

Though this award is made in the name of the National Association of Direct Selling Companies, it is sponsored by Bozell & Jacobs, Inc. Each year, the companies of the association submit entries to be considered by independent judges representing various phases of public relations, such as publishers and editors of magazines, heads of better business bureaus, and noted authorities in the field of public relations.

As a result of the public relations efforts of the association and member companies, many hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children have had gainful occupations selling American products to the American public.

The Shadow of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., for the date of September 4, 1962. This

article, by Ralph McGill, is a thought-provoking essay on the subject of the 35-hour workweek and unemployment. Because of the timeliness of the article and the stimulation it provides for thought processes of both labor and management, I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 4, 1962]

THE SHADOW OF UNEMPLOYMENT—ECONOMIC ACTION BY GOVERNMENT SECTOR HELD NECESSARY IF PRIVATE SECTOR FAILS

(By Ralph McGill)

Labor Day should have been a nudge to all lazy minds.

For all of labor, management, and the public members of our population, there is need to comprehend the dimensions of what is the symbol of our most critical domestic policy—unemployment. It is at the root of most of our national frustrations.

Both management and organized labor—looking at unemployment and what it symbolizes, seem to be bereft of ideas. They are not exactly stricken dumb. Indeed, some have talked too much and unwisely. George Meany, harassed and barbed like an old bull in the ring with the picador critics barbing him for action, blurted out support for a 35-hour week. No thoughtful labor leader really likes this idea. But in the absence of any alternative, and in the presence of his fretful members, they cannot oppose it. The railroads may soon be closed down in sullenness, foolishly refusing arbitration.

The huge body of unemployed casts a shadow over every contract negotiation. As new machines come, rare is the negotiated agreement which does not reduce jobs. Members of unions are unhappy. They await each new contract with apprehension.

The unemployed are the symbol of a national economy which is slowed down. The reasons for it are many. But the army of jobless men has grown with each recession since the Second World War. Automation has but one purpose—to reduce production costs. Unless this is done, U.S. goods and services increasingly will become less competitive.

How can the U.S. economy be cranked up? There is no ready answer.

It is, however, the essential question. It sits like Banquo's ghost at every conference of management, labor, and Government. The fact that the economy is slowed down and has created more than 5 million unemployed touches every single problem in the Nation, including that of race.

A 35-hour week, if overtime were abolished, would spread the workweek. But it also would boom costs. Jobless men, and labor leaders to whom members look for guidance, however, are not able to think out loud in terms of the long view. Walter Reuther, of the United Auto Workers, was too wise to be drawn into the 35-hour week position. He proposed a negotiated "flexible work week." Automobile workers would work as many hours as the economy demanded. A flexible week meant, of course, that if the work did not add up to 40 hours, it would be less. It was, despite the fact it was a proposal weighted with semantics, at least more reasonable than a straight 35-hour week proposal.

What must be understood is that if the economy does not get going, there will be no domestic peace in this country. The one big union of the AFL–CIO is unhappy in its official family. The younger men, with most of the ideas, feel they cannot be heard and are not permitted opportunity to debate their ideas. But while this may give grim satisfaction to those who are strongly anti-labor, it cannot provide any genuine satisfaction. Unless the economy is substantially improved, with new ideas to meet new situations, there will be no opportunity for antilabor gloating.

The problem, insofar as mere stating of it is concerned, is fairly simple. If the private sector of the economy does not, or cannot, improve the economy so as to reduce unemployment to its irreducible minimum, then the Government sector, acting for the general welfare of the Nation and its people, must act. A number of people, for example, shivered in the recent heat of July when steel was down to 43-percent capacity. That month Russia, for the first time, produced more steel than the United States. In that month the United States had more idle capacity than total Soviet output.

The old ideas are no longer valid. They just don't do the job. The rail strike, and others almost upon us, are examples of the failure of new ideas and of reliance on the impotent old formulas. There must be a break with the past. That is not easy.

But labor and management are loath to admit this. Both talk in terms of the old ideas. Both are hardheaded and unresilient. Neither has come up with a workable idea. Strikes, based on stubborn reliance on muscle, are less and less tenable.

The Government sector—if the private sector fails—will be required to act.

Our Constant Ideal in a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the speech given by the Honorable Edward D. Re, Chairman of the U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, on the occasion of the annual national convention of the Italian War Veterans of the United States, which was held at the Hotel Pick-Ohio, Youngstown, Ohio, on August 25, 1962. I am also including the introductory remarks of Mr. Anthony Olivo, who presented Chairman Re to the convention:

REMARKS OF ANTHONY OLIVO, ESQ., AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE ITALIAN AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, IN INTRODUCTION AND HONOR OF HON. EDWARD D. RE, CHAIRMAN, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES, PICK-OHIO HOTEL, YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, AUGUST 25, 1962

Members of the clergy, honored guests, members of the Italian American War Veterans, ladies and gentlemen, it is my honor and privilege to present our principal speaker at this, the 27th National Convention of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States. This function would normally be very simple and extremely brief.

When a person of national prominence holding truly high office is presented to an audience, protocol and tradition require that the speaker simply be identified by name and by the title of his office. The dignity and prestige of the office give a status that does not require a biographical statement of achievements or offices previously held.

Although the man I am to present falls within this latter category, ladies and gentlemen, it is because of my friendship of long standing that I am induced to disregard protocol in order to acquaint you with some of his accomplishments. I therefore hope you will not regard me as presumptuous if I acquaint you briefly with some of the highlights of our guest's career as a lawyer, educator, and public official.

May I state at the outset that our principal speaker is no stranger to the Italian American War Veterans of the United States. This is the eighth time he has addressed our organization. Some of us know him as the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States; others are aware of his reputation as an eminent lawyer, professor of law, author, lecturer, and distinguished public official.

Born in Italy in 1920, Edward D. Re began his brilliant career as a student at Public School 176 and New Utrecht High School in Brooklyn, N.Y. He graduated cum laude from St. John's University School of Commerce in 1941. He received his bachelor of laws degree summa cum laude from St. John's University School of Law and was admitted to the New York bar in 1943.

The dedication of our guest throughout his extremely active life was early manifest by his great strides as an educator and attorney. After his admission to the New York bar, Chairman Re received the degree of doctor of juridical science from New York University. In 1960 he was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of pedagogy by the University of Aquila in Italy. He was appointed to the faculty of St. John's University School of Law in 1947 and was made a full professor of law there in 1951. He has also been admitted to practice before the Federal and State courts of this country, including the U.S. Supreme Court, and various administrative agencies.

Dr. Re's talents as lawyer and educator were soon called upon in the public service of his country. In 1956, he was appointed a special hearing officer for the Department of Justice by the Attorney General of the United States. That same year, he was the recipient of the Distinguished Service Award of the Brooklyn Junior Chamber of Commerce. He was appointed to the Board of Higher Education of the city of New York by Mayor Robert F. Wagner on March 25, 1958. In 1960 he was tendered the "Order of Merit" by the Republic of Italy. In the 1960 national elections he served the New York State electrical college as an elector of the President and Vice President of the United States.

From 1956 to 1962 he was reelected three consecutive times as divisional vice chairman of the Comparative Law Division of the American Bar Association Section of International and Comparative Law. A short time ago he was elected divisional vice chairman of the International Law Division of that same association, the first time any attorney had served in both capacities.

Chairman Re is the author of many well-known books, among which I may mention "Foreign Confiscations in Anglo-American Law," "Brief Writing and Oral Argument," "Cases and Materials on International Law," "Selected Essays on Equity," and "Cases and Materials on Equity." He has contributed dozens of articles to legal periodicals in military, international and comparative law.

During the Second World War, he served in the U.S. Air Force from 1943 to 1947, and is currently in the Active Reserve, U.S. Air Force, Office of the Judge Advocate General.

Chairman Re has been the recipient of many awards for his educational and civic contributions. This year he received the Air Force Commendation Medal for his service in the U.S. Air Force, as well as the Morgenstern Foundation Interfaith Award for his activities in the field of religious and racial understanding.

Through his own personality, wisdom, and fairness, Dr. Re has won not only the respect of his colleagues in the professions, but the admiration of his many friends throughout

the Nation. Since his marriage in 1950 to the former Margaret Ann Corcoran, also a member of the New York bar, this devoted public servant has had an exemplary family life. The Res have been blessed with nine children.

On February 15, 1961, President Kennedy announced the appointment of our guest as chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States. Dr. Re appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee and was unanimously confirmed by the Senate on March 28, 1961. Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter administered his oath of office on March 29, 1961.

In devoted and patriotic service to God, country, and fellowman, no one is more deserving of our praise and fondest welcome. Ladies and gentlemen, may I present our principal speaker—the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States—the Honorable Edward D. Re.

OUR CONSTANT IDEAL IN A CHANGING WORLD

(Remarks of Hon. Edward D. Re, Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, at the National Convention of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Pick-Ohio Hotel, Youngstown, Ohio, August 25, 1962)

Reverend clergy, distinguished members of the judiciary, public officials, officers and members of the Italian American War Veterans, my fellow Americans, it is an honor and a privilege for me to be given the opportunity of addressing this distinguished and patriotic audience. On this memorable occasion I am particularly privileged to bring from Washington the cordial greetings and best wishes of the President of the United States for the continued success of your organization and the worthy ideals to which it is dedicated.

It also gives me great pleasure to inform you that the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, the distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has asked me to convey to you his warmest congratulations and sincere best wishes on the occasion of your national convention.

I am particularly happy this evening to extend a cordial greeting to Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, the distinguished Representative from Ohio to the U.S. Congress, who is with us tonight. I know well the admiration and high esteem in which Congressman KIRWAN is held not only by the people of his district, but by the entire State of Ohio, and, may I add, the administration and the Congress of the United States. May I therefore join with his many friends in expressing our best wishes to Congressman KIRWAN for his continued success, and for his continued contribution in the service of our country in the Congress.

I also would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Congressman JOHN FOGARTY for having inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 25, 1962, an editorial entitled "Italian Americans in the National Government" that appeared in the Italian Echo of Providence, R.I. I am particularly pleased to mention this because I know that the Italian Echo is published by Mr. Ermanno J. Leonelli, editor, your Rhode Island department commander, and because the article was written by Joseph Leonelli, who is presently your national senior vice commander.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the eighth time I have been privileged to speak at one of your conventions. The fact that I have been invited eight times is more than merely an acknowledgement of esteem. Indeed, it is the indication of a friendship which I have always treasured and of which I hope to be deserving. May I therefore take this opportunity to thank you sincerely for the honor that you have done me over the years.

Tonight I am particularly privileged to be your principal speaker. This not only heightens my responsibility, but imposes upon me the duty to bring you a message that is both timely and worthy of this important occasion. I am keenly aware of the fact that at your prior national conventions this function has been performed by such outstanding Americans as Governor Notte of Rhode Island and Governor Volpe of Massachusetts.

Many of you may remember when I first spoke at your New York convention in 1955. My topic on that occasion was "The Role of Italians in American History." At subsequent conventions I was privileged to speak on such fundamental American notions as equality of opportunity, the equal status of all citizens in our nation, and the role of America in the free world. On each of these occasions I have spoken about our American ideals, and what we as Americans have done and can do to make these ideals a reality not only for all Americans, but for all the peoples of the world.

Tonight, once again, it is my privilege to speak to you on still another aspect of that American ideal—its constancy in a changing world. At a national convention of American War Veterans, I can think of no subject more fitting or appropriate. Surely this is so when one addresses men and women who have fought to preserve the American heritage and to hold it aloft as a goal to be achieved by all nations throughout the world.

And so, it is indeed fitting for all of us here tonight to call to mind once again the principles and ideals on which this American heritage is based. May I, therefore, refresh your hearts and minds by going back to the time in human history when these ideals were first proclaimed to the world—the date of our Declaration of Independence—1776.

THE WORLD OF 1776

The world of 1776 was vastly different from that which we know today. In those days the world consisted of people governed by czars, emperors, kings, and monarchs who ruled by divine authority—men who believed that they were good enough to rule over their fellow men solely by virtue of their royal status.

King George III was on the British throne; King Louis XVI was reigning in France. Empress Maria Theresa and her son Joseph II ruled Austria; Frederick the Great was King of Prussia. The Empress Catherine the Great had acceded to the throne of Russia a few years before, and Napoleon Bonaparte, then only 7 years old, was soon destined to become Emperor of France.

The notion that one man, by virtue of his royal birth, was superior to other men and therefore capable of ruling over them had not been seriously questioned. Indeed, in 1776, in all walks of life, one's freedom, occupation, and status were dictated, to a great degree, by the accident of his birth.

The world of 1776 was a world of colonialism and intense national jealousies. It was a world where nation competed against nation to dominate and exploit the undeveloped regions of the world. It was a world marked by gross intolerance in politics, philosophy, and religion—a world where slavery was an accepted fact of life. The ideas of personal liberty, the equality of men, and personal advancement through private initiative and individual talent, were not regarded as matters of concern to the political order.

This, then, was the world of 1776—barren of the ideal of personal freedom, straightjacketed by the age-old ties of predujice and intolerance, and dominated by the notions of national supremacy and individual superiority by royal birth and status.

THE AMERICAN IDEAL

It was in this unreceptive soil that an idea was planted that was to change forever the course of human history. This idea was advanced by a handful of patriots in the New World who pledged, you will recall, their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor on the effort to throw off forever the shackles of personal and political tyranny. Their idea was as simple as it was profound, and it was forever enshrined in our Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

This dynamic new philosophy was to deal a mortal blow to class restrictions, legal and social prejudice, and national intolerance and discrimination. The ideal that all men are created equal was substituted for the notion that one man was superior to any other man. The ideal of equality of opportunity became a doctrine that was to be legally enforced. And the function of government is to secure these rights.

The American ideal, as set forth in our Declaration of Independence and Constitution, was the beginning of the most noble of all experiments known in the government of men. The Thirteen Colonies had set out to make a reality, and on a huge scale, what the Athenian philosophers had done only in imagination and theory 22 centuries before.

From its noble beginnings in 1776, that American ideal has become the crowning achievement of man's political and philosophical thought. The fertile ground in when it grew in strength, power, and influence was the combined effort of all people that had faith in the ideal. History has witnessed the fact that the ultimate source of all America's strength and material prosperity has been that ideal—an ideal based on the cardinal principle of the equality of all men and the combined contribution of all peoples regardless of race, color, or creed.

The most striking feature of this ideal in the century and a half since its proclamation in the Declaration of Independence has been its constancy notwithstanding the crises of the rapidly changing world. That ideal wove the free world together during the chaos and devastation of World War II. And it remained constant even after the war was won.

THE AMERICAN IDEAL AND THE MARSHALL PLAN

Instead of exercising the traditional rights of a victorious power, America responded after the war with an unparalleled generosity. It was our American heritage of justice, brotherly love, and freedom for all men that prompted us to embark upon a vast program of assistance to those countries stricken by the war. This great and noble experiment, which began with the Marshall plan, was hailed by Sir Winston Churchill as one of the most noble acts in human history. It was the helping hand of friendship that gave the necessary determination and inspiration to the countries of Europe to rebuild that which had been destroyed, to recreate that which had been devastated.

With our help, the people of Western Europe not only restored their countries, but they preserved their great traditions and civilizations which turned back the tide of Communist subversion.

Since the days of the Marshall plan, this country has continued to provide an amount of foreign aid that is a staggering tribute to the material strength of America and the spiritual strength of the ideal to which we are committed. From 1946 to the end of the last fiscal year, we expended a total of $90,510,990,000 in economic and military assistance throughout the world. Europe alone in these years received a total of $44,097,500,000—$28,622,200,000 in economic assistance and $15,475,400,000 in military aid.

Of this, France received a total of $9,394,400,000; Germany, $4,999,200,000; Italy, $5,664,800,000; and the United Kingdom, $8,689 million.

The various foreign aid programs beginning with the Marshall plan have been the most concrete manifestation to the rest of the world of the constancy of the American ideal of brotherhood. Having preserved for itself this ideal at great sacrifice, this country has spared no efforts to make it a reality for all the peoples of the world. And it is well to remember that all that we have asked in return is the knowledge that our assistance, both material and moral, be used for the purposes for which it has been so generously given—to help others achieve the blessings of freedom and liberty that we enjoy in America.

THE AMERICAN IDEAL TODAY

The foreign aid program about which we have spoken is only one striking example of our American ideal at work in a changing modern world. That ideal has come a long way since the days of 1776. In 1962, a king is indeed an exception—and czars, emperors, kaisers and monarchs by virtue of divine birth are a thing of the past.

Scientific and technological achievements have grown at an astounding pace. Recent advances in transportation and communication have made the globe seem smaller. But all this material progress ought not to blur our vision—for our American ideal of equality for all men is still our greatest contribution to the world. Our foreign assistance, our technical assistance, our military aid are all merely devices by which we are able to help less fortunate neighbors in other lands to achieve their true aspirations of freedom and liberty.

Human progress is not to be measured by scientific and technological achievement alone. Rather, it is measured by the progress of the human spirit and the success of our efforts in achieving the ideal to which we are committed. All freedom-loving people should learn from our own history that although that ideal was given expression in 1776 it did not become a reality until almost yesterday. Indeed, we as Americans know that we have not yet achieved it fully. Like all ideals, it offers a goal toward which we must constantly strive.

While we spoke of the equality of man as far back as 1776, we tolerated slavery until 1885. Human misery and social injustice were not coped with until after 1930. Other aspirations of America were not achieved until 1961. But as every American knows well, and as every friend of freedom ought to know, with every generation we have indeed come closer to that ideal of 1776. To that ideal we have remained ever constant.

Scientific progress, however startling and remarkable, cannot detract from the dignity of the human person and the freedom of the human spirit. We as Americans firmly believe that our success as a nation has been made possible by that ideal. We have reaped the best of the talents and wisdom of peoples of all races, color, or creed. We have proven to the world that even what seems impossible can be achieved by the cooperative effort of all men working for the common good.

The torch of liberty that was lit in 1776 has indeed become a beacon of hope and inspiration for all the oppressed peoples of the world. It has been passed down to us, and we, in turn, must preserve it for the generations yet to come. In the words of President Kennedy, we cannot witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which we as a nation have always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

As individual Americans, we perhaps may not be able to participate in the blazing of the new frontiers of space or science. To us, however, falls the far more important task of preserving the foundations of the American ideal in our daily lives. We must extend to all others the blessings of freedom and liberty which we ourselves take for granted. We must never allow ourselves to succumb to the evils of prejudice, intolerance, or bigotry. These are all destructive of the common good, unnecessary, and sinful.

America stands as living proof that with the cooperation of all people, using the word in its true classic sense of working together, all people will indeed prosper. For all men of faith, this indeed is the plan of God. In law and government, "love thy neighbors" can have no other meaning.

Montesquieu once said that "the deterioration of any government begins with the decay of the principles on which it was founded." Our principles of 1776 have acquired new vigor with each passing generation. They are our constant American ideal in a changing world. They are our greatest gift to all mankind.

Alaska's Airlines Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, recent action of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Pacific Northwest Alaska case has caused real concern on the part of the people of Alaska. The action in question consists of proposals to ban continuation of Pan American World Airways service between Seattle, Wash., and Fairbanks, Alaska; to curtail Northwest Airlines service between Seattle and Anchorage; and to bring about a merger of Pacific Northern Airlines and Alaska Airlines. Augmenting the anxiety of Alaskans as to future airlines transportation to, from and within Alaska, is the recent House action cutting airline subsidy appropriations 15 percent below the budgeted amount. This would cause real hardship to the subsidized airlines serving Alaska's comparatively small and widely scattered population, and has prompted the sincere hope that the partial restoration of funds adopted by the Senate will be accepted by the House.

The position of Alaska, based upon its primarily unique situation, is ably expressed in an Anchorage Daily Times editorial of August 22, 1962, which I hereby submit for the consideration of my colleagues.

The editorial reads as follows:

NO TIME TO TRIM AID FOR AIRLINES

A strong case can be made in support of this city's stand for continued airline subsidies.

The subject is of pressing importance in view of the obvious efforts of the Federal Government to terminate subsidies. The Civil Aeronautics Board has made it one of the prime considerations in connection with the forthcoming investigation of Alaska's air transportation problems.

The Federal agency is pressing for a merger of two airlines which are under subsidy in the hope that the subsidy would no longer be necessary. At the same time the agency has proposed restrictions on nonsubsidized airlines.

The chamber of commerce has taken a stand against any restrictions and against any move to reduce or terminate subsidies.

This may sound like a hairbrained idea that has no logical support. But it isn't.

Federal subsidies for transportation were made an integral part of the Nation's policy as far back as 1862 when Congress wanted railroads built through the vast wilderness of the West to the Pacific coast.

Subsidies were a part of the national policy again in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 when Congress sought to encourage the development of commercial airlines.

To spark the construction of railroads Congress made lavish grants of land (20 sections for each mile of track), gave the railroad companies a 400-foot-wide right-of-way for the entire distance and extended liberal cash loans. Congress was also liberal in other ways.

This subsidy for the railroads is famous in history. The subsidy gave private investors an opportunity for profits from land as well as transportation. Even today some railroads hold enormous assets in the form of minerals and land.

The same policy, on a cash basis for aid, was applied to the encouragement of airlines. Subsidies for air transportation were in the form of cash and, as a result, the Nation has today, self-supporting trunklines. Subsidies are still being paid to many feeder lines throughout the States.

In Alaska this is not the time to withdraw or curtail the subsidies. The Federal policy has made possible the basic air transportation system in this vast area of wilderness. Continued financial support is needed while development takes place, the same as on railroads at the turn of the century and on air routes in the older States.

This new State is often said to be 50 to 100 years behind the other States in its development of the basic features of civilization, one of the main ones being transportation. The Federal Government must recognize this by extending the period of subsidies until the economy grows to a point where airlines can be self-sufficient.

Principles applicable to the old 48 States often are misfits when applied here. The Alaska trunklines are unlike trunklines elsewhere in that they extend over wilderness, instead of settled areas. Population centers are few and far between. Feeder lines in this State are unlike feeder lines elsewhere. They often have more route miles than trunklines elsewhere. They are more than interurban services. They are feeder lines in name more than they are in fact.

It is to the best interest of the Nation, for military as well as civilian purposes, to have a strong, reliable and permanent transportation system here. This is a point that other cities, especially Seattle, can support unequivocally. The Military Establishment, which would be directly concerned, might well consider joining the Alaska carriers and the public to prevent any curtailment.

Without good transportation Alaska becomes an impenetrable wilderness in this day of speed and mobility.

A Friend in Washington—Hon. Hale Boggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent editorial complimenting the distinguished Democratic whip of the House, HALE BOGGS,

upon his continued and diligent efforts to improve our country's relations with our neighbors in Latin America. This editorial was written by Dr. Angel Cueva, editor of El Tiempo de Nueva Orleans, for publication in his Spanish language weekly in the issue of August 4.

New Orleans is truly "the gateway to the Americas" and HALE BOGGS has helped to make it so, as Dr. Cueva points out, by his work in the House to expand the avenues of communication between the people of our country and the peoples of all the Americas. HALE BOGGS' efforts are particularly noteworthy in the field of encouragement of trade and commerce between New Orleans and the Mississippi Valley, and the nations of Latin America. As was cited by the International House of New Orleans in 1957 when it presented our colleague the Thomas F. Cunningham Award, HALE BOGGS was given this honor "in recognition of the invaluable service he has rendered to the United States and Latin America in his sound, constructive interest in the liberalization of world trade." For his diligent efforts in this same field, he also received awards from the city of New Orleans (International Order of Merit) and from the Mississippi Valley World Trade Conference.

Seeking a meaningful liberalization of world trade, HALE BOGGS has been a leader in the Congress in securing the favorable enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1958, and has contributed importantly toward the passage of the current Trade Expansion Act of 1962. During several past Congresses, he served as chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy, and during the 87th Congress, he served as chairman of the Joint House-Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy. As chairman of both these subcommittees, he has done a superb job of spotlighting our country's need to expand its trade markets throughout the world, and of educating both the public and private sectors of our economy, as well as all our citizens, on the benefits to be derived from trade policies tailored to this thesis.

I personally congratulate Mr. BOGGS upon his high achievement in strengthening the ties between our people and those of all the American nations, and I am pleased to commend to my colleagues Dr. Cueva's editorial of August 4 in his newspaper, El Tiempo, published in HALE BOGGS' city of of New Orleans.

The article follows:

[From the El Tiempo de Nueva Orleans Aug. 4, 1962]

A FRIEND IN WASHINGTON

As we had hoped, Mr. HALE BOGGS has won another election to the U.S. House of Representatives. Not only has he ably represented his district and his State, he has also become a leader of truly national stature. His position as Democratic whip in the House of Representatives places him in a privileged position in the Federal Government.

We congratulate him.

It is worth the attention of Latin Americans in New Orleans that Representative BOGGS has dedicated a good portion of his efforts to Latin American affairs, especially to those that would improve the relations between the people, of this hemisphere. El Tiempo knows of some of these efforts: An inter-American university, cultural and educational exchanges through New Orleans, peoples to peoples programs, and his active cooperation with projects such as the Peace Corps and the Alliance for Progress.

He has demonstrated real knowledge and understanding of the nations to the South.

It is surely unnecessary to point out that these efforts represent the valid approach to fight communism.

But El Tiempo is particularly impressed with the special interest that Representative BOGGS has shown lately in the Latin American Colony of New Orleans. Could it be possible that he is planning some program or project using the unique features of this sector of our community? As Representative BOGGS has pointed out, our affairs are ever more inevitably tied to Latin America. The development of the European Common Market and the resulting increase in the standard of living there, the reduction of immigrants from Europe, furthers this course. At the same time, many Europeans openly hope that the Common Market will become a third force in the world. Our foreign markets will be that Latin Americans represent the future major foreign influx into this country, and accordingly will be major carriers of cultural communications.

Our future, our very lives, may very well depend on our hemispheric ties. It is with these facts in mind, that El Tiempo brings to its readers a hope based on the ever increasing interest of the Federal Government, and the New Orleans leaders, to work in every possible area to bring closer the peoples of this hemisphere. Representative BOGGS efforts in this direction, as well as his unique position, enable him to act on ideas along this line for New Orleans.

We urge the Latin Americans of New Orleans: "Ready yourselves, for you may soon be able to serve both your native and adoptive countries."

A Retailer's View of S. 1740

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, a bill which has received a great deal of attention by virtue of its catch phrase public reference, the truth-in-lending bill was the subject of some penetrating comments published in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette on September 4, under the signature of Mr. R. G. Guter, president of Stone & Thomas, a leading department store outlet in my district.

Because of the strong current interest in all measures which may influence the trend of our economy, and the recent emphasis by the White House on such measures, possibly even including a major tax cut, I feel that Mr. Guter's comments might well be brought to the general attention of my colleagues.

The letter reads as follows:

EDITOR, THE GAZETTE:

I read your August 22 editorial "Truth-in-Lending Bill May Spur Consumption," with a great deal of interest. The title caught my eye because as a retailer I am always concerned with spurring consumption.

I am very familiar with Senator DOUGLAS' so-called truth-in-lending bill (S. 1740). As much as I welcome any move to give our economy a boost, S. 1740, if passed, will do no such thing—during the 1961 Senate hearings a proponent of S. 1740, Daniel Fusfeld, an economics professor at the University of Michigan, voiced his concern in this regard:

"My suggestion is that the bill be amended to provide that it not be implemented until the national economy has reached full employment prosperity. At the present moment, unemployment is still too high and the recovery has not proceeded so far that we can be confident it will cumulate to an adequately high level of employment and output. S. 1740 is a highly desirable bill, and I hope it becomes law—but it should be made effective at the proper point in the business cycle, in order that it not interfere with the present upswing."

His statement reflected an expert's opinion that far from spurring consumption, the bill would have a depressing effect on our economy. And he said this at a time when the economy was on the upswing, which certainly is not the case at this time.

I strongly disagree with other points in your editorial, but these have been argued and in my opinion, thoroughly discredited elsewhere, particularly in the Senate committee hearings.

The point is: To state that S. 1740 "may spur business consumption" is completely without validity. This is the one thing the bill, if it becomes law, will not do. If the validity of all the points you raise must be measured by the truth of this statement your opinions are wholly lacking in substance.

It has frequently interested me to note the skill with which many bills introduced to Congress are publicized under misleading titles. In this case the Douglas credit control bill, when referred to as the truth-in-lending bill, is as misleading as your editorial's title.

You have performed a disservice to the retail industry by your careless editorial.

R. G. GUTER,
President, Stone & Thomas.

Improved Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress, in effect, is also a member of the board of directors of our Nation's biggest business—the U.S. postal service. As such he must have a continuing interest and sense of responsibility with regard to the operations of this vast complex.

I am sure that every Member will agree that the postal service simply cannot afford to remain a static operation. It must constantly keep pace with technological advances, social changes, and population and economic growth. It must always be a dynamic force reflecting the movement of a flourishing and prospering nation.

With these thoughts in mind, I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues an address of Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen, on August 14, 1962, in Lansing, Mich., in which he announced the pilot phase of a new Post Office Department program designed to further improve mail service,

particularly in the central commercial areas of our great cities. General Belen also discusses a number of other improvements which have recently been inaugurated by the present management of the Post Office in their continuing effort to maintain our postal communications system as the finest in the world.

General Belen's remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL FREDERICK C. BELEN, AT LANSING, MICH., AUGUST 14, 1962

I am particularly delighted to be back here today to announce the pilot phase of a new Post Office Department program designed to further improve mail service, especially in central commercial areas of our cities.

Each time I return among the people here in my hometown, I think of the quote from J. G. Holland: "No nation can be destroyed while it possesses a good home life."

Lansing was selected for the pilot operation because—in addition to providing us with a progressive, moderate-size city that has a representative population of families and businesses—it is a city I know so well. This should help in any difficulties which may arise, but I want to emphasize we are determined this program will succeed and we feel there will be few difficulties.

In the postal service, knowing a city well can be important because of the unusual problems we sometimes encounter with street names. In one of our cities, for instance, they have one street named "That Way," and another street named "This Way."

This new service, ABCD, accelerated business collection-delivery, assures speedy same-day delivery of mail to the downtown business community.

Of course, we do not expect it to be as speedy as the truckdriver driving along our fine Michigan highways at 90 who innocently asked the arresting officer if he was going too fast. "No," the officer replied, "you were just flying too low."

After a trial period here, we plan to expand it to other city delivery post offices large enough to support afternoon delivery in business sections. This includes hundreds of major cities over the Nation.

Realizing the importance of prompt, dependable mail service to the Nation's businessmen, Postmaster General J. Edward Day some time ago asked me to have technicians in the Bureau of Operations study possible improvements of collection and delivery services in central business sections. ABCD is the simple and logical result.

A late morning collection (11 a.m.) of mail from 38 specified collection boxes, including cooperative mailing racks in the large buildings, will be made Monday through Friday starting today.

These collection points will be distinctively identified by special decals reading "Centro Collection-Delivery."

This program—called ABCD for easy reference—is a development of our nationwide improved mail service program launched last year. Its first objective was to work with large mailers so vast volumes of mail would not be piled on us after 5 p.m., slowing down the flow of other mail.

Today's newly disclosed phase of the NIMS program is especially designed for collection and delivery service in central commercial areas.

I hope you will take advantage of same-day business delivery of mail here by using the designated collection boxes to the fullest extent, and by depositing mail in time for the special collection at 11 a.m.

Interesting and exciting as this vista of same-day business delivery is, I am happy to tell you that I have several other major new plans which will also be of significant value here to your postal service in Lansing, and will be developed here in their pilot phases.

Beginning today at 3 p.m., special collections will be made on each floor of the three largest buildings in the city: Michigan National Tower, Stoddard and Bank of Lansing buildings.

Placards will be placed on the mail chute on each floor advising tenants of time mail will be collected from a point near the elevator. Building managers are cooperating by designating an elevator for use by our carriers during this special mail collection period.

This collection of important mail will make it possible for us to process it sooner and speed it to destination through earlier connections with air and surface dispatches.

We hope this experiment will prove successful in Lansing as a prelude to improved service throughout the Nation in cities where we have numerous high office buildings, each producing a mail volume equivalent to the total handled by some entire small post offices.

Meanwhile, on a national level, we have developed recently a new major program to end career "dead ends" for letter carriers while providing improved delivery service.

Lansing is being included in the first phase of this plan.

A new position, carrier technician, PFS–5, is created, assuring grade advancement to deserving senior letter carriers who accept added responsibilities to insure good deliveries over a number of routes.

These carrier technicians are better trained to note the changing delivery conditions affecting an entire neighborhood, as well as every day delivery problems.

Of course, I don't expect solutions like the one I heard about involving a new substitute mail carrier in Vermont whose first delivery article was a box of baby chicks. The addressee was not at home when the carrier arrived, and mindful that "the mail must go through," he took each of the 24 baby chicks out of the crate and stuffed them, one at a time, through the envelope slot in the addressee's door.

In a more serious vein, I should note that complaints from patrons about delivery service, when the regular carrier is absent from duty, were practically eliminated during a pilot operation of this program at Cincinnati, Ohio, January 6 to June 22. We hope for similar results in other cities.

In other phases of our nationwide improved mail service program, we are constantly searching for new and improved methods of handling mail.

Realizing volume is one of our greatest problems—with 67 billion pieces of mail annually—much of our planning has been directed toward assisting volume mailers.

Any satisfactory progress in this field requires cooperation, and we have worked hard to create a cooperative spirit between the Post Office Department and these patrons who generate the bulk of the mail.

Post Office management and service improvement studies are now in progress at several selected offices. Already we have developed much data that will help us increase efficiency in all postal operations and reduce errors and dead letters. As you know, the increase in dead letters—largely as a result of poor addressing—is a serious problem. However, even in this area, we occasionally encounter a lighter side. A couple of small boys recently were touring their post office and the postmaster mentioned "dead" letters. "Who killed them?" one of the youngsters asked.

Nationally, we have reevaluated our collection and delivery services, and we are now setting up new schedules for these services at many points that will be geared to connect with key air and surface dispatches.

These plans contemplate next-day delivery in more distant cities.

We have made many other services available to volume mailers which speed up their mailing operations, including:

1. We have instructed post offices to furnish business firms and large volume mailers up-to-date transportation schedules so they can deposit their mails to connect with the best dispatches.

2. At many offices parcel post and relay truckdrivers now make delivery early in the day of "tie-outs"—large bundles of mail all for a single firm—before the regular delivery by carriers. This assists these firms greatly.

3. We have authorized exceptional delivery of important incoming airmail to banks, commercial and industrial firms at the local airport mail facility in their cities.

4. On national holidays when carrier delivery is suspended we permit business firms to call at the post office at specified times for their mail.

There are dozens of other smaller services that we extend to volume mailers as a part of our national postal policy of providing the utmost assistance to business mailers.

For example, postal experts meet with private business mailroom employees to instruct them in proper preparation of mail and suggest solutions for mailing problems.

We furnish large volume mailers with information as to the number of "possible deliveries" within a total delivery area or on a particular carrier route.

We have authorized simplified forms of address and special bulk rates for large firm mailings, and we even loan mail sacks to business mailers to facilitate handling before entry into the mails.

We permit newspaper publishers to use rural mailboxes on Sundays and holidays for delivery of papers; also we authorize business firms to use (without charge by the Department) their postage meter dies for firm advertising.

As a matter of accommodation to volume commercial mailers, we maintain trust accounts for their postage due mail, and we notify them when it is time to replenish their accounts.

We are constantly looking for new fields where improvements can be made within the limits of our financial ability—not only in the area of doing something new, but in changing that which is old. We know that we have a vast complex organization where there are no pat answers to problems. For instance, in one area recently we were startled to learn that we had failed to include one important item for the brand new post office—a hitching post for horses.

As an example of how we must sometimes even look backward as well as forward, in the registry service, over the years, the Department, in its effort to conserve man-hours had cut security procedures in handling registered mail to the very minimum. The question came up as to whether this process had not over some past years been carried too far.

Now the whole system is being reevaluated with a view to providing any necessary changes to insure continuance of the security and reliability of the registered mails.

In still another area, firm mailers are deeply concerned with the problem of breakage to parcel post.

Of course, breakage too is a matter of serious concern. However, here too, we occasionally get a laugh. One of our postmasters recently asked a lady if there was anything breakable in the package she was mailing. "Yes," she replied emphatically. "The Ten Commandments. I'm mailing a Bible."

Seriously, though, we in the Department are determined to reduce the present percentage of damage; though our record nationwide is pretty good—being but one-fourth of 1 percent of total volume.

Studies are to be undertaken to identify the type of damage and probable causes. We will identify those physical postal and

railroad facilities and handling techniques which have the capacity for damaging adequately prepared packages, and take action to correct them.

However, let me reemphasize that much of the damage is obviously directly attributable to inadequate packaging by mailers.

To correct this, we inform postmasters of results of studies on the common packaging deficiencies which lead to damage so future mailers will eventually through them be able to profit by the mistakes of others.

In the overall field of mail handling, we have kept pace with national business growth by extending delivery service to more than 68,000 business firms.

In the overall field of mail handling, we are now using automatic data processing machines to run tests to enable us to pinpoint quickly areas where corrective action is needed to speed up opreations and mail handling.

A little more than a year ago we embarked on our NIMS program.

For years, the postal service has had a continuing program urging people to "mail early"—this was a "shotgun" appeal to some 180 million persons, many of whom mailed only a few letters a month.

While this program was helpful, it did not produce the desired results because the appeal was too widely dispersed.

The nationwide improved mail service program, called NIMS, taps the real source of the problem by taking the mail-early problem directly to volume mailers—business people, who generate an estimated 75 percent of the Nation's total mail volume.

We have made considerable progress under NIMS, as we call the program.

Prior to its inception, in July 1961, tests of first-class mail were conducted at a number of the larger post offices. Evaluation of these tests showed approximately 80 percent of first-class mail arriving at these post offices during the 4-hour "crash" period from 5 p.m. to 9 p.m.

Since then, the tests conducted at the 294 NIMS offices revealed the following progress:

During the 3-month accounting period ending October, 1961, even though a number of NIMS offices were still obtaining nearly 75 percent of their first-class mail after 5 p.m., the national average for receipt of such mail stood at 67.1 percent.

Since October 1961, progress has been gradual and for a recent accounting period the national average stood at 60.4 percent. This means we have shaved off much of our 5 o'clock "mail shadow"—thus the late afternoon mail glut that slowed mail handling and delivery all over the Nation. As a result, many letters today are arriving at destinations sooner.

Business firms realize that mailing early in the day contributes to faster service by reducing the volume of mail during the peak period. This early deposit of mail can be processed and dispatched before the daily end of business mail arrives in the post office. The smaller amount of evening business mail, arriving after 5 p.m.—which demands prompt service—can then be processed and dispatched rapidly by every available means.

Important letters and parcels are no longer buried in the avalanche of 5 o'clock mailings with possible chance of delay in delivery. Last minute mailroom pressure, created by the inevitable end of the day bottleneck of mail is eased thus creating a more harmonious and efficient mailroom operation.

There is a quicker return of bill payments and fewer mailing errors. Many businessmen have reported to us that they are getting good results from NIMS and the many other improvements and special services we have developed for business.

Of course, we can't always anticipate every businessman's problems in connection with the postal service. For example, in one of our cities not long ago a businessman had an important appointment to keep. He decided he needed a pair of pants pressed first. He proceeded to the mailbox in front of the cleaners and, in his hurry, dropped the pants into the mail box as well as the letters.

Seriously, though, many businessmen have reported actual savings in the operations of their postal communication services due to less overtime payments; faster replies to mail; and greater manpower efficiency due to the leveling of the mail volumes within their organizations.

Now, in conclusion, I want to extend my special thanks to you for coming here today. Recognizing that you—as a group—represent some of our largest mailers, and the people who are most directly interested in exactly what we are doing to give you more for your money in the postal service—I have given you one of the most detailed reports yet made public on just what is news in your postal service today. I hope you have found it of some value in considering how you, in turn, can make your mailing operations more efficient and get more for your money out of these operations.

I am deeply grateful to the many old friends and associates who have come here today. It is a great honor and a deep pleasure to be here in my hometown in my capacity as Assistant Postmaster General. Thank you.

Preventing World Catastrophe by Accident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the following statement, "Preventing World Catastrophe by Accident," is timely and worthy of attention. This material is from the September 3 issue of Gist Research, World Peace Edition No. 130.

The article follows:

RISK OF WAR BY ACCIDENT IS AN INCREASING CONCERN OF U.S. CONGRESSMEN—AUSTRIA'S SUCCESSFUL NEUTRALITY CONSTITUTES A VALUABLE OBJECT LESSON?

"An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

Of a considerable number of Congressmen interviewed the large majority do not believe leaders of any nation would dare start a world war III intentionally but think it could eventuate accidentally by reckless, nearsighted and provocative policies, and actions of the military.

The concern about the chances of accidental war by those who are given the constitutional "power to * * * declare war" emphasizes the necessity for major nations devising plans and pursuing policies and procedures which would minimize the possibility of plunging the world into catastrophe by accident.

Every time one sees a baseball or football game there usually is a demonstration of the importance of disengagement in preventing fights. Were it not for officials disengaging hotheaded players, battles between entire teams could be frequent. Police control rabid fans.

Press reports show that the most dangerous locale in which the flames of a new world war could be ignited is in Germany. It seems that disengaging East and West armed forces there and leaving the duty of policing the boundaries, etc., exclusively to a U.N. police force would help greatly in preventing a war by mishap.

Disengagement of the armed forces of Israel and the Arab States in 1956, and giving the task of policing the boundaries to a U.N. police force has proved effective. This development came after the Gist editor polled a number of Congressmen and about 20 U.N. delegates on the idea. Senator MCCLELLAN said: "The United Nations will never be very effective until it has a police force to enforce its edicts."

Disengagement of the opposing armed forces in Western and Central Europe was proposed in 1958 by George Kennan, former United States Ambasador to Russia. Anthiny Eden and Hugh Gaitskell, among others. It was contended that disengagement could prove the first step toward lasting peace, insure against nuclear armament of Germany, liberate 17 million East Germans, and create conditions in which reunification of Germany could be realized and the Soviet threat terminated.

Kennan said: "We must get over the obsession that the Russians are yearning to attack Western Europe." He contended that the real Soviet threat is primarily political. Gaitskell, possibly the next British Prime Minister, maintained that disengagement would reduce the danger of a nuclear war, achieve reunification of Germany, and brighten the prospects for all satellite countries, gaining independence.

The effectiveness of sincere efforts for disengagement, neutrality, and disarmament is proved by developments in Austria. The Western Allies and Soviet Union signed in May, 1955, the treaty ending the military occupation of that country, guaranteeing Austria's permanent neutrality and pledging that Austria would never "join any military alliance nor allow military forces on its borders."

The historical and momentous developments in Austria should serve to brightly illuminate the road to world peace, progress, and prosperity. It has been proved that disengagement, neutrality and disarmament are not ephemeral but can be lasting and practical.

Research indicates that adoption of the proposal for disengagement in Western and Central Europe in 1958 would have prevented the current, critical, costly crisis in Germany.

Peace decision and action should be taken soon. The sands of time are indeed running exceeding low.

Catholic War Veterans Endorse Section 12 of H.R. 7927 To Stop the Free Delivery of Communist Propaganda by the U.S. Postal System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, section 12 of H.R. 7927, which passed the House last January and which is the postal rate bill, provides that the U.S. postal system shall no longer deliver free or at subsidized rates the several million pieces of Communist political propaganda that are flooding this country every year. In addition to the many organizations, including the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign

Wars, who have endorsed section 12, I am pleased to have learned today that at the 27th National Convention the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, meeting last month in Philadelphia, Pa., adopted a resolution strongly supporting section 12 as a part of the bill H.R. 7927.

The Second Mile and Beyond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial appearing in the August 16, 1962 edition of the Carpinteria, Calif., Herald, entitled "The Second Mile and Beyond."

The editorial follows:

THE SECOND MILE AND BEYOND

United States diplomats have been influenced, and rightly so, by the philosophy of going the "second mile" in all efforts for control of atomic and hydrogen bomb testing.

In the past decade our Nation has attempted in nearly every practical way to obtain some agreement with the Soviet Union to end such testing with each country agreeing to submit to reasonable inspections by experts in the field to allay the possibility of cheating by one, or both, of the countries.

The danger to civilization represented by the enormous destructive power of atom and hydrogen bombs is such that any civilized society would do all in its power to prevent the catastrophe of an atomic war.

In this belief, President Truman attempted to obtain sensible agreements. Later President Eisenhower offered his "open skies" proposal. And now we see the conferences continuing under President Kennedy to achieve such a ban on testing.

For almost 3 years an unofficial ban existed. It continued until the Soviet Union abruptly ended the moratorium last September.

Even so, the United States has steadfastly attempted to work out an agreement this year. First, the United States said that to avoid the Soviet Union's objection to having American inspection stations in the Soviet Union that we would agree to having such stations along the U.S.S.R. perimeter, rather on Soviet soil.

Then we offered other concessions. Only last week the United States dropped the number of inspections from 180 to 80 in a further concession.

In view of these developments, many Americans are beginning to wonder how far we can carry this "second mile" philosophy. They wonder if the end result may be only adject surrender to every Soviet demand, in the name of "concession," until there is nothing left to concede.

There are several reasons for questioning the current policy of concession after concession:

(1) The Soviet Union fails to find it in its interest to offer any real concessions from its side of the table to counterbalance the scales.

(2) While testing techniques are, no doubt, more sophisticated today than they were some years ago, will cutting the number of stations from 180 to 80 give us the positive assurance we must have to be sure the Soviet Union is not cheating in the future as they obviously did during the 3 years when no tests were held?

(3) American diplomats seem to forget that the Soviet Union promises and treaties of the past are not a record which gives much hope that any such promises or treaties will mean much in the future—if the agreement should get in the way of other Soviet policies.

(4) No test agreement will ever become effective until and unless the Soviet leaders believe such a ban is in their country's best interest—and they haven't shown any real inclination toward achieving an effective ban in the months of negotiations currently going on.

(5) The Soviet Union could probably never agree to any test ban without a complete retraining of their minds. The Communist goal is world domination; after they have said it enough times, surely we will soon start to believe they mean it. A test ban treaty would recognize, in effect, the fact that the free capitalist nations would remain outside the Communist empire. Khrushchev's boast that our grandchildren would live under communism would, therefore, be false, and careful observers doubt that he would ever go so far as to admit such a possibility, knowing full well that the "success" of the Communist system cannot be achieved short of world domination.

If the Soviet Union sincerely wanted an effective agreement, one could be worked out rapidly, with the stipulation that we as well as they could be certain no cheating took place. That the Soviets will not agree to this leads us to the assumption that they do not, nor have they ever wanted, such an agreement. The talks going on are merely window dressing to conceal other objectives.

It should now be abundantly clear to all people that the Soviet Union's real objectives are to stall any more American testing to confuse the issues, to use a serious conference as a sounding board for propaganda, and to ultimately wear down the free world until it has nothing else to "concede"—except freedom itself.

We believe that the U.S. negotiators have walked well beyond the "second mile" in an honest effort to arrive at a mutually satisfactory agreement. It seems to us that any further "concessions" would not contribute to peace, security, or freedom as we understand those words.

A Plan To Reduce Federal Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as nearly everyone present must know by now, I have been strongly and consistently critical of Federal hiring policies. The ever-increasing number of employees fastened onto our ship of state is unconscionable.

Thus in times past I have been successful in amending certain bills to provide that vacancies could be filled only one in four until a certain reduction was reached. This became known as the attrition method of personnel reduction.

Recently I have seriously considered asking the membership of this House to support a successor amendment to my rider of a decade ago. However, I am pleased to note by a recent Washington Post, in Jerry Kluttz' column, that the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget is preparing a directive which would require examining agency needs before advancing people automatically into vacancies caused by retirements. This would appear to be a long step in the right direction.

I would like to include herein for the benefit of the House the pertinent excerpt from Jerry Kluttz' column of September 1, 1962, and my letter to Chairman Macy of the Civil Service Commission, complimenting him on this new program.

The article and letter follow:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 1, 1962]

DOWNGRADING OF JOBS LEFT VACANT STUDIED BY ADMINISTRATION

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Spurred by Congress, the Kennedy administration is taking a harder line on filling vacancies in Federal agencies. The elimination and downgrading of more vacated job and agency reorganizations has been suggested.

Civil Service Chairman W. Macy told the Senate Appropriations Committee that the "existence of a vacancy should offer the opportunity to determine whether a reorganization of functions and staffing can be accomplished to secure more efficient organization."

Further, he added, "good position classification procedure requires that every job that is vacated be studied to determine whether the existing grade is warranted in the event the position should be refilled."

Macy revealed that the Budget Bureau, on behalf of the President, would send a directive instructing agencies to follow the above practices before filling vacancies.

Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, suggested the use of retirements to either hold down or cut Federal employment. But CSC's Executive Director, Warren Irons, commented that he'd like to see the committee "urge the same kind of review for every vacancy that occurs—not just retirements, but those who resign or leave the service for other reasons."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 4, 1962.

Hon. JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman, Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACY: In his weekend column in the Washington Post, Jerry Kluttz has reported that your Commission intends to prepare a directive for the Bureau of the Budget to send to all Federal agencies instructing them to observe a stricter procedure in filling vacancies caused by retirements.

Mr. Kluttz further reported that your agency's executive director recommended a study be made before filling a vacancy caused by any reason.

As a sometime author of a personnel reduction amendment tied to the attrition method, I desire to take this opportunity to applaud your efforts along the lines described. I recognize that your plan is not based on my formula, which involved purely numerical reduction to a stated plateau. Nevertheless it is encouraging that a new game of musical chairs is not automatically to be played every time a vacancy occurs, without first examining agency requirements.

If you can bring this off, you will establish yourself as a truly fine public servant.

This proposed directive is a great first step. Next I hope it can be supplemented by arm's

length discussions with agency heads and personnel chiefs, to instill in the latter a dedicated approach to trying to make do with the same if not fewer hands.

If the agencies themselves can become imbued with the spirit of turning out their missions with a streamlined force, that will make the formal observance of the directive less onerous. The directive will still be a guide; the execution will have to come from an inner desire on the part of agency officials to cut down on Government costs, rather than increasing them at every turn.

Forgive my harangue, Mr. Chairman. I am delighted to take notice of your efforts. Having my name on the Jensen rider meant nothing to me as such. I would have fought as hard for the amendment had anyone else offered it. So now that your program is outlined it should obviate any legislative edict at this time.

Thank you for indulging me this time to comment.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

Federal Communications Commission Probe of Radio Station WGES—Now Known as KYNR—in Chicago Asked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the McLendon Corp. acquired ownership of radio station WGES in Chicago and, despite assurances to the Federal Communications Commission to the contrary in its application for assignment of license, the McLendon Corp. promptly dropped all of its foreign language programs including German, Italian, Polish, Swedish, Hungarian, Slovak, and Spanish programs.

This action was taken by the new management 5 days after the assignment of license became effective on August 8, 1962.

I believe this wanton disregard of representations to the FCC by a licensee should be of concern to all Members of Congress because it involves the fundamental question of how much credence can be placed on testimony presented under oath to a Federal regulatory body.

On October 13, 1961, the McLendon Corp. petitioned the FCC for assignment of the WGES license issued in 1959 to radio station WGES, Inc., controlled by John A. Dyer and associates. The McLendon Corp. purchased the station for $2 million.

In its transfer application dated October 13, 1961—file No. BAL-4363—the McLendon Corp. stated in part as follows:

The Commission's records will reflect that the programing of WGES has been essentially the same for several decades. The cosmopolitan complex of Chicago makes it obvious that there is a need for the type of specialized programing that the station has done in the past. As is indicated in the reply to paragraph 12 of section IV of this application, the assignee intends to retain the present personnel of the station in order to be assured that there will be continuity in the programing.

Attached to this transfer application was a program schedule which listed a whole series of foreign language programs which were at the time being carried by WGES.

Despite these assurances that the new owner would not eliminate the foreign language broadcasts and despite the McLendon Corp.'s claim that the license should be renewed so that these foreign language programs could continue serving public necessity and convenience in the Chicago area, on August 13, 1962, 5 days after the assignment became effective, the McLendon Corp. advised all of its foreign language broadcasters that they would be removed from the station effective August 28, 1962. This has been done.

The McLendon Corp. stated it would devote its entire 24-hour-a-day broadcasting operation to programs designed exclusively to serve the needs of Chicago's Negro community.

This abrupt departure from the original program schedule filed with the FCC in the application for assignment by the McLendon Corp. was called to my attention by many of my constituents who have learned to rely on these foreign language programs for news and entertainment during the past 30 years of continuous broadcasting over station WGES.

Recalling that Newton Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, has stated repeatedly that while the FCC will not engage in any form of censorship of programing, the FCC would require strict compliance with program schedules filed with renewal application for radio licenses, I immediately protested to the Federal Communications Commission this major departure of the McLendon Corp. from its original application.

I was joined in this protest by others, including William Klein, conductor of the "Germania Hour," Chicago's oldest foreign language program, listened to daily by hundreds of thousands of Americans of German descent in the Chicago metropolitan area.

As a result of these protests, the FCC, through its Acting Secretary Ben F. Waple, sent the McLendon Corp., in Chicago, the following letter on August 21, 1962:

THE MCLENDON CORP.,
Radio Station WGES,
2708 West Washington Boulevard,
Chicago, Ill.

GENTLEMEN: On June 13, 1962, the Commission approved your application (BAL-4363) for assignment of license of station WGES, and the assignment became effective on August 8, 1962. The assignment was approved in part upon the representations made in the application, and particularly in exhibit G thereof, that the long-existing specialized programing format, including foreign language broadcasts, would be continued.

The Commission has now been advised that shortly after you assumed operation of station WGES, employees were advised that effective August 28, 1962, all foreign language broadcasts were to be discontinued. In view of the representations made in the application, it is requested that within 10 days from the date of this letter you advise whether the Commission's information as to a planned discontinuance of foreign language broadcasts is correct and, if so, when and on what basis the decision was made.

Very truly yours,

BEN F. WAPLE,
Acting Secretary.

On August 24, 1962, the Federal Communications Commission sent the McLendon Corp. the following telegram:

The MCLENDON CORP.,
Radio Station WGES,
Chicago, Ill.:

Your immediate comments requested on following complaint received from William D. Saltiel, counsel for the Germania House: "My client has received notice of cancellation of its program to be effective August 25, 1962. A news release by McLendon Corp. of August 23, 1961, gave assurance to my client and other foreign language programs that no changes would take place after it received FCC approval of the transfer of license. Gordon McLendon, president of the corporation, stated in this release: 'A radio station is licensed in the public interest, convenience, and necessity, and we never change station programing as long as it is established that such programing is the best way to utilize facilities to serve the public needs and tastes.'

"'WGES has for over 25 years presented programs given by minority groups, German, Italian, Polish, and Negro, as well as other and smaller nationality segments,' said Mr. McLendon. Upon this assurance my client did not protest the transfer of the franchise and license, nor did other programers. We are now faced with cancellation next Saturday."

BEN F. WAPLE,
Acting Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.

This telegram had reference to the following press release issued by the McLendon Corp. in Chicago on August 23, 1961, shortly before it filed its formal application for assignment of license issued to station WGES:

The MCLENDON CORP.,
August 23, 1961.

DALLAS—The McLendon Corp. of Dallas, which has purchased radio station WGES, announced today that upon FCC approval of the transfer, it plans no changes in the programing of that station.

WGES is presently programing toward minority groups in Chicago—Negro and also German, Italian, Polish, as well as other and smaller nationality segments.

"A radio station is licensed in the public interest, convenience, and necessity," Gordon McLendon, president of the corporation, said, "and we never change a station's programing as long as it is established that such programing is the best way to utilize that facility to serve the public needs and tastes."

On August 28, 1962, the McLendon Corp. sent the FCC a very long letter with numerous exhibits as its reply to the two FCC communications. In this lengthy reply, the McLendon Corp. attempts to justify its abrupt shift in policy by claiming that several other stations in Chicago carry foreign language programs while not a single station carries programs exclusively designed for Chicago's large Negro community.

I am at a loss to understand what the McLendon Corp. means by "exclusive Negro programing," but this is a decision that one would quite properly leave to the judgment of the broadcaster.

That is not the issue in this case. There is only one issue here: How much credence can be placed on the veracity of statements made before the Federal Communications Commission in applications for a broadcast license.

Mr. Speaker, following is the reply I submitted to the Federal Communications Commission, at the Commission's invitation, in behalf of those of my constituents who suffered an irreparable personal loss when their favorite foreign language programs were dropped by station WGES, which has since been renamed by the McLendon Corp. as station WYNR:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1962.

Mr. BEN F. WAPLE,
Acting Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WAPLE: Thank you very much for your letter of August 29, in which you were kind enough to furnish me with a copy of the response forwarded to the Federal Communications Commission by the McLendon Corp. as its answer to the Commission's original inquiry regarding discontinuation of foreign language broadcasts by radio station WGES (now WYNR).

In taking advantage of your kind invitation to comment on the McLendon response, permit me to advise you that I feel more convinced than ever that the Commission should reopen this entire case and compel the McLendon interests to show cause why the license obtained for radio station WGES (now WYNR) should not be revoked.

In their voluminous effort to justify the abrupt change in policy, which is completely contrary to the applications they originally filed with the FCC when the renewal and assignment of license was pending, the McLendon interests make out an excellent case on just how little value can be placed on sworn statements filed with the FCC.

The McLendon interests have introduced a whole series of collateral arguments which I submit have nothing to do with the issue before the Commission.

It is my contention that this matter deserves a thorough study, with hearings under oath, by the Commission so that we can ascertain how much credence does any regulatory body have a right to place on sworn statements filed with that body. This is the only issue as far as I am concerned.

If, indeed, the public interest can be served by having the licensee drop all foreign language programs and devote the entire broadcasting schedule to programs directed to the Negro community, this conclusion was just as apparent to the McLendon interests when they filed their original brief as it is today.

The McLendon interests had until August 8, 1962 when the assignment of license became finaly consummated, to amend their original petition. It is quite apparent to me from their exhibit E, which purports to be a letter written by Mr. Gordon McLendon to Dr. John A. Dyer, that the McLendon interests did not want to disclose their plans for abandoning the foreign language programs until the ink was dry on the assignment.

While I do not have a copy of Dr. Dyer's letter of August 22, 1961, to Mr. McLendon, it is quite apparent from Mr. McLendon's reply of August 23, 1961, that Dr. Dyer, the potential seller of this license, was deeply concerned about the abandonment of foreign language programs on station WGES. It would appear to me that the Commission in its searching investigation should obtain the article in Billboard Music Week, referred to in Mr. McLendon's letter to Dr. Dyer, and also the release by All-State Records. If necessary, the authors of these articles should be subpenaed by the Commission because it is my firm belief that the Commission will find evidence indicating that the McLendon interests were already planning in 1961 to abandon foreign language programs on station WGES in the face of their sworn assurances to the Commission that no such action would be taken.

It is my understanding that Dr. Dyer would be perfectly willing to testify under oath before the Commission as to the evidence which led to his concern over this drastic change in programing on WGES.

The McLendon interests alleged in their reply that they dropped these foreign language programs because the broadcasters were following a "brokering" policy, which is contrary to the policy established by the McLendon Corp. Their brief is notably silent on any efforts or suggestion that the McLendon interests made to these foreign language broadcasters that such "brokering" policy would be abandoned by the new management, nor is there anything in this brief to indicate that an offer was made to the foreign broadcasters to become salaried employees of the new management. As a matter of fact, this brief is conspiciously silent about one Paul Miczko, a Polish language news commentator, who was in fact a salaried employee of radio station WGES and whose broadcasts were eliminated along with all the other foreign language programs.

I have discussed this matter with the foreign-language broadcasters, and they all advise me, and are prepared to testify under oath, that the station made no effort to alter its relationship with these foreign-language broadcasters consistent with the McLendon Corp.'s policy of nonbrokerage.

The McLendon Corp. alleges that there are seven radio stations which serve the Chicago metropolitan area and which "broadcast either exclusively in foreign language or devote a major portion of their broadcasts to such programs." The Commission's records can show the fallacy of this allegation.

The seven stations listed by the McLendon Corp. are radio stations WSBC, WCRW, WEDC, WOPA, WHFC, WEAW, and WJOB. The Commission's records will show that stations WSBC, WCRW, and WEDG share the same wavelength; and when one station is on the air, the other stations are off the air.

I am not aware of any foreign language programs on WCRW. By listing these three stations individually, it is apparent that the same attitude expressed in the original application for renewal and assignment of this license continues even to this late date.

Radio station WOPA is located in Oak Park and has a very limited range in Chicago. WHFC is in Cicero and, similarly, has a limited reception in Metropolitan Chicago. WEAW is located in Evanston, and to the best of my knowledge carries some foreign language programs only on Sunday.

WJOB is located in Hammond, and during my 30 years of observing foreign language broadcasts in Chicago, I have never been able to hear this station in Chicago, even though I am acquainted with the broadcasters on this station and frequently have wanted to hear their programs.

This allegation raises a serious question about the credibility of the McLendon interests' reply.

The McLendon Corp. alleges that during the year in which this entire matter was pending before the Commission, it had conducted studies to determine how best the station could serve the public interest. But it is most significant that a final decision had not been made until sometime after August 8 to abandon the foreign language programs—significant because August 8 is the day after which no further action could have been taken either by Dr. Dyer, the seller, the broadcasters, or perhaps even the Federal Communications Commission itself.

I submit that by waiting until after August 8 before a decision was made, the McLendon interests have denied both Dr. Dyer and the foreign language broadcasters their right to due process before the Commission, and I refuse to accept the theory that this decision being made after August 8 is merely coincidental. Certainly it is the responsibility of the FCC to exhaust all avenues of investigation on this particular point.

The McLendon Corp. submits seven photostatic copies of the questionnaire which this corporation sent out to prominent people in Chicago inquiring about the type of programing they would prefer for WGES. Accepting these exhibits at face value, I should like to call the Commission's attention to the fact that six out of the seven people who replied to this questionnaire in this exhibit significantly indicated they would prefer ethnic music directed at distinct groups of varying cultures: Negro, Polish, Spanish, Greek, Slavic, etc.

This would indicate to me that the prominent Negro leaders of the community in Chicago themselves approve of continuing foreign language programs in addition to the Negro broadcasting on the station.

The McLendon Corp. also submits a series of memorandums on meetings that Mr. J. Schatz had with various people in Chicago relative to the station's consideration of devoting the entire broadcast period to Negro-oriented operations. I have been unable to find a single memorandum of any discussion that Mr. Schatz might have had with leaders of other ethnic groups in Chicago to determine how WGES could serve the public interest with their cooperation.

It is patently clear from these memorandums that the McLendon Corp. had made up its mind to try to corner the Negro market in Chicago and then set out to prove its point.

It is my earnest hope that the Commission will reject such tactics.

It is entirely possible that the best interests of the Negro community in Chicago can be served by a station devoting all of its broadcast hours to Negro-oriented programs. This is a decision which I would leave to any broadcaster in Chicago, for certainly I would find repugnant any effort by anyone, including myself, to try to impose my views on the judgment of a broadcaster or engage in any form of censorship; but I submit this is not the issue in this case. The issue here is whether or not this license was obtained through deceit and whether or not the American people have a right to place any credibility on sworn statements filed with the Federal Communications Commission or any other regulatory body.

To permit this matter to go unchallenged would be to acquiesce in making a mockery of proceedings before the Federal Communications Commission.

For this reason and many other which I will be very happy to develop before the Commission if this entire matter is reopened, I do hope that the FCC will issue a show cause order on the McLendon Corp.

Sincerely yours,

ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
Member of Congress.

Burma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week I had the distinct pleasure of attending the Wilkes-Barre

Rotary Club meeting and introducing the principal speaker on that occasion, His Excellency U On Sein, Ambassador of Burma to the United States. His address was highly informative and well received and as part of my remarks today I quote the text of that speech.

His address follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HIS EXCELLENCY U ON SEIN TO THE WILKES-BARRE ROTARY CLUB, WILKES-BARRE, PA., SEPTEMBER 4, 1962

Burma is about the size of Texas, that is over 260,000 square miles, with 20 million people, sandwiched between the two subcontinents of India and China and sheltered by a ring of high mountain ranges. It shares land borders with other Asian countries, Thailand and Laos on the east, China in the northeast, India and Pakistan (East Pakistan) on the northwest. In spite of occasional unsuccessful Chinese invasions, it stood as an independent country for about 2,000 years, until the 19th century when it was annexed by the British. It was at the height of its prosperity under the Pagan dynasty in the 11th century, and the magnificent monuments and Buddhist temples of that period which still stand today at Pagan furnish eloquent testimony to the glory that was Burma. To most Americans, as to most people elsewhere, the name "Pagan" means nothing. That so little is known of Pagan is a reflection on the quality of salesmanship possessed both by the early Burmese and the British. For Pagan is the equal of many ancient places both in the east and west. For monuments at Pagan, if no longer in her ancient glory, furnish glorious proof of the existence, at the early period of 11th century, of a great civilization founded on one of the great religions of the world—Buddhism.

From then until the advent of the British in the first quarter of the 19th century, Burma has a continuous history as an independent country. She was invaded on occasion, but the invaders did not stay. She was not always unified under one kingdom, but the existence of a common religion and language provided a unifying force which internecine wars could not break. Eighty-five percent of the people of the country are Buddhists and speak the Burmese language.

Burma lost her independence to the British in three stages as a result of the three Anglo-Burmese wars of 1824, 1852 and 1886. The British took the two coastal strips of Arakan and the Tenasserim in 1824; to these strips was added what was called Lower Burma in 1852. But the Burmese Kingdom at Mandalay continued to exist until 1886 when the whole of Burma passed under British control. I am giving you these dates to point up to the fact that Burma began to lose her independence to the British 50 years after you in this country won yours, and that she lost it finally after you had completed 110 years of independence. Burma lost her independence in the latter part of the 19th century, in what might be called the modern period of world history. It was a period when the new ideas of liberty and equality were spreading fast, and when the major colonial powers of the world were beginning to engage in wars among themselves which were to leave them greatly weakened. In these circumstances, it now seems inevitable that Burma's re-emergence as an independent country was only a matter of time. What made it even more inevitable is that throughout the period of British rule the Burmese people did not lose their basic sense of solidarity and unity. They retained their religion, their language, and their culture, and to this was added a strong determination to regain their freedom from foreign rule.

In fact the history of Burma from 1886 to 1948 is a story of a continued struggle for independence. The Burmese nationalists repeatedly but unsuccessfully rebelled against the British regime. In the early years, the fight took on the form of abortive armed rebellions. Later it was transformed into a nationalist movement to achieve the same end through constitutional methods. Under this nationalist pressure, the British were forced to introduce a series of constitutional reforms which aimed at giving the people of Burma an increasing share in the administration of the country. But these were always too late and to little, and failed to satisfy the aspirations of the Burmese people. Then came the war with Japan in December 1941. The outbreak of the Second World War gave the Burmese another opportunity. The Burmese nationalists offered to cooperate with the British in the fight against the Japanese in return for a promise of independence after the conclusion of the war. The British rejected the offer.

The Burmese people rose up in arms against the British, then later on fought the Japanese when the latter did not keep their promise to bestow independence on the country. The resistance movement against the Japanese was led by the late Gen. Aung San. This resistance played no small part in the defeat of the Japanese in Burma in cooperation with the allied forces. The Burmese naturally expected that the British signatories of the Atlantic Charter would return to Burma in a more liberal frame of mind than when they evacuated Burma in early 1942. Incredible as it may seem, the British tried to put the clock back. Far from wanting to speed up the progress toward independence, they tried to impose on the country a form of government which was less advanced than the form which had existed in the years immediately preceding the Japanese invasion. The Burmese leaders who led the resistance movement boycotted the government, and within a year forced the last British Governor to request Gen. Aung San to cooperate and form a government. From that point on, the road to independence was clear except for one hurdle. This was the British insistence that independence should be contingent on the Burmese winning the voluntary association of other ethnic groups—the Shans, the Kachins, the Kayahs, and the Chins—with the new form of government to be established in independent Burma. This was no walkover, since it had been the consistent British policy in Burma to keep these people apart from the Burmese of the mainland of Burma. They had in fact been cordoned off from the Burmese, had no representation in the Burmese Parliament at Rangoon, and were administered directly as frontier areas by the British Governor, unlike the Burmese who had experienced a considerable measure of internal autonomy excercised through their representatives in Parliament. Thanks to the basic sense of solidarity mentioned earlier, and to the common bonds which had been established as a result of the common suffering during the Japanese occupation period, the necessary accords were reached. It was agreed that each of these ethnic groups should enjoy local autonomy within the areas in which they lived, these areas to be designated "autonomous states." Out of this was born the concept of the Union of Burma.

A constituent assembly including the representatives of the minority groups mentioned and the Karens was elected in 1947 for the purpose of drawing up the constitution for independent Burma, and for deciding its future status vis-a-vis the British Commonwealth. Burma declared her independence on January 4, 1948, and chose to withdraw from the British Commonwealth. The birth of the Union of Burma was acclaimed throughout the world. The future looked bright, and we looked forward to channeling the enthusiasm and energies released by the achievement of independence, toward exploiting the resources with which kind nature had endowed our country for the benefit not of a foreign power, but to raising the living standards and giving our people a happier and fuller life. Such were the hopes we nurtured, and the dreams we dreamed.

The war had left the whole country in complete ruin, fought over twice by the Japanese and the Allied armies, both of which had used scorched earth strategy. Three-quarters of our towns and villages had been razed to the ground. The national income, though small before the war, was reduced by half. Hospitals and schools were gone, oilfields were destroyed, cattle slaughtered, and population decimated.

The Government of independent Burma started its business in all seriousness. But within a year, the whole face of Burma had changed. Instead of turning its hand to constructive work in peace and harmony, the Government found itself beset with no less than three major rebellions. It looked as though Burma had, immediately on achieving independence, embarked on another period of internecine strife which was to last for some time. To the outside world, Burma and chaos became almost synonymous. To us in Burma, the outlook seemed bleak. I am sure you will want to hear some explanation for this puzzling gulf between promise and performance. As I see it, these troubles had their roots partly in the period of British rule, partly in the period of the Japanese occupation, and partly in the events which took place in the years immediately following the end of hostilities with Japan.

The Government of Burma strove manfully to deal with the enormous problems confronting it. Dauntlessly and desperately the Burmese Government fought for time to build up a strong army, and to rally the people around it. By 1951, the back of the rebellion was broken. Since then, the situation has undergone a drastic change. The writ of the Government runs all across the length and breadth of the country. All the rebel groups have been on the run, disorganized and demoralized. The Burmese leaders realized that rebellions were a symptom of the times, that the unrest had its roots in the uncertainties, the frustrations, the disillusionments, and the fears which had developed in the country during the past decade.

Recently my country had a change of government. We tried with democratic parliamentary institutions and unfortunately they failed to succeed. For a successful working of a parliamentary form of government we must have mature politicians and an enlightened electorate. In the beginning of 1962 political conditions in the country deteriorated to such an extent that the armed forces were compelled to assume charge of the country. The revolutionary Government of Burma is determined to make efficiency and discipline as their first task. General Ne Win's political manifesto after taking power expressed no departure from Burma's past policies, internal or external. He said that all politicians were old comrades of the nationalist struggle. Our foreign policy is to stay away from military blocs, both East and West.

I would like to say a few words on the foreign policy of Burma. My country emerged as an independent state in the midst of the cold war. Burma refuses to take sides in the cold war and as a result has come to be known as a neutralist country in cold war terminology. Lately attempts have been made to improve the terminology "neutralist" by using the terms "uncommitted" or "unalined." Personally, I have never liked the word "neutralist" in this context. None of these terms provide an accurate description of the foreign policy of Burma. For her policy is to judge each issue, as it appears, on its merits, and to determine her attitude on the basis of such judgment.

Burma is not a member of either the SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) or the CENTO (Central Treaty Organization), but we are not hostile to those countries who are members of such military blocs. We have as our next door neighbors some countries who are members of such military blocs. Our relationships with those countries are extremely good. Genuine independence in terms of Burmese thinking is synonymous with an independent foreign policy.

There are several reasons why we prefer to maintain our uncommitted status. The first is that since our hands are full with the formidable task of building up our nation we cannot afford to get ourselves committed abroad. It was with that end in view that I earlier mentioned Burma's history and the problems confronting it. My American friends would be best qualified to Second, Burma was a British colony for similar reasons, deliberately avoided being involved in "entangling alliances" for almost a century after she became independent. Secondly, Burma was a British colony for some generations and our past experience has taught us to be extremely cautious in our relations with any great power or powers. Burma wishes to remain on friendly relations with all countries of the world, including the great powers. Burma is not unmindful of the fact that a policy of isolation is inconceivable in the 20th century. That is why we applied for admission to the United Nations soon after we became independent. Burma's voting record at the United Nations illustrates her independent foreign policy. The main objective of our foreign policy is to preserve our independence and to achieve this we need the faith and cooperation among all nations of the world.

Our Dwindling Gold Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Mines and Mining held a hearing today on several gold bills introduced by myself and other Members of the House. I wish to include in my remarks a statement presented to the committee by Merrill E. Shoup of Colorado Springs, president of the Golden Cycle Corp. Mr. Shoup calls attention to our dwlindling gold reserves, and the necessity for increasing our domestic production of gold.

His statement follows:

OUR DWINDLING GOLD RESERVES

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Merrill E. Shoup. I reside at 17 Broadmoor Avenue, Colorado Springs, Colo. I come before you today representing the Golden Cycle Corp., of which I am president, and the Cripple Creek Mining District of Colorado in which Golden Cycle Corp. holds extensive mining and milling properties. I also represent the following mining companies which I am privileged to serve as president: Cresson Consolidated Gold Mining & Milling Co., Dr. Jack Pot Mining Co., Elkton Co., Empire Lee Mining Co., Jerry Johnson Gold Mining Co., LeClair Consolidated Mines Co., New Gold Dollar Mining Co., and the United Gold Mining Co.

To introduce myself more fully, I might mention that I hold degrees in economics from Dartmouth College; and for a time following completion of my undergraduate and graduate studies I was an instructor in economics. Later I completed studies in law and was a practicing attorney in Colorado for a number of years prior to devoting my full time, attention, and energies to a number of business enterprises, with most of which I continued to be associated. I am president of two small national banks and a director of three; president of the Holly Sugar Corp., which is one of the Nation's two largest beet sugar companies; a director of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad; and I serve as chief executive of several other enterprises.

I have recited some of these details of my background and training in an effort to indicate to you that my interest in gold, monetary affairs, and general economic conditions in our country stems not from a narrow and entirely biased point of view, but from a viewpoint which probably is, in many respects, typical of that held by many American businessmen who are deeply interested in the economic vigor and health of the United States.

I am grateful for this opportunity to appear once again before a Committee of the Congress to continue an effort, in behalf of the domestic gold mining industry, to which I was first committed almost 30 years ago. I feel just a little apologetic at the same time; for, when it comes to the subject of gold and congressional hearings, I am beginning to feel like the man who came to dinner, so often have I made the pilgrimage here to testify in behalf of our Nation's gold mining industry in general and Cripple Creek in particular.

Since the views that I hold are so amply spread on the record of other hearings held at other times by various committees of this and the other body, I will refrain from taking your time by reviewing and reiterating the things I have offered previously in testimony of this kind. I might, however, with your permission, make an occasional reference to cite previous testimony it has been my privilege to submit.

I come before you members of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining to add a strong and urgent endorsement of H.R. 12873 in behalf of myself and those I represent. We strongly support H.R. 12873, a measure introduced by our esteemed Congressman from Colorado, the Honorable J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, whom I count not only as an able representative of our State but also as a valued personal friend; and the very able gentleman from California, Congressman HAROLD T. JOHNSON, a valued champion of the domestic mining industry.

In the language that we of the mining West are accustomed to using, I would sum up my feelings about H.R. 12873 by saying that it makes a lot of sense. Further than that, it is a positive approach to a critical problem confronting our entire Nation.

The members of this subcommittee are probably even more acutely aware than I of the low ebb of our national gold reserves and the apparent inability of our Government to reverse the flow. Perhaps you are less intimately acquainted wtih the prostrate state of our domestic gold mining industry. Cripple Creek district is an excellent example. All operations have ceased despite the fact that we are standing astride rich, known deposits of gold that could help replenish our national reserves. We cannot state with exact certainty just how much gold remains to be taken from the rich mines at Cripple Creek, but we have good reason to believe that there is a great reserve still to be tapped. Our geological and exploratory studies support this belief.

If this is true, why are we shut down?

It is rather simple, we believe. We are closed down because of a Government policy which refuses us the opportunity to mine our ore profitably. We are forced to bring what we dig from the granite beneath the Rockies to the Treasury of the United States and accept a flat $35 an ounce for it. We are not allowed to offer our product on an open market and allow the law of supply and demand to set a price which will pay our costs and give us a reasonable profit. As long as the Government controls all sales and purchases of gold, something must be done to increase the price it pays us for our product. We aren't even allowed to possess the gold we dig; for this, too, is against the national law.

Detailed information relating to and supporting the generalities in which I have been dealing was presented by me earlier this year in the course of hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. Senate, and appears in the record of those hearings beginning on page 47 of the hearing record on Senate Joint Resolution 44.

In 1954 it was my privilege to testify before a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the U.S. Senate, which was then conducting hearings on S. 13, S. 2332, S. 2364, and S. 2514, measures to permit the sale of gold, to resume the redemption of gold, to permit the free marketing of newly mined gold, to establish a sound monetary system, and for other purposes. If I were permitted, and if time were not necessarily restricted, I would like to reiterate now most of the statements I was permitted to enter into the record then; for they apply today as well as they did several years ago.

The basic fact that our national gold mining industry has been all but suffocated by a gold price, established almost 30 years ago and left unchanged ever since, still stands before us.

I believe it was this same subcommittee, 86th Congress, 1st session, before which I was privileged to appear in 1959 when hearings were being conducted on House Concurrent Resolutions 177 through 184 and House Concurrent Resolution 189. The testimony I was honored to present at that time appears in the record, serial No. 8, commencing on page 282; and, again, I would today reiterate much of what I said on that occasion were time not of the essence.

In the years since I began my efforts in behalf of the gold-mining industry, dating back to the World War II period when we were needlessly stripped of our labor and thus dealt a mortal blow, there have been many hearings and many attempts to bring succor and aid to a dying national industry. Yet here we are today with our gold reserves fast slipping through our fingers and the same—or even a worse—state of affairs existing in our domestic gold-mining industry.

It has been said, by officials of the Treasury Department representing the present administration, that resumption of gold mining in this country couldn't solve our gold-shortage problem in a lifetime; and I would not contend here today that it could.

But I submit that resumption of domestic production certainly could not further deplete our gold stocks. On the contrary, it would represent a step toward reversing the trend we now suffer. Other nations are building their stocks of gold by any and all means, attaching more value to it, apparently, than to printing-press money or other artificial bases. Russia, for example, is putting the force of its Government behind gold production and is digging the precious ore just across the Bering Strait from our State of Alaska. In many other zones of the Soviet Union she is also gathering gold by other means, as we are all aware, and obviously intends to have the ruble supplant the dollar as a world monetary standard—a ruble backed by gold, not printer's ink.

Those of us who struggle for our gold-mining industry have been told repeatedly that a unilateral change in the price of gold executed by this Nation would have a num-

ber of ill effects domestically and abroad. Possibly this would be the case if the price of monetary gold were arbitrarily increased.

This is one of the basic and principal reasons why I support the measure now receiving your consideration. It suggests a method for reviving domestic gold production without tampering with monetary values.

I would point out, too, that gold has come to have strategic significance and may certainly now be considered an important defense material. Gold is being used, for example, in electroplating numerous components of space vehicles. It is being used in electronics systems where high performance and reliability are essential. Gold is apparently the best and most efficient known reflector of infrared rays, which explains its being used, I understand, in the space suits for our astronauts to protect them against dangerous radiation in space. We have even learned that there is gold plating on the hulls of the space craft carrying our men into orbit. This precious metal is also being used industrially to goldplate transistors, connectors, printed circuits, and many other things important to our latest communications systems.

When this nation has required strategic materials in the past, it has always adopted the means necessary to get them. Uranium is an example. Our Government did not hesitate to invest many hundreds of millions of dollars in a uranium procurement program which certainly held out incentives to miners, prospectors, and producers in general. This is but one example of the numerous occasions on which our Government has set up a procurement agency and program to acquire needed materials, and we all are aware of the stockpiling programs which have been carried on to assure adequate supplies of metals and other materials needed to protect the Nation's welfare.

I believe that the program offered in H.R. 12873 can be looked upon in the same light as the many other procurement programs in which this Government has engaged in the past, which seems to me to be a very persuasive argument in favor of the proposal now being considered.

There are those who cry "subsidy" as if it were a unique word in the American scheme of things. I would call to this subcommittee's attention the fact that the "subsidy," or "incentive payment," suggested by H.R. 12873 would be minor in comparison with the "subsidies" currently paid to other American industries—agriculture, as an example. It has become national policy to subsidize or otherwise assist those industries and services which are deemed necessary to the national welfare. I submit that production of gold is urgently demanded in a time when we cannot even honor the short-term claims against our gold reserves held by foreign interests and still have gold enough to meet the statutory requirement for 25 percent backing of our currency, and I say it is time that gold production be subsidized in the national interest.

We talk much of resources in this Nation—conservation, beneficial utilization, development of our resources, and husbanding of our resources. There is a resource associated with gold that I would call to your attention—trained, able, skilled hard-rock miners. Men like these do not walk down every street. Their knowledge and skills are not acquired from books. Yet they are a vanishing race of Americans. The average hard-rock miner today is not a young man, and he is not training younger men to take his place when he can no longer go down into our Carlton tunnel 3,100 feet below the surface up there in the Rocky Mountains.

This is a resource that we must think about, too. Some of the idle miners throughout the West are among those unemployed who swell our relief roles; and this costs us money we would not have to spend if these people were gainfully employed, doing what they are trained to do and know how to do best.

A resumption of gold mining would revitalize mining communities and neighboring towns and cities all over the West, returning property to tax roles, stimulating transportation facilities, buying supplies and services no longer in use, demanding new equipment and machinery, and bringing forth new wealth.

Measure these positive values against the cost of a subsidy, or incentive payment, such as that contemplated in H.R. 12873; and the total net cost of the program provided for in H.R. 12873 is relatively insignificant.

The Cripple Creek district in Colorado, which I represent here today, was second only to the Lead, S. Dak., district in the production of gold through 1958. More than 19 million ounces of gold, worth at least $665 million, have been taken from Cripple Creek district mines since 1892. The district produces mainly gold ore, with a very minor amount of silver and no other recovered metal.

Our difficulties at Cripple Creek leading to our placing the district in a closed condition, with facilities, however, in standby order and ready to resume operations, began when the gold closing order L–208 was imposed on October 8, 1942. This order proved to be a body blow from which we have never been able to recover fully, especially in view of the fixed Government price of $35 an ounce, which prevents our operating at a profit, however reasonable.

The Carlton Mill at Cripple Creek is one of the most modern gold mills in the world, constructed at a cost of $2¼ million. We were forced to shut down its operation at the end of 1961, but it has not been dismantled or otherwise altered. It stands huge and silent awaiting only a resumption of mining to begin pouring out new national wealth.

Underlying the Cripple Creek mines we have completed two major tunnels to drain the district. About $1¼ million was invested in these alone, and they are still quite capable of doing the job for which they were designed.

Throughout the big Cripple Creek Basin there are productive mines which are now silent. We ask only to be given an opportunity to put them back into production. What applies to the Cripple Creek district likewise applies in varying degrees to many other gold mining districts in the United States.

We have untapped resources to develop, but we cannot carry on the job because the present Government policy prevents our investing the necessary funds for production in known deposits and exploration to locate still unmined deposits.

We respectfully submit to this body that confidence in the dollar is waning, principally because the world knows well that our gold reserves are vanishing.

Our monetary situation is shaky because we have forsaken the gold standard and turned our faith to the printing press dollar. History has proved that those leading world powers before us who have followed this path have ceased to be world powers.

Virtually all the people of the world recognize gold and its value. Many cannot read the printing on a dollar, but they recognize gold instantly. Gold is power; yet this, the richest nation on earth, is allowing its gold to slip away to other lands and cannot now even meet its gold obligations.

In summary, let me reemphasize these points:

Revival of the gold mining industry would spur the economies in what are now greatly depressed areas, putting people back to work and placing money in circulation to stimulate businesses of many kinds.

The net subsidy required to revitalize our gold mining industry would be, indeed, comparatively small in terms of other subsidies being paid other industries in the United States today; and it would purchase great benefits for our Nation as a whole.

Our gold reserves are steadily dwindling, yet we have effectively halted operation of more than 90 percent of our gold producing activities by clinging to a 30-year-old price and policy which take away from the American citizen his rights to develop a strategic resource or to own a kind of property, gold.

Our gold mines are not played out, but they lie idle and silent because of an adamant Government position.

Finally, I respectfully extend to all the members of this subcommittee a cordial western invitation to visit Cripple Creek, as an official group, and there to see—those of you who have not already seen—the great potential for future productivity and contributions to the national wealth. I might attempt, by talking in behalf of Cripple Creek for many hours, to convey an impression that would be gained much more effectively in minutes out there where all this begins. We would be most happy to make your visit interesting, informative, and, I am sure, profitable. This invitation is most sincerely extended. Thank you.

Alabama's Next Governor Looks at Auburn University—Past, Present, and Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in this day of modern science and advanced technology, with its missiles and rockets and space satellites orbiting the earth, and with the security of our Nation constantly being threatened, there is a compelling and ever-increasing need for the best educated minds and the best trained personnel in all fields of endeavor.

We are challenged as never before to meet the growing demands for scientists, engineers, technicians, and skilled and trained people in all areas of learning. We can well and aptly recall the wise and prophetic words of Thomas Jefferson when he declared:

> If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and what never will be.

All Alabamians are justly proud of the outstanding achievements of Auburn University and the fine contributions Auburn University is making toward meeting this urgent need for educated and trained personnel through its programs in engineering, scientific and technical education, through its research activities, including the agricultural experiment stations, and through the cooperative extension service program.

At the joint Land-Grant-War Between the States Centennial dinner held at Auburn University on August 1, the Honorable George C. Wallace, Governor-elect of Alabama, delivered a most informative and excellent address entitled "Auburn Unibersity: Past, Present, and Future," in which he spoke of the Land-Grant College Act and the important role Auburn University has fulfilled and

is continuing to carry forward in providing the trained manpower our Nation must have. I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUBURN UNIVERSITY: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

I am very pleased to see so many distinguished Alabamians here tonight. In addition to many members of the new legislature, the Auburn trustees, members of the press corps and of the administration and staff here at the university, I am particularly glad to see many members of the Alabama War Between the States Centennial Commission and of the executive council of the Alabama Historical Society. These two important groups have contributed much to a better understanding and knowledge of the great events that have shaped the history and destiny of Alabama.

I think it is most appropriate that Auburn University is holding this dinner to observe both the War Between the States and Land-Grant College Centennials. Both the war and the Land-Grant Act have played significant parts in Auburn's history and progress.

The history of this institution dates back earlier than the war, since the university was actually chartered in 1857 and opened its doors in 1859. With the coming of war, the student body, almost to a man, volunteered for service in the Confederate Army. President Jefferson Davis, from his railroad car, reviewed the well-trained Auburn Guard. During the war, college instruction was suspended at the institution then known as East Alabama Male College. The main campus building, which was located on the present site of Samford Hall, served during the war as a hospital where sick and wounded Confederate soldiers were nursed by the women of Auburn.

When the war was over, the college reopened with great hopes of carrying on the educational program that had been interrupted. But the institution was in real financial difficulty: with a ruined economy, patrons could not make gifts or honor their earlier pledges. Plans to raise funds and increase enrollment failed.

In spite of this bleak outlook, an almost unnoticed act passed by the Congress during the war was later to provide the key to unlock the future success of Auburn. The date was June 19, 1862. The atmosphere was bleak and heavy in the Congress. Union forces were close to one of their big defeats, ending the first peninsular campaign. There were empty desks left vacant by southern Representatives and Senators when they left the Union and the Halls of Congress in 1861.

Few people were thinking of the future and fewer than that were thinking of it optimistically.

But among the few was a Senator from the State of Vermont, Justin Smith Morrill. His optimism paid off for future generations of Americans in an education system unique and democratic. His optimism was later to provide the spark for the future development of Auburn University.

Since 1859 Morrill had fought a battle for a new kind of education. He had in mind a system that would serve a growing, industry-agriculture conscious nation by providing training for everyone in the sciences and agriculture. His ideas were similar to those of men like Thomas G. Clemson, of South Carolina, brother-in-law of John C. Calhoun, who gave his private fortune and land holdings to build Clemson Agricultural College in South Carolina.

On June 11, 1862, Morrill's colleagues in the Senate passed a bill creating America's great system of land-grant colleges. And on July 2, 1862, the day after the Confederate assault on Union troops outside Richmond, President Lincoln signed the bill.

With his signature, American education made its break from the European pattern which had shackled it since the 17th century. The new system was aimed at making a success of democracy, a success which depended upon an enlightened educated common people.

When the Land-Grant Act was signed, American universities were patterned after British institutions, which offered a curriculum of the ancient languages with preparation in four fields: law, medicine, theology and teaching.

Of course, such education was needed and widely respected. However, we were not providing the trained man power necessary to build a nation from almost nothing and a civilization from a wilderness.

Thus a hundred years ago, in the midst of the great war we are commemorating tonight, the Congress voted to sell some public lands if the States would use the proceeds as a perpetual endowment for college instruction in "agriculture and the mechanical arts," without neglecting traditional subjects.

The purpose was to provide practical higher education in the arts and sciences, at minimum cost, for the sons and daughters of farmers and industrial workers. The idea was novel and unproved, and the public treasury was burdened with wartime expenditures, but President Lincoln signed the bill nevertheless.

As President Draughon pointed out in an address to a Newcomer Society dinner in 1954, this act, passed by the Federal Congress when the Confederate States were out of the Union, probably owed its passage to the fact the States were locked in a war. Such an act had been proposed before the war by farm and industrial groups from the Middle West, but had been opposed by many representatives of the Southern States. Ironically this legislation when finally enacted provided the type of education so desperately needed for the development of the great natural resources of the South.

Briefly the act provided 30,000 acres of public land, script for each Senator and each Representative to which a State was entitled by the census of 1860 for the endowment in each State desiring it of at least one college whose objects should be "to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."

As I noted earlier, this was a new departure in higher education and of such great consequence to the future development of our country that the Morrill Act has been called the greatest educational measure ever to pass the Congress.

In 1868 the Alabama Legislature accepted the terms of the Morrill Act, and, again, in 1871 authorized the Governor to receive from the Federal Government land script in the amount of 240,000 acres of public land. This land script was acquired and sold under the provisions of the laws of Alabama and the U.S. Government for the sum of $253,500. This money was invested in 8-percent bonds of the State of Alabama, issue of 1871.

Auburn University, at that time still a Methodist institution known as the East Alabama Male College, like all the colleges of the South in the Reconstruction period, was in serious financial trouble. In 1872 the board of East Alabama Male College offered its property to the State as the site of the land-grant college. This was fortunate for the State of Alabama because there was no money available to build a college and no community or other institution had expressed serious interest in the new venture. The offer was approved by the Methodist conference and accepted by the State of Alabama by act of the legislature, February 26, 1872, which located the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama at Auburn.

Thus a start was made toward the great land-grant university at Auburn today. In 1872 Rev. Dr. Isaac T. Tichenor became the president of Alabama's land-grant university and with a faculty of eight undertook to achieve the purposes of the Morrill Act. Perhaps President Tichenor best defined the mission of the college in 1874 when he wrote:

"Men must learn to recuperate our wasted lands; how to increase the productive power of our labor; how to make our languishing agriculture profitable; how to construct and control machinery; how to utilize our immense resources before we can hope for any great and permanent improvement in the condition of our people. No other institution in this State proposes to educate men for these purposes."

Thus Auburn's president looked into the future and foresaw an ideal and pattern of service which Auburn is rendering to the State of Alabama today.

As Auburn and the other land-grant colleges grew, they became far different from their historic predecessors. They have placed greater emphasis on professional or specialized education. This kind of practical education was the main objective of the Morrill Act. A balance was achieved between the old and new with specific provisions for teaching of "other scientific and classical studies." Thus the values of the old system were combined with a curriculum designed to meet the needs of an expanding industrial America.

Very quickly Alabama recognized its obligation to support its land-grant college. Today, approximately half of Auburn's operating budget is provided by the State of Alabama, with the balance coming from research contracts, student fees and the Federal Government.

As I mentioned earlier, passage of the Morrill Act opened college doors wider and wider in Alabama and all over the United States. The sons and daughters of farmers and mechanics had been denied the possibility of a college education because they could not afford the expensive tuition charged by private schools such as Harvard, Yale, and William and Mary.

The Morrill Act was designed to change that situation. A century ago only one youngster in hundreds went to college. Today about one-third of the Americans of college age are enrolled in institutions of higher learning. Today with only 6 percent of the world's population, the United States has about 40 percent of the college and university population. In my opinion, there is an obvious close connection that has historically linked widespread college attendance in this country with our progressively greater wealth, better health and improved way of life. The few millions originally invested in the land-grant colleges have added billions of dollars to the wealth of Alabama and the rest of the Nation.

One American farmer now feeds himself and 26 others at home and abroad, due in large measure to the work of the agricultural experiment stations at the land-grant institutions. Engineering achievements at land-grant institutions include basic discoveries about metal fatigue, building the first cyclotron, and aid given in developing transistors. Merely mentioning these few results of land-grant college education, research, and extension proves my original point—that the public which supports higher education has been its chief beneficiary.

Auburn's contributions through its instructional program, experiment station programs of agricultural research and the cooperative extension service have touched every family in Alabama. The first student body of about 60 has grown to more than 9,000 today. The original 16 acres devoted to experimental farming has grown into a won-

derful and farflung system of experiment stations and a research program that annually repays its cost many times over in new income for the people of Alabama.

The one building that housed the university when it became a land-grant college has grown into a vast multimillion-dollar physical plant housing the sixth largest State university in the South today.

I could recount many other significant events in the history of this university, but I think you would agree that none would surpass the contributions made to Auburn by the Morrill Act. As one of the 68 land-grant colleges and universities Auburn stands today on the threshold of even greater service to the people of Alabama.

As President Draughon noted in his newcomer address:

"Throughout the years Auburn has remained true to its great responsibility of teaching the principles of science and their application to the needs of the agricultural and industrial classes. Today its goal is unchanged. * * * Auburn owes much to the past. Men must still learn to recuperate our wasted lands; to increase the productive power of our labor; to make agriculture profitable; to design and construct and control machinery. But today the body of useful knowledge has increased 10,000-fold, and we in Alabama must learn to use the new tools that scientific research has given us as we move forward into a new era. Auburn owes much to the past, but its great mission is such that its greater debt must ever be to the future."

It is toward that future mission of greatness that we must all work. As your Governor and as chairman of the Auburn board of trustees, I look forward to working with you over the next 4 years to continue to strengthen and broaden the good work you have underway at Auburn today.

The Menace of Communist Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was published last night in the Washington Evening Star entitled "The Menace of Communist Cuba," written by one of the finest columnists who writes today, Mr. William S. White.

I am particularly interested in the last two paragraphs, which say:

Failing this, we should raise a new collective military organization from among the minority who are our real friends in Latin America. Much the same was done in 1949, when we created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from within the United Nations when it became clear that the U.N. would do nothing about Soviet aggression in Europe.

And failing this, the United States should act alone to clear the Soviet military apparatus from Castro Cuba, come what might.

Mr. President, I completely agree with that suggestion made by Mr. White. I have made a similar suggestion on many occasions, starting about 2 years ago, when I recommended that we get busy and create a NATO-type organization in the Western Hemisphere made up of those countries in Central and South America which feel like we do about communism and the threat of encroaching communism, which themselves are willing to combat communism even to the extent of using military weapons if need be.

We should take the leadership in that endeavor. I think it will serve us well in future days if we get such an organization active immediately. That step, coupled with the additional steps recognizing a Cuban Government in exile, are the two absolutely necessary steps that should be taken before anything can be done about Fidel Castro and communism in Cuba. I highly commend the article to the Members of Congress, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 1, 1962]

THE MENACE OF COMMUNIST CUBA

(By William S. White)

The Soviet Union's publicly boasted military penetration of the Western Hemisphere in Castro Cuba is many things, apart from the most insolent menace to the new world that the United States has ever tolerated.

It destroys forever the airy assurances of pseudo-liberals that "revolutionary movements" are fine things, indeed—so long as they involve leftwingers and not rightwingers.

It places a terrible responsibility before history upon all those Americans who cheered Fidel Castro on in Cuba long past the point where it was plain that he was transplanting the evil fungus of armed international communism to within 90 miles of our Florida coastline.

UNMASKS COMMUNISM

It bankrupts the whole evangelistic theory, parroted with religious fervor, that communism results from capitalistic injustice, et cetera, and will vanish at once, given the spreading of sufficient welfarism among the masses. Cuba, before Castro, was never half so underprivileged as dozens of other lands which have nevertheless never sought the lethal embrace of Moscow.

It fully supports what has long been fully obvious—that communism, like Hitlerism before it, is a movement of bandit ferocity and cannot be explained by old-lady minds as simply springing from too little milk for the kiddies and too little free land for the workers and peasants.

It brings into the gravest question the practicality of the vast effort being made by the United States through the Alliance for Progress to cure all the ills of Latin America with economic aid. Foreign aid is a sound and splendid thing—when it is given to nations willing and able to use it for freedom's strength and openly and unashamedly against communism.

But the bulk of the more powerful Latin American nations, while avidly ready for our economic aid, repeatedly have refused to follow us in any total quarantine of Castro Cuba. It is fashionable to say that we, the United States, should never force our views upon the recipients of our aid. This is the line even when precisely our views are essential to maintain that freedom from foreign domination for which the Latins so endlessly clamor—especially those who have snuggled up closest to international communism.

And brought into question, too, is the very validity of the Organization of American States. This association of the nations of this hemisphere was created to prevent just the kind of foreign penetration which is and long has been so openly involved in Castro Cuba.

But an effective majority of the OAS has thus far been unwilling to take any fully rational step against Castro Cuba. The most ironic of all excuses is given by the nation closest in geography to us, Mexico. She has said that while she would like to help, she just can't find any precedent for it in international practice. There is a sour jest in this—for Mexico, of course, is famous for its scrupulous respect for both law and justice.

COURSE FOR UNITED STATES

So what is now left to the United States?

We should try one more time to persuade the Organization of American States to act in honesty and honor against the Soviet cancer in the Caribbean.

Failing this, we should raise a new collective military organization from among the minority who are our real friends in Latin America. Much the same was done in 1949, when we created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from within the United Nations when it became clear that the U.N. would do nothing about Soviet aggression in Europe.

And failing this, the United States should act alone to clear the Soviet military apparatus from Castro Cuba, come what might.

Utopia Is No Bargain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, while the House has before it so much legislation of a welfare nature looking to the care of our citizens from the cradle to the grave, it seems to me that we can learn a great deal from the experience of the English in this field.

The following article entitled "Utopia Is No Bargain" by Graham Hutton is very much to the point. Mr. Hutton is a British author but has lived in the United States for 5 years and is distinguished as an economist, lawyer, and sociologist who has followed the pitfalls, disappointments, and consequences of the British welfare state ever since it was attempted 15 years ago.

The article follows:

UTOPIA IS NO BARGAIN—BRITAIN'S CRADLE-TO-GRAVE WELFARE SCHEME EVOKES SOME SOBERING SECOND THOUGHTS ON STATE VERSUS PRIVATE INSURANCE

(By Graham Hutton)

The biggest domestic economic problem in Britain today is the financing of her welfare state out of taxes. Apart from compulsory education, the welfare state includes compulsory state insurance for every citizen for all health requirements, including dental and ophthalmic treatment, plus state insurance for workmen's compensation, unemployment and all kinds of benefits for incapacitation from work.

The self-employed are expected from unemployment insurance for the plain reason that they cannot be supervised in the hiring and firing of themselves. But they are not exempted from anything else. The retired have to pay for the services of the state's health service. Everybody who works for reward has to come under the compulsory state-systems for retirement pensions, health services and workmen's compensation. All doctors and medical specialists operating the

health service or any of its parts are paid directly by the state on the basis of the numbers of patients inscribed on their card indexes and of the treatments such clients get. Hospitals are run by regional or municipal boards for the state and under the supervision of the Ministry of Health. Employers are compelled by law not only to check off from their employee's pay envelopes the insurance tax such employees are due to pay, but also their state dues for the welfare state, to which the employer has to add his own contributions.

Accordingly the process is extremely costly and complicated for a nation with just under half its total population gainfully employed. The process is further confused by a rapidly growing proportion of people retired and retiring—15 percent next year, rising to as much as 20 percent by 1979. Most of these have to be kept by their younger, working fellows out of these latter workers' compulsory contributions to the state funds for pensions, plus those from their employers.

INFLATION-FED COSTS GOING UP AND UP

As inflation pursues its career in Britain no matter what government is in power, the welfare state and its financing become more and more of a built-in, inflation-fed, inflation-feeding process. Taxes and levies can never come down, can only go up more and more, as the state—no matter who is in power—finds the costs ever rising for doctors and dentists, nurses and equipment, buildings and drugs, fuels and civil servants, to say nothing of the growing number of pensioners.

This process was not foreseen during the Second World War when the coalition government asked Sir William (now Lord) Beveridge to make his now famous report on social security. Lord Beveridge has since castigated successive Socialist and Tory governments for not observing two cardinal features of his report; namely, his insistence on making the health and other social security services actuarially and properly funded, and secondly, on avoidance of what has since become called "the democratic fallacy." That fallacy is the building of the welfare state's benefits into the political party structure, so that the two major parties vie with each other at the hustings in bidding for the votes of all welfare state beneficiaries.

These beneficiaries are (a) pensioners and near-pensioners (very important in an aging nation like Britain); (b) industrial working men and women (very important in a country where women at grandmotherly ages form larger and larger proportions of the working population); (c) young wives starting families; (d) all parents of children under working age (for the free school meals and other benefits, or family allowances to second and other children, etc.); and finally—whenever unemployment goes or stays up—(e) the workpeople afraid of losing jobs or of not getting them back.

Lord Beveridge and others, including this writer, pointed out more than 15 years ago (before the complete health service came into force and doctors were nationalized along with all hospitals) that if inflation persisted along with abandonment of the famous Beveridgian principle of actuarial funding, any and every government would inevitably find itself forced to outbid the opposition in a Dutch auction for welfare state benefits. Worse, whoever won that auction would have to find the funds to redeem electoral promises not out of contributions alone, but also out of the broad mass of the people's taxes.

Exactly that has regularly come to pass. Government is driven to all sorts of devices and strategems to "raise the wind," both within and outside the regular finances of the welfare state. The Socialists began in 1950–51 only 3 years after the late Aneurin Bevan had imposed the health service and its administration upon the doctors. The Socialists made people pay a small sum for each prescription, though they had originally got all things ostensibly "free" against contributions and taxes. This has been carried further by Tories, who have even been driven to invoke old wartime regulations about the nation's military security to conclude state bulk buying of drugs from Italy and elsewhere, in order to force down the private enterprise companies' prices for their products used in the health service.

SYSTEM WOULD COST UNITED STATES $55 BILLION

Americans can gage the extent of the fiscal problems of a blanket state compulsory system of all insurance—retirement, sickness, workmen's compensation, unemployment—if I put the proportional British problems in terms of America's national income and Federal budget. If America made all these insurance compulsory and Federal as Britain has done for nearly 15 years, excluding all education, it would require something like one-tenth of the national income, or, say, $55 billion in taxes and contributions. Moreover it would have to be administered federally and centrally. That would mean unwinding the various 50 States' welfare and other relief services, apart from education. Benefits under a Federal scheme would be administered so that they did not admit of wide variations in separate States, not only as pensions, but also as other like benefits under insurance for health services, unemployment, sickness, workmen's accidents, etc.

British Governments have found their greatest difficulties not in "raising the wind" for an evergrowing welfare state's benefits. Britishers grouse but pay up, are honest on the whole; they are patient as a people, they positively like queuing and traffic jams, and they never get together to protest to Parliament about anything. British Governments have found their main problems in keeping the terribly complex list of separate benefits roughly in step during the inflation.

First the swelling army of retired folk acted up, and demanded redress, whipped up by the opposition, of course. That was a cinch politically. No one gets the vote till he is 21; the youthful proportion of the nation was not growing so fast. But we keep our vote till death relieves us of it; and the old were—and still are—increasing at a breakneck pace compared to the working population. Second, immediately the pensioners got a bit extra out of taxes, up the Government had to put taxes and contributions on the working people, the employers, and the general body of taxpayers. This fed the fire of inflation. So third, the expectant mothers, the poor receiving state relief (half of all state pensioners got some additional public relief or other), the sick, and the unemployed had to have their benefits raised. This in turn drove the Government in the next budget to raise contributions and taxes further. And so the merry partnership of inflation with rising benefits under the welfare state forged ahead. No one dared to reduce, curtail, or hold a line on anything, for fear of losing the next election. The welfare state inexorably came to take more and more of both the central and the local budgets, till it now takes one-third of all taxes, levies, and compulsory state contributions and local taxes combined. Indeed, it takes over one-tenth of the national income, and over half as much again as the nation spends on defense. And all this excludes education costs.

No wonder Britain has had repeated crises in her balances of payments, in her export trade, which comes from private employers who have to compete abroad, and in her defense costs in other currencies.

WORKERS NOW INDULGE IN "GOLD DIGGING"

Compulsory state insurance for everything also has other aspects which have gradually come to disturb an increasing number of Britishers. Take a few examples. First, workmen's compensation. At the outset this was expected to be based on "the contributory principle." That is, it was expected that the blanketing of every workman in the nation by compulsory state insurance would supersede that workman's right at common law to proceed against his employers in the courts for compensation for injuries or incapacitation caused by something "during the normal course of his employment." Nothing of the kind has happened. He is covered by the state's insurance and continues to invoke the courts in his aid. Worse even than libel law, workmen's compensation cases have become what is known in Britain as a gold-digging operation."

Or take another case: fringe benefits from employers. Many American employers, and most British ones, expected from the British welfare state that its all-comprehensive, compulsory insurances would supersede trades unions' demands for fringe benefits. But what happened? The official British Trade Unions Congress, the purely advisory confederation of all important trade unions, has asked all its member unions to try out employers' reactions to an extra, additional system of sick-pay benefits.

Another example: pensions. The first flat-rate retirement pension system of the state became increasingly hard to finance under inflation. So the Tory government brought in a sharp, smart-seeming, overriding, second-tier system. From April of last year, 1961, employees were forced either (a) to switch their employees into a new graduated state pension system in which, for finance purposes, the higher paid employees subsidized relatively higher pensions for the lower paid employees, thus losing part of their own actuarial benefits, or else (b) to "contract them out" of the new state pension scheme by initiating a private supplementary pension scheme of their own with an insurance company, and after approval by the internal revenue.

To the surprise of the Government and the Ministry of Health and national insurance officials, the number of employees contracted out quickly rose to more than 20 percent of total employees eligible for the state scheme, and is still slowly rising.

This result arose from two interesting phenomena; namely, (1) the quick dawning on employers that private insurance could offer better retirement bargains as pensions than the state's schemes; and (2) the equally quick realization by both employers and employed of this paradox: the better an employee the higher his pay, the higher therefore his "graduated" contribution, but the rate of graduated pension he eventually got would have a ceiling on it no matter what he earned during his working life, and no matter what he had paid into the state's coffers during that working lifetime.

The combination of (1) and (2) compelled both farseeing employers and better paid employees top refer contracting out of the new State pensions. Further, they led the private insurance companies to initiate all sorts of new and more attractive retirement pension schemes for private insurees, both corporate and individual, as for example, "dynamic pensions" rising with inflation after retirement, supplementary pension plans for employers on their better paid employees' behalf, etc.

BRITISHERS SEEKING PRIVATE SERVICES

But nothing has been quite as striking an implied criticism of the welfare state as the rapid rise in the number of Britishers—companies, other institutions and individuals—who, while paying their compulsory levies for welfare state benefits, decline to

make use of some or all of its state services, even including state education. In addition to paying for others' benefits, they subscribe big sums out of taxed incomes in order once more to obtain private medical and hospital or other health services, or private education. Their total remains small as a percentage of the entire nation, the mass of which (as in all nations) remains ignorant, indigent or indolent in public affairs. But in the 14½ years since the health service alone has been in force, this minority has multiplied more than tenfold, its rise has accelerated in the past 5 years, and more and more private schemes and services are springing up. As for private education, there are longer waiting lists for private schools, and more such schools springing up, too.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT "DYING ON ITS FEET"

Another important social, political and administrative side effect of all this compulsory bureaucratized, centralized, and flatly standardized state welfare is its debilitating effect on local government, local patriotism, charity and personal voluntary services of all kinds. The cry is heard everywhere in Britain today that local government in the counties and municipalities is dying on its feet. Central government and its armies of officials have overridden what in America would be States and cities (and their citizens) rights. Indeed, the sugegstion is seriously and now more frequently being made that Britain needs more of a federal; less—not more—of a centralized, system of government; more—not less—powers given to counties and municipalities. Similarly and for much the same reasons, the cry is heard that Britishers need a custodian of the custodians, an ombudsman (like Scandinavia) to safeguard the individual citizen's liberties against government and its officials, a tribunal of tribunals to which the citizen or aggrieved company or other body can bring its pleas—as the equity court arose in the middle ages alongside the king's courts of law—for justice and fairplay in the welter of new state-agency bodies, tribunals, courts and bureaus. The complaints about poor state services in Britain range from the railways to hospitals; from the doctors and dentists (who fear for their professions' standards) to the universities; from businessmen and insurance companies (who, left to themselves, conclusively prove that they can offer insurees better bargains) to trade unions (who begin to see that they could drive better bargains across the board with their employers than their members get from the state).

In all this mixup, governments twist and turn. They try to extricate themselves from the toils in which the Socialists entangled them in those confused years immediately after the war, when the British version of the welfare state was faultily financed and the ensuing inflation thereby aggravated.

BRITISH ERRORS HOLD A LESSON FOR THE UNITED STATES

At the present time, therefore, thinking Britishers in many walks of public life look with great interest—and sympathy—on the current disputes in America about "extensions of social security." The Britishers interest stems not from any American disput in principle. It stems from the natural hope that Americans will not simply copy the British systems word for word and method for method. Why should Americans repeat the costly errors built in by the British a decade and a half ago, and now becoming painfully obvious even to British Socialists and trade unionists?

The British economy has had to be damped down by Government action in order to force Britons to export more. The stock exchange has had a slump like Wall Street. "Profitless prosperity" stares every British employer (and trade union bargainer) in the face. So anything that would lower the crushing weight of British taxes on companies and on every joint man-and-wife income over $4,500 would spell an increase in British competitiveness, an improvement in Britain's ability to finance defense expenditures overseas or loans to underdeveloped countries, and a lowering in unit costs. Today much the same problems touch America. It seems an odd moment to talk of adding to costs, levies, taxes, and officials, all round.

MANY ASSUMPTIONS NOW PROVED TO BE FALSE

Perhaps the most obvious error in the financing—or nonfinancing—of the British social security system since 1948 was the universal, all-party, unquestioning assumption that if the centralized state authorities provided comprehensive "cradle to grave" insurances of all kinds and administered them by officials, the citizens so insured would (a) get materially better benefits, (b) would continue to get them no matter what new benefits private enterprise insurers could offer them, (c) abandon claims for social security and other benefits against employers, (d) cease to demand new "fringe benefits," and (e) view the state's system as something outside party politics. Instead, the very reverse has occurred; each assumption has been proved false.

Thus, the state has seen the social security benefits become the sport of rival, outbidding politicians. To hold or win votes, the finances of the system have been enormously and uneconomically expanded, and inflation has been chosen as the least obvious, least painful way out.

Inflation in turn has made the voter suspicious of all politics and parties and brought Parliament into disesteem. It has also made insurance companies and the public more aware of what private enterprise can do better than the state can.

The present and future working population has been overloaded with taxes, levies, and other fiscal burdens, in order to pay existing and immediately forthcoming pensioners, and can hardly throw the burdens off now.

The trade unions have begun to demand, under full employment, "all this and heaven too"—all the state social security plus all the American employers' and employees' privately agreed fringe benefits as well. Local governments, municipalities, and private insurance companies have seen workmen's compensation turned into gold digging operations, while the courts have complained but can do nothing to remedy abuses.

The upshot in Britain has been that a thinking minority—including the leading newspapers and Members of Parliament—now demands radical revision of the welfare state services, so that better paid citizens should be permitted to do more for themselves, thus setting free more of the state's standardized flat-rate services for the small needy minority alone.

It is disturbing to at least one Britisher (the writer, who has lived and worked on both sides of the Atlantic) to see—in education, public health services, social security and a lot else—that just when one of our two nations becomes aware of its past errors in these fields, it goes kind of haywire and copies the earlier errors of the other. Each of us, British and Americans, in education and social security and much else, seem at this moment to be out to duplicate the earlier errors of the other country. We British are going all-out for technical, scientific education at all costs, particularly at the cost of the humanities, on the plea that you Americans have done so much better out of technical education. Just at the same moment you are going all out to develop the humanities at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and California Institue of Technology, etc.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE APPEALS TO BRITISH

So with the welfare state and social security, the law and practice of workmen's compensation, local government versus centralized government, pensions, etc. Just when we British are getting worried out of our normal apathy by the awful financial, fiscal, and administrative blunders we made a decade and a half ago, you Americans look like repeating some, if not all, of them.

On the other hand we British—employers, trade union leaders, insurance companies, local and municipal authorities—are laboring and lumbering along under a deadweight of flat-rate state-imposed standards and handicaps. Your hitherto private-enterprise, private-bargaining, fringe-benefit, voluntary-associational systems seem most attractive to us, just when you look like tearing up a good deal of them to copy us.

I would conclude, out of my detailed knowledge of our British welfare state system during the past 15 years, with two warnings to my American friends in this field. First, remember the old German saying: Gegen die Dummheit kämpfen die Götter selbst vergebens—"Against stupidity the gods themselves fight in vain."

Secondly, don't build stupidities into a governmental and political system. Once built in they are harder and harder to unpick as time goes on, and the structure itself looks more and more like collapsing with them.

In a time of economic uncertainties and risks above all, a country needs to heed such warnings. The foundations of democracy and the four freedoms lie in personal initiative, responsibilities, and enterprise; in the voluntary, not the compulsory, prinicple.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BROCKTON, MASS.,
June 27, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have written to Hon. HOWARD SMITH chairman, House Rules Committee, also my own Congressman, requesting support of your House Resolution 211. Also I have written my three Representatives to have the President declare the week in July that was voted by Congress as Captive Nations Week.

Thank you, sir.

Yours sincerely,
Mrs. GLADYS M. KELLEHER.

IRVINGTON, N.J.,
June 18, 1962.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I respectfully urge your continued support of the House Resolution 211.

Very truly yours,
IWANNA KALYNYCZ.
LUBOMYR E. KALYNYCZ.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
July 16, 1962.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your favorable action is hereby requested in favor of the House Resolution 211.

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. EUGENE CEHELSKY.

JULY 14, 1962.

EDITOR,
Kenosha News,
Kenosha, Wis.

DEAR MR. BROWN: For the past 3 years, pursuant to an act of Congress passed in 1959, the President of the United States has proclaimed the last week of July as Captive Nations Week, when Americans are asked to work and pray for the early restoration of these enslaved people to their historic freedom and national independence. Thirty-nine resolutions are now pending in Congress to create a permanent Congressional Captive Nations Committee, which by public hearings and otherwise would exploit the spirit of Captive Nations Week the year round.

Opinions have been stated and printed by the State Department and Presidential advisers, no doubt reflecting the thinking of the President as well, that prove that they are anxious to do away with our Captive Nations Week and to kill the pending congressional resolutions. For more information on this, those interested can write to the two Congressmen mentioned below (care of House Office Building, Washington, D.C.).

The objections raised by our New Frontiersmen are of such nature that it is hard to believe they could be made by responsible men with any depth of knowledge of the conditions within the Soviet colonial world. We continue to have the same type of thinking in our leaders as we had during the last 17 years of the cold war—during which the Soviets have made most of their gains. We refuse to succeed. We even refuse to worry them a little.

Our best and unused weapon in the cold war is the 23 captive nations held by the Communists, containing more than 1 billion people. To Khrushchev, they mean trouble, pressure, resistance, insecurity, and ultimate rebellion. The hatred of these people for the slavemasters of the Kremlin and their burning desire to be free from Communist tyranny is the best weapon in our arsenal, but our leaders, prompted by the State Department, refuse to use it. The official policy of the New Frontier continues to be one of appeasement and refusal to take any affirmative action to roll back the Communist tide in any part of the globe (examples: Cuba, Katanga, Laos).

Congressmen EDWARD J. DERWINSKI and DANIEL J. FLOOD are two of the many Congressmen working against great pressure to establish a special Committee on Captive Nations (Congressman FLOOD'S H. Res. 211). This resolution would provide information to deal with Red propaganda concerning Western imperialism, pointing out the true facts that imperialism and colonialism as practiced by the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe far exceed any abuses which could be charged to Western Nations. The nationalistic spirit of self-determination, culture, and heritage of these peoples would be continually marshaled and encouraged by this committee. Our representatives in the U.N. would be forced to provide the long needed exposé of imperialism as practiced in the Communist world.

There is no better way to turn world opinion against the Soviet Union. The right of self-determination is the issue that stirs all of Africa and Asia today. It has been historically a part of American doctrine. We should exploit it to the fullest, at every possible opportunity, with regard to the Communists. Our representatives in the U.N. must demand full discussion of Soviet colonialism and point out again and again that not one of these nations entered the Communist orbit voluntarily and that these once-free nations are now held in bondage and systematically exploited more ruthlessly than any other colonial empire of modern times.

If we take the offensive on this issue of Captive Nations and use it to answer every Soviet thrust, we will be hitting the Kremlin in its most sensitive area. We will also be giving the people of the Soviet slave colonies encouragement in their efforts to preserve their heritage and their hopes of eventually regaining their independence. This can be a powerful force on our side in the important area of central Europe.

Write today of your support for a permanent Captive Nations Committee, to your Congressmen, Senators, and President. For a free copy of Captive Nations—Key to Victory in the Cold War, by the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, write to the undersigned.

JOHN DOSUS.

KENOSHA, WIS.

SOUTH PLAINFIELD, N.J.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I, Roman Manovilov, a Cossack by origin, respectfully urge you to support favorably the enactment of the Flood resolution calling for a Special House Captive Nations Committee.

Very truly yours,
ROMAN MANOVILOV.

Experiment Stations Research Facilities

SPEECH
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12712 to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations is a most worthwhile program and I am gratified that the House has passed this legislation.

The bill provides for the future appropriation of Federal funds on a matching basis to aid the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other facilities for agricultural research in State experiment stations.

As a member of the Research and Extension Subcommittee I am well aware of the great value that research at State experiment stations has had through the years to the well-being of our citizens. Washington State University which is located in my own congressional district has been among the leading universities in the Nation in agricultural experiment station work. As our population continues to increase, the work at these experiment stations must keep pace with a continuing sound and balanced research effort. This bill is needed to modernize and channel our research efforts toward further progress.

The Age of Make-Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, consistency is a rare virtue, especially when sought for in the conduct of our State Department policies.

As the United Nations General Assembly approaches the opening of its fall session, consistency would be a virtue that could be well applied in that body.

The unrealistic and contradictory behavior of our State Department is decribed in a very interesting manner by the Chicago Daily Tribune in an editorial which appeared in its Monday, September 3 edition entitled "The Age of Make-Believe," which I ask leave to insert into the RECORD at this point.

The editorial follows:

THE AGE OF MAKE-BELIEVE

The following statement, we have learned, was made last month by a European political leader:

"All kinds of interference whatsoever by this or that power in the internal affairs of other countries are regarded by me as one of the main causes of the present international tension. * * * All sovereign nations have the right to establish whichever social system pleases them."

A clear reference, it would seem, to the half nelson grip in which the Soviet Union holds the satellite countries of Eastern Europe.

It does, indeed, refer to the satellite nations—Poland in particular. But Russia isn't the villain. The statement was aimed at the United States. It was made by the Communist boss of Poland, Mr. Gomulka, in an interview which he thought was going to be published in this country. When the interview was rejected as Communist propaganda, he had it printed in a Warsaw paper instead.

Just 2 weeks before this interview was published, our Ambassador to Poland, John Moors Cabot, pleaded with Congress not to prohibit aid to Communist countries. To forsake Poland, he said, would cause "a drastic fall in the temperature of our relations" and "would be taken as a deliberate slap at the Polish Government."

Mr. Cabot was only echoing the sentiments of his bosses, President Kennedy, Secretary of State Rusk, and Under Secretary Ball, all of whom have said, in effect, that we must keep on sending help to Communist and neutral countries even if we go broke in the process.

Congress passed the aid bill, after some moralizing against helping the Communists, but it is we who end up with the slap. Why? Because, as Mr. Gomulka has said before, our aid is small and carries political implications, and the negotiations leading up to it are arduous. And because, he added last month, "the U.S. Congress, year after year, passes resolutions calling for the so-called liberation of the nations of eastern Europe."

Mr. Gomulka's ingratitude has earned him an additional bonus this year. Mr. Kennedy broke precedent by declining to proclaim a "Captive Nations Week" in July. We must not, apparently, risk offending people like Mr. Gomulka.

It is as preposterous of Mr. Gomulka to pose as the freely chosen leader of an independent regime, as it is of Khrushchev to pose as the champion of peace, or Nehru to pose as the enemy of war and colonialism (while he invades Goa and refuses to allow a plebiscite in Kashmir), or of the United Nations to proclaim the inviolable right of self-determination (while denying it to Katanga). Maybe, as Hitler said, the more grotesquely you distort the truth, the more easily you can fool people. But why must so many of the gullible victims be in our State Department?

Look Out, Venus, Here We Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WM. J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the headlines of editorials in some newspapers frequently leave the reader in considerable doubt as to what is the content of the editorial. Not so with the Kansas City Star of Kansas City, Mo. An excellent illustration of this point is the heading of a recent editorial in the Star: "Look Out, Venus, Here We Come." Not only is the heading of the editorial in the nature of an eyecatcher, but the content is most factual and objective. It points out the Russians were only able to get as near as 65,000 miles from Venus, and that while, admittedly, they may lead us in one aspect of the space race, from an overall and scientific point of view the United States is clearly ahead.

All of us on the House Science and Astronautics Committee are, for the time being, given reassurance from the use of orientation motors which can be fired selectively, and by the use of certain combinations, change the course of *Mariner II*. Fortunately, these midcourse corrections do not require large amounts of energy. We believe that there may be a misconception by some because of certain press reports that this change of course procedure is an emergency measure rather than a measure which has been part of the plan all along.

The specific details of the reorientation use small reaction motors working in opposition to the velocity of the spacecraft proceeding on its initial course. In other words, these motors would give the spacecraft a slightly sidewise position and thus change the general course. It should be kept in mind, the spacecraft has to cover 180 million miles in its actual course to Venus in order to cover the direct line of sight distance of 36 million miles. Accordingly, it can be appreciated that a small amount of energy applied early in the flight can make a large correction before the full distance is completed.

Those who may have a disposition to snipe at our space effort should take note of the accomplishment to date of *Mariner II*, and on the other hand, those who have always realized the importance of our space program should enjoy a new pride of achievement. Yes, look out Venus, planet Earth's emissary is heading your way.

The editorial of August 28 follows:

LOOK OUT, VENUS, HERE WE COME

The United States has scored in space, and scored big.

With a little luck in the back-seat driving scheduled for next Tuesday, *Mariner II* will be nudged into a course that will take it within 10,000 miles of the mysterious planet Venus. On December 14 Venus may be a little less mysterious. Earthbound man will have his first clues to the nature of his neighbors.

To be sure, we must still qualify the claim to success. It is a long way to Venus—180 million miles by the roundabout route of *Mariner II*. There is an old law of the launching pad which says that if anything can possibly go wrong, it will. It is not the part of pessimism to suggest that the law applies also to interplanetary travel. The fantastic spacecraft is tumbling through an unknown void and no one can guess at the perils which may beset it along the way.

Mariner II, on its flight into the unknown, will report back important information—information that is absolutely essential if man, himself, is ever to set forth on a similar journey. Once in the vicinity of Venus, the flying laboratory should gather data on the cloud-shrouded planet.

Already, however, *Mariner II* has told us something about the overall capabilities of the United States in the space age. The Russians' single shot at Venus came within 65,000 miles. But there is only mathematical proof of the near-miss, for the radios of the Soviet Venus probe were dead long before it reached the planet. Since that shot on February 12, 1961, Soviet scientists have concentrated on man in space. They have done well and admittedly they lead in this one aspect of the space race. But from an overall and scientific point of view, the United States is clearly ahead.

Whatever may happen next Tuesday—or on December 14—the Venus shot is a fine boost to the morale of the American people. We probably needed it. Some were a bit shaken by the twin orbiting of the cosmonauts. Certainly we hope that those who belittle the whole space effort will not attempt to minimize the meaning of *Mariner II*.

We do not minimize it. Indeed, we stand in awe at this daring assault on the cosmos which has beckoned man but always rebuffed him. Tonight, look out on the brightness of the evening star and know that the knowledge-seeking emissary of planet earth has a rendezvous with history.

Wyoming Valley's Tourism Treasury Is a Priceless One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I submit another in a series of articles on the early history of Wyoming Valley that has been appearing in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent. This particular feature appeared in that publication on August 12, 1962.

The article follows:

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Sunday Independent, Aug. 12, 1962]

WYOMING VALLEY'S TOURISM TREASURY IS A PRICELESS ONE—ABRAHAM PIKE—DESERTER AND PATRIOT

How Pike and a Sergeant Boyd, who also deserted from the British Army in Canada, got to Wyoming Valley, or their reason for selecting this frontier area in fleeing from British Army service, is not known.

Both were in Wilkes-Barre less than a year after the Battle of Bunker Hill (June 17, 1775), but neither drew community attention until the hectic days of June 1778, when word was received of a possible attack by British and Indian forces—an attack that did come and ended in the Battle and Massacre of Wyoming.

TRAINED MILITIA

There is nothing glowing to be gleaned from the early records other than Pike and Boyd "made themselves useful in aiding to train the militia"—because of their experience as professional soldiers in crack British regiments.

That Pike took part in the Battle of Wyoming is a matter of record, but more must be mentioned about the part he played.

When the line of battle was formed at 3 p.m. on that fateful day, July 3, 1778, Pvt. Abraham Pike was stationed with the 6th Continental Line on the extreme right.

Lt. Col. Zebulon Butler, commander in chief, eager to ascertain the exact whereabouts of the British and Indian forces, rode along the line to seek a volunteer for this service.

Pvt. Abraham Pike offered his service—knowing that capture would mean death as a deserter—and was accepted.

He went forward, found the enemy gathered in considerable numbers in the immediate vicinity of Fort Wintermute, and, without being discovered, returned to report the situation to Lieutenant Colonel Butler, who gave the signal to advance.

Private Pike survived the battle and massacre.

DID NOT FLEE

Unlike many of the settlers, who fled from the valley, Pike determined to stay and meet any Indian resistance head on in his desire to establish a home for himself and a wife.

This he did.

Not only was the hamlet of Pike's Creek named for him, but the beautiful stream bearing the same name and Pike's Creek Reservoir.

He earned the reputation of a fierce Indian fighter and some of the other settlers felt that his intense hatred was keeping the redskins stirred up.

But Pike, a married man and father by 1780, has established a home and farm along the creek to bear his name, despite the ever present danger of marauding Indians whom he defeated at all turns.

For a time after the Sullivan expedition and the sound defeat of the Indians, there was comparative peace.

But Abraham Pike was not through fighting and outwitting redskins.

CAPTURED BY INDIANS

It was March 28, 1780, when Asa Upson and a boy, Jonah Rogers, who were making sugar on the Plymouth Flats, were suddenly surrounded by Indians and captured. Upson was killed and Rogers was carried off.

The Indians then made their way to the Back Mountain home of Abraham Pike where they surprised him and his wife while they were making sugar in a field. They made camp and helped themselves to Pike's sugar.

The next day, the Indians proceeded to what is now Orange where they captured Moses Van Campen, his aged father and Peter Pence. They killed the elder Van Campen.

Before going to Orange the Indians stripped and painted Mrs. Pike and allowed her to return to her infant, which they had bundled and thrown on the roof of the Pike cabin in the morning when they broke camp.

The prisoners then were led to the mouth of Wysox Creek where they made a daring escape.

STORY OF ESCAPE

The boy, Jonah Rogers, told this story of the escape, which was recorded by military authorities:

"In the afternoon of the day before we reached the place of encampment we came to a stream. I was tired and fatigued with the journey; my feet were sore and I was just able to proceed. Pike told the chief of the gang that he would carry me over on his shoulders. The old chief, in a gruff voice, said: 'Well.' Pike whispered in my ear as we were crossing the stream: 'Jonah, don't close your eyes tonight. When they sleep take the knife from the chief and cut the cords with which I am bound.' I was the only one of the prisoners who was not bound every night—the old chief took me under his blanket. The nights were raw and cold, and though protected in this way I thought I should perish. This much of the project was communicated by Pike to the other prisoners. Toward nightfall they halted, kindled a fire, partook of their evening meal, and were soon stretched on the ground. In a few minutes the old chief was asleep, and in the course of half an hour the savages were all snoring; but Pike knew his friends were awake, from the occasional half-suppressed cough.

"Pike was the nearest to me and not over 2 feet in distance. It was a terrific effort for me to make up my mind to perform my part of the business, for I knew that instant death would be the penalty in case of failure. But, as time passed on, and the snoring of the savages grew louder and louder, my courage seemed to gather new strength. I had noticed where the old chief lay down; the knife in the belt was on the side next to me. I peered out from under the blanket and I saw the embers of the fire still aglow and a partial light of the moon. I also saw the hands of Pike elevated. I thought the time had come, and these 2 hours of suspense I had passed were more terrible than all the rest of my life put together. I cautiously drew the knife from the scabbard in the chief's belt, and, creeping noiselessly out from under the blanket, I passed over to Pike and severed the cords from his hands."

USED TOMAHAWKS

"All was the silence of death save the gurging noise made by the savages in their sleep. Pike cut the cords that bound the other prisoners. We were all now upon our feet. The first thing was to remove the guns of the Indians—the work for us to do was to be done with tomahawks and knives. The guns were carefully removed out of sight, and each of us had a tomahawk. Van Campen placed himself over the chief and Pike over another. I was too young for the encounter and stood aloof. I saw the tomahawks of Pike and Van Campen flash in the dim light of the half-smoldering flames; the next moment the crash of two terrible blows followed in quick succession, when 7 of the 10 arose in a state of momentary stupefaction and bewilderment, and then came the hand-to-hand conflict in the contest for life. Though our enemy were without arms, they were not disposed to yield. Pence now seized one of the guns, fired and brought one down; four were now killed and two dangerously wounded, when the others, with terrific yells, fled at the report of the gun. As they ran, Van Campen threw his tomahawk and buried it in the shoulder of one of them. This Indian, with a terrible scar on his shoulder blade, I saw years after when he acknowledged how it came there."

Pike returned to his wife and child to spend the remainder of his life in the neighborhood to be named for him.

There are no Pike descendants.

Following Pike, Nehemiah Ide and Jeremiah Brown in 1801 became the first settlers in what is now Lehman Township.

Pakistan International Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Ayub Khan, President of the Republic of Pakistan, disclosed last week that he would pay an official state visit to the United States during the middle of September. I understand that he will be visiting with the President at the White House for conferences at that time. His visit brings to mind the great cooperation between our two countries these many years.

When the President of Pakistan visited the United States a few years ago, he was given a parade up Broadway and many Americans had the pleasure of meeting firsthand this unique gentleman. More recently, when Mrs. John F. Kennedy, wife of the President, visited Pakistan, good will was continued when she flew aboard the Pakistan International Airlines' jet to Karachi.

The President of Pakistan will arrive aboard a Pakistan International Airlines plane for his visit and has been greatly responsible for the establishment and growth of this friendly government airline, which flies not only to our eastern neighbor, but also stops in London, Rome, Frankfurt and many other cities of the West.

Pakistan and the United States have always been close friends. As a matter of fact, aboard each Pakistan International Airlines jetplane is shown a first-run American movie. On every flight both first-class and tourist-class passengers see first-run American films at no charge. The food, of course, is a combination of American, European, and Far Eastern, depending on the personal tastes of the passenger. Small gifts of perfume are even given out, and the stewardesses are dressed in the native costumes of Pakistan.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have had occasions to meet with some of the executives of the Pakistan International Airlines, as well as their Government executives. They are a most progressive group. Their courtesy, cooperation and friendliness have been most important in the relationship between our two countries.

Abroad their planes they offer almost everything, from haute cuisine hors d 'oeuvres to flaming desserts. Their Boeing 707, Boeing 720–B, Super Constellations, are American airplanes with Pakistan crews and still another sign of friendly cooperation. Their service links New York with London, Rome, Geneva, Frankfurt, Beirut, Teheran, Karachi, Bombay, Dacca and Delhi, and is helping to bring the United States closer to our friends from the Far East, and our friends in Europe as well.

I want to take this opportunity to personally welcome Pakistan International Airlines to the United States. They have recently opened new offices at 608 Fifth Avenue in New York City and we all wish them well in this endeavor.

Welcome to America.

The California Water Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, a very distinguished Californian, Mr. William E. Warne, director, department of water resources and administrator of the Resources Agency of California, delivered an outstanding address before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress during their last session in Washington, D.C. Because of its importance to our State, as well as to the Nation, I am inserting it in the RECORD that others may have the benefit of the information which it contains with reference to cooperation between a State and the Federal Government in water development.

THE CALIFORNIA WATER PROJECT

(By William E. Warne)

California today is in the midst of one of the largest water development programs so far undertaken. California is in the water business today for one essential reason: It has no alternative.

The search for solutions to California's water problems is not new. It has been in progress since the first State legislature met in 1850. The stream-gaging program was started then and is still going on. It has provided much of the basic data required to launch many water development programs.

Local agencies felt the pressing water need nearly 100 years ago. Early in the 20th century, cities such as Los Angeles and San Francisco were forced to search in far mountain valleys for new supplies.

Much of California's water supplies has been developed by local water districts. California adopted the district concept of water development with the passage of the Wright Act in 1887. This sparked an era that has seen more than 950 dams and reservoirs constructed in the State. The initiative of the irrigation districts alone has served to water more than half of the land presently irrigated in California.

Federal agencies also have played a big part in the water resources development in California. The Corps of Engineers has planned and built monumental navigation, flood control, debris control, and water storage projects in California.

The Central Valley project, originally conceived by the State, was adopted and constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation. It is one of several important reclamation projects in the State.

The Central Valley project was designed to supply water for irrigation and municipal supplies to improve navigation on the Sacramento River, to provide adequate stream flows to halt sea water intrusion in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, to control floods in the valley, to generate hydroelectric power, and to serve other purposes, such as providing expanded recreation facilities.

Water development then has not been lacking in California. But even with the imaginative and farsighted programs which have been carried out in the water field by many levels of government, water development has not kept pace with greatly increasing needs.

Except for a strip along the Pacific coast north of San Francisco, California is semiarid or outright desert. We are perhaps the first State to face immense population growth in an arid area.

California's population is now about 16 million and is increasing at the rate of more than half a million each year. There is every reason to believe this increase will continue for as long as we can now foresee.

We are blessed with much potentially good land and with a climate that provides the opportunity for a wonderful agriculture and a wonderful life. Water, however, must be supplied in order to sustain them.

California's great agricultural production, highest of all in crop and livestock value, comes 80 percent from irrigated land, yet the irrigated land is but 8 percent of the total area of the State.

Our main problem in California comes down to the fact that nature has not provided the right amount of water in the right places at the right times.

Well over 70 percent of the water of California is in the northern half of the State, while nearly 80 percent of the water requirements are in the southern half. Throughout the State, the bulk of rainfall occurs in a few winter months, while the summers are long and dry.

This year, for the first time in 4 years, we have come close to having a normal water year. For the past 3 years, we have experienced drought. Even a normal water year does not alleviate generally the water problems in California.

I mentioned earlier that California's earliest efforts to develop a workable State water plan resulted in what is now the great Central Valley project of the Federal Bureau of Reclamation. That project, however, was not conceived as a lasting answer to the State's growing water needs. Something more had to be done. The Bureau has expanded the original concept several times and, just to serve the Central Valley, may well expand it more in the future. But still, something more had to be done.

The California Legislature in 1946 authorized a complete study of the State's water resources, problems, and needs. This study disclosed that we have enough water in California for all of our needs for as long as we can reasonably foresee the future. The next step was to work out a general plan for comprehensive water development throughout the State. The California water plan, adopted in 1959, was the result.

The State water plan was not hastily put together or assembled on cloud 9. It was developed out of the accumulation of decades of basic data and surveys of needs and requirements.

Through the adoption of the plan, note that the State of California made no effort to preempt the field of construction and did not do so. The plan anticipates that local, private, and Federal agencies will build those units of the comprehensive plan that fall into their programs and are of sufficient interest to them to warrant their efforts.

The comprehensive plan very likely will never be completed because it is in effect without end. Some of the projects are a long, long way in the future, beyond our ability to see plainly all needs and all possibilities of satisfying them. Therefore, like a camera, it has placed the nearer objects in much sharper focus than the farther ones. The plan is flexible and subject to continued refinement. But it exists and it is useful, especially as a guide to what needs to be done next and how to avoid doing an expedient thing now that will stand in the way of doing a much more important thing later.

By adopting this plan, the State recognized that it must assume a leading role in the coordination of its own comprehensive water development. It recognized that the State itself, must finance and build essential elements of the plan that lie outside the programs of other agencies, local or Federal, private or public.

Immediately following the decision, the present comprehensive State water project was authorized. California needed this project. The project was completely out of the purview of any existing Federal agency. It was beyond the capability of any local agency.

The project that California needed to meet recognized requirements for the next 30 years, was broader than a comprehensive river basin project, bigger than the Central Valley. It was interregional. It was transmountain. It was multibasin. It was; in a word, a statewide project.

The State water project is now being started and it is all of these things I have said of it because California herself occupies more than one region, is not encompassed by any one river basin, is divided north and south and twice east and west by mountain ranges. Therefore, the State alone can provide the unifying element to resolve statewide water problems.

That we intend to cooperate with the Federal Government is evident in the very structure of our program. The San Luis project, a key feature of both the State water project and the Central Valley project, will be financed, built and operated jointly by California and the Federal Government. This is cooperation at its highest level. The Oroville Dam will be financed 22 percent by the Corps of Engineers up to a total of $85 million, this representing flood control values.

Where do we stand then with this project today?

California voted $1.75 billion in bonds and added about $300 million of water funds from offshore oil royalties to finance the project. Water users are signing contracts to repay the costs.

We are actually delivering water through facilities of the State water project. Eight days ago in Livermore Valley, in the heart of northern California, we began to service an area of need through the first reaches of the South Bay Aqueduct.

Further north, work has begun at Oroville Dam and Reservoir, a complex which will include the largest zoned-fill dam in the world. At Oroville, relocation of highways and railroads is virtually completed and work on the first of two diversion tunnels is under way. We have called for bids on the main embankment, which will tower 735 feet above the streambed, and we expect construction to begin on this by the fall of the year.

Above Oroville we have completed Frenchman Dam, one of five small dams which will be used for recreational and water supply purposes in Plumas County in the northern part of the State.

The San Luis project, now that the contract between the Bureau and the State covering the joint facilities has passed review of the Congress, is about to go ahead. Actual construction will begin early in 1963.

We have now signed water service contracts with five districts throughout California, for a total of 1,800,000 acre-feet. The completed project, we estimate, will have a firm annual yield of approximately 4 million acre-feet. So you can see that we are close to making the project pay for itself, and this early in our contract negotiation schedule.

We are busy now with final negotiations for rights-of-way all along the project. We are working out final alinements for the aqueduct that will cross the vast San Joaquin Valley and bridge the Tehachapi Mountains into southern California.

We have included $130 million for small local units, usually in the watersheds of origin, and have financed the first few of these, they to be built by local districts.

We have set 1972 as the year when we expect to deliver project water in the south at Perris Reservoir in Riverside County. We expect to meet the schedule. Having done so we expect to shift water distances of 750 miles north to south from areas of plenty to areas of scarcity. The project will be used to capacity by 1990 and additional conservation works will have been required by then on north coastal streams. Plans are under way to be ready with projects on the Eel or Trinity Rivers by 1975 or 1980 for this purpose.

The key to California's present situation is that our State, faced with extraordinary growth and skyrocketing needs, has taken the plunge. We have gone all the way in. We are pledged to bring forth statewide solutions, using all the resources available to us, including our own.

We are not trying to elevate the State over the Nation. We are simply endeavoring to follow the American tenet in the democratic way. We are trying to do for ourselves the water tasks that we need to have done and that are peculiar to our State and to this time. The task of building California has necessitated the undertaking now of the State water project. It is as simple as that.

I hope other States and the Federal Government will understand our problems and sympathize with us as we move to solve them. Some precedents are being established. I am proud to be a part of the administration of Governor Brown who has had the vision and the fortitude to tackle this job. The project is worth building for California.

Medicare in England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney, S.C., Ledger, of September 4, 1962:

MEDICARE IN ENGLAND

National health service in England goes very much farther than President Kennedy's proposed "medicare" would in this country. But the people in England, including the doctors, or at least most of the latter, are well pleased with the British plan. That is

what a young Britisher, David Jennings, a native of Canterbury, who is a guest in a Cheraw home, told the Cheraw Chronicle in a discussion of a comparison of the two plans.

Here is what Mr. Jennings said in an article he wrote for the Chronicle:

"To an Englishman who has lived with the national health service since 1948, it would seem inconceivable that anyone could build a convincing argument against it. But one is inclined to forget the different circumstances which surrounds both cases. Britain is a country in which socialism is popular. Indeed, at this very moment, the Socialists are the favorites to win the forthcoming general elections.

"In America one could quite truthfully say the opposite is the case. Socialism here from my experience is almost a dirty word or at least treated with extreme suspicion. The medicare bill indisputably smacks of socialism, however mild, and correspondingly is distasteful to Americans for that very reason. This makes a clinical view of the bill purely on its merits almost impossible.

"The medicare bill was intended to relieve the elderly citizens of the crippling burden of medical bills, which, unless one is lucky enough to die quickly, are almost inevitable. It did this by paying for the cost of hospitalization for a set period. It did not pay for the medicines and miscellaneous needs. By British standards, the medicare bill was a very weak dose.

"For the British National Health Service provides free medical services for everybody from birth to death. This covers their every need, from visits to the doctors to prescriptions, hospitalization, operations and aftercare. Dental service is free to anyone under 21, with only a comparatively small charge for adults. Opticians provide Government-subsidized spectacles. This all costs the taxpayer approximately $1.50 per week, and from this charge, one is also provided unemployment benefits, national assistance and old-age pensions.

"Whatever small sacrifice the British doctors are required to make to Government supervision seems, objectively speaking, a small price to pay for the relief and peace of mind of all sections of the community. The doctors themselves certainly don't act as if they have lost something. Indeed the current popularity of the national health service among doctors is a good measure of its success in Britain. So I hope I can be excused for saying the Americans in their excitement over medicare appear to be making much ado about nothing."

Arthur J. Goldberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that recent editorials appearing in the Chicago Daily Tribune and the Peoria Journal Star relative to the appointment of Arthur J. Goldberg to the Supreme Court be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point. Both of the editorials pay high tribute and praise to the Secretary of Labor whom I have often characterized as the most effective of President Kennedy's Cabinet. We have our opposing views it is true but I certainly would not let that in any way detract from the outstanding job Mr. Goldberg has performed in the past as Secretary of Labor, and I am sure that he will likewise serve with distinction on the Nation's highest Court.

The editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune]

MR. JUSTICE GOLDBERG

The appointment of Arthur J. Goldberg to the Supreme Court has been received with general approval throughout the United States. It has been particularly well received in Chicago where Mr. Goldberg is known most intimately, for here he was born, went to school and college, studied law, and first distinguished himself as a practicing lawyer.

We are not among those who will undertake to predict how Mr. Goldberg will vote on the important cases that are about to come to the Court's attention. We will venture to predict that he is too good a lawyer to accept specious defenses even of causes which he favors, and he is too independent a man to allow former associations with clients or Government to dominate his thinking on the bench.

Mr. Goldberg showed great promise when he was graduated from Northwestern University's Law School at the head of his class. He has been an able, disinterested, and tireless public servant since he became Secretary of Labor. There is every reason to hope that as a Justice of the Supreme Court he will make an important contribution to the law of this country.

Those who think that Mr. Goldberg will be a radical judge because he represented great trade unions as a lawyer may be fooled as others were fooled when Justice Frankfurter was appointed to the Court. They were certain that Mr. Frankfurter would be the least conservative man on the bench and that his agile mind would be at the service of every leftist cause that came to the Court's attention.

In fact, Mr. Justice Frankfurter retires from the Court amid the sighs of conservatives who have come to regard him as their strongest friend on the bench. We doubt that this reputation is wholly deserved, but Mr. Frankfurter has been, indeed, the chief spokesman for judicial restraint, meaning that he doesn't want the Supreme Court to invade the territory that he thinks the Constitution gives to the various State legislatures, State courts and the State and Federal regulatory commissions. This attitude of his has made him a radical when these bodies have gone that way and a conservative when they have moved in the other direction.

Mr. Frankfurter will be missed from the Court. We may be sure that the new man will be very different but he, too, is a man of outstanding talents and in the long run may prove to be no less influential in setting the Court's direction.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Daily Star]

LABOR DAY AND THE MAN FROM ILLINOIS

This is a proud day for the laboring man of Illinois, thanks to a Chicago Jew with a mind like a steel trap.

Arthur Joseph Goldberg, more than any other man labor's advocate, will shortly take a seat on the Supreme Court of the United States.

This fact is a recognition that organized labor has come a long way. In fact, arrived.

The Justices of the Supreme Court hold in their hands a power second only to that of the President. Membership on this tribunal must therefore be accorded with great care, and it is our view that this has historically been the case.

Arthur Goldberg's choice has been roundly acclaimed by Democrat and Republican alike—an evidence that his judgment is the sort which can best serve America.

There can be no doubt that Goldberg's passions lie with the laboring man. In his critical position as Secretary of Labor he never attempted to deny this fact. But his actions as labor secretary have proven that he could lay aside this prejudice and administer the law of the land fairly.

Quoting the Italian historian, Gaetano Salvemini, Goldberg has said: "We cannot be impartial. We can only be intellectually honest * * * aware of our passions and on guard against them. Impartiality is a dream, and honesty, a duty."

Goldberg is no dreamer. His action as labor secretary—running off from his Washington desk to try to hammer some sense into labor-management negotiators right at their bargaining tables—is one of the most vivid demonstrations of common sense we've seen come out of the Kennedy Cabinet.

We expect that Mr. Goldberg will apply the same sort of tireless attention to the great legal questions which will come before the Court. We also expect that his prejudice will show—at times—in favor of the liberal concepts which are ingrained in the labor movement he rose from. Let's look at his background.

The eighth child of a poor Chicago immigrant family, Goldberg graduated at the head of his law school class at Northwestern in the depression year of 1930. By the mid-thirties he was in the thick of organized labor's battle for recognition.

After wartime service as an OSS officer organizing Nazi opposition in occupied Europe, Goldberg came back to his practice in Chicago and by 1948 had been appointed general counsel of the CIO. In this role he was the main challenger of the Taft-Hartley law which labor so despised. He lost the big battle, but he is credited with convincing the bench he will now sit upon that pensions are legitimate goal of collective bargaining.

His work on the merger of the AFL–CIO is well known and his inspiration is credited with the formation of labor's ethical practices committee which led to expulsion of the Teamsters and other scandal-ridden unions.

In 1959 he conducted labor's negotiations in the 116-day steel strike which resulted in a major victory for the United Steelworkers. Yet early this year Goldberg was able to set aside his prejudice and bring about a steel settlement which most of the pundits in the land were sure would never come about without a strike.

Throughout his service as labor secretary, Goldberg has escaped any damning criticism from management. Surprisingly his most severe castigation has come from the AFL–CIO which at times has felt he might go too far in protecting the public interest—at labor's expense.

From this we can see that Arthur Goldberg, a man of labor, is also a man of the people.

Mr. Justice Goldberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join a multitude of Americans in congratulating the President on the outstanding appointment which he made to the Supreme Court of the United States in the person of Arthur Goldberg. In my opinion, Mr. Goldberg has done a remarkable job as Secretary of Labor and will be sorely missed in the Cabinet. How-

ever, I know he has much to contribute to the judiciary.

I am inserting an article by George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the Washington Post on September 5, 1962, and would recommend it to my colleagues who may have missed it because I consider it a most fitting tribute to both Arthur Goldberg and Justice Frankfurter:

THESE DAYS—MR. JUSTICE GOLDBERG

(By George E. Sokolsky)

As President Kennedy had to appoint a successor to Justice Felix Frankfurter on the U.S. Supreme Court, it is only fitting that he should have found a moderate liberal, one who believes in a humanitarian capitalism and who respects the law. It is always to be presumed that when a President makes a principal appointment, he is likely to follow his own ideas and his own conscience. President Kennedy is developing into a moderate liberal.

When Justice Frankfurter was appointed to the Supreme Court, he was attacked as an excessive liberal, as a Socialist, as an enemy of our way of life. During the whole of his career, Frankfurter had been a Jeffersonian Democrat, a firm believer in our law, based on the Constitution. When his ideas conflicted with those of some of his colleagues, many conservatives took him to their hearts as the leader of the conservatives on the Bench. Actually, Frankfurter was motivated neither by the excesses of doctrinaire liberalism nor by the excesses of doctrinaire conservatism.

He believed in the law—in the law as an instrument to safeguard the individual human being from the brutality of tyranny, any kind of tyranny. And there can be a tyranny of the majority of minorities or of individuals. This is a Jeffersonian concept of Americanism and is incorporated in the Declaration of Independence as well as in the Constitution of the United States.

In Arthur Goldberg, Frankfurter's successor to the Supreme Court Bench, the country will find a jurist of the same cast of mind. Goldberg emerged to prominence out of the big labor unions just as Frankfurter reached prominence as a professor in the Harvard Law School who was deeply concerned with the problems of labor. But wherever Goldberg served labor, he was a stabilizing personality because he believed in the law and in the sanctity of a contract and in the need for establishing a system in industry which would keep up the productivity of the United States by a labor-management relationship based on binding contracts. The Communists want no contracts because, contracts in effect, are a limitation on revolutionary tactics.

Goldberg has undoubtedly been the most active and most effective Secretary of Labor in the history of that office. He brought to his work a new concept; namely, that in every industrial dispute a third party, the people of the United States, sits at the table. The people have rights, too. When the engineers strike on aircraft, depriving the people of an essential service and wasting capital investment, the people as customers, as investors, have rights which must be represented.

He has not taken the position that labor is always right or that management and the investor are always wrong. But he has taken the position that the welfare of the United States must come first. We cannot afford the luxury of labor laissez faire any more than we can afford the luxury of capitalist laissez faire. We are in trouble and we must face our troubles courageously. The time when the individual can sacrifice the general welfare and the survival of his country to satisfy personal whim or even personal purposes is gone and is not likely to return.

Arthur Goldberg will be a worthy successor to Felix Frankfurter as a moderate jurist who probably will oppose making the Supreme Court a third legislative body. Frankfurter opposed that because it is essentially unconstitutional. The Court has to do with interpreting law, not with making law. The temptation for a Supreme Court Justice or any justice to pursue obiter dicta rather than the law is not unusual. Enormous restraint is required to remember that even Solomon had to think twice before rendering a final decision. On the other hand, were it not for the courage of Chief Justice John Marshall we should not today be a nation. His decisions bound the 13 sovereign States into one lasting United States.

It is sad to see Justice Frankfurter go. It is unfortunate that Goldberg will not be able to complete his term as Secretary of Labor. It is fortunate that President Kennedy resisted all the politics of any judicial appointment, the pulling and bargaining, the employment of powerful friends, and selected one who is by experience and temperament worthy to sit on the Supreme Court bench in these trying times of transition.

Our Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, today there are more than 17 million persons over age 65 in the United States. These people are not an abstract statistic. They are individual human beings—people who have fought our two world wars, who stood by America in the depression—people who have given the best years of their lives to make our country great. We cannot allow our elder citizens to be discarded and neglected. Their wisdom and experience can serve the Nation well for years to come. These men and women are a national asset, not a sterile burden. They are still productive and should take a place of honor in our society.

The four great problems of the aged are employment, income, housing, and health. I am proud to be a Member of a Congress and administration which have attacked these problems by operating and perfecting existing programs and seeking to create new ones.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The great problem in employment is the reluctance on the part of employers to hire older workers. A nationwide program to combat discrimination and to provide direct help in obtaining employment is carried on through the Federal-State employment service system of the Department of Labor. Services include employment counseling, job solicitation, and placement. In fiscal year 1961, 1.1 million older workers were placed in gainful employment by this service.

Also, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of Health, Education, and Welfare helps older workers who are disabled to return to work. During fiscal year 1961, 1.204 million workers were rehabilitated in Indiana. Assuming that Indiana is close to the national average, about 30 percent of these workers were over 45.

INCOME PROTECTION

The second great problem of the elderly is maintenance of income. Because of retirement, the person over 65 is forced to get by on drastically reduced income. The median annual income of couples over 65 is $2,530, compared with $5,314 for couples under 65. But senior citizens are protected from poverty and degradation by the Social Security Act. The Social Security Administration protects the elderly through two programs: Public assistance and old-age survivors, and disability insurance—OASDI.

About one-fourth of the population over 65 are indigent, and qualify for old-age assistance under public assistance. According to the latest available statistics, in June 1962, 24,967 Indiana residents received a total of $1,712,179—an average of $68.58 per person.

But the greatest help to the aged is social insurance provision provided by OASDI. This program pays retirement benefits to older workers and survivor benefits to their widows and dependent children. More than 7 out of 10 Americans over 65 are receiving benefits under this program. In 1961, 452,819 Indiana beneficiaries received $363,515,000 in OASDI payments.

Furthermore, following in Franklin Roosevelt's footsteps, President Kennedy secured the following benefit increases in OASDI from Congress in 1961: The retirement age for men was lowered from 65 to 62. The minimum monthly benefit was raised from $33 to $40. Work-time requirements for fully insured status were liberalized; and widows' benefits were increased.

ADEQUATE HOUSING

The third problem of the aged is adequate housing. The report to the President of the Federal Council on Aging indicates that twice as many people over 65 live in low-rental housing—$30 a month—than younger people, which means that the quality of their housing is often poor. A remedy to this is now being sought by a number of Federal programs. First, the Public Housing Administration pays grants to local housing authorities in order to subsidize rents of low-cost apartments for the elderly. Under the Kennedy administration, the allowance per room has been raised $500 and single men and women as young as 62 have been extended eligibility. The estimated expenditure for this purpose in fiscal 1962 is $22.5 million. Second, the Community Facilities Administration makes available loans to private corporations or consumers' cooperatives in order to finance medium-cost housing construction for the elderly. The Kennedy administration has raised the loan authorization for this program from $50 million to $125 million. Third, for elderly persons who desire to buy homes but find difficulty because they are considered poor mortgage risks, the Federal Housing Administration has a program of mortgage insurance on liberal terms.

The anticipated figure for this program in fiscal 1962 is $60 million.

HEALTH CARE AND HEALTH CARE COSTS

The fourth and greatest problem confronting our aged is health. At the very time that their income is at a lifetime low, their medical expenses are at a lifetime high. After age 65, 9 out of 10 persons are hospitalized at least once; 2 out of 3 twice or more. And they stay longer. The average stay of the person over 65 is 14.9 days as compared with 7.6 days for the person under 65. According to Health, Education, and Welfare, half of all aged couples have medical costs exceeding $800 per year, and half of all unmarried aged persons have costs exceeding $600 per year. Furthermore, private insurance coverage of the elderly is grossly inadequate. Only 30 percent of persons over 65 have three-fourths of their hospital costs covered, as compared with 54 percent for persons under 65.

These statistics conclusively show that our older citizens are confronted with medical bills far out of proportion to their ability to pay. The American people have gone to a great deal of trouble to insure that our elders live out their well-deserved retirement in peace and prosperity. We have set up a comprehensive social security system and have constantly added new programs and increased benefits. But we have not protected against the costs of illness.

At the present time the only operational program specifically directed toward giving medical aid to the aged is the Kerr-Mills Act. But beneficiaries are limited by a strict means test and only half the States have agreed to participate in the program. Indiana has not yet enrolled.

Therefore, further action is needed. Such action has already been proposed by President Kennedy. It is the medicare or King-Anderson bill. Medicare is a comprehensive medical care plan providing four types of hospital and related services; inpatient hospital services, skilled nursing home services, outpatient hospital diagnostic services, and home health services. Up to 90 days of hospital care and up to 180 days of skilled nursing home care will be provided. While medicare will not pay doctors' bill or surgeons' fees, it will defray the most costly of all the medical expenses which the elderly must face. Finally, it insures the integrity of our medical institutions by expressly forbidding Government interference with hospital operation or the patient's choice of doctor.

ELDER CITIZENS AND THE ECONOMY

Last year the Federal Government spent over $15 billion in programs for the aged. The figure is expected to rise to $25 billion by 1967. This should make it quite clear that we are moving ahead with programs for our senior citizens.

Every dollar spent is but small recompense for the services these people have rendered to our country, and I assure you that I shall give these programs my continued and vigorous support.

A great portion of this expenditure is a repayment of moneys contributed earlier by the beneficiaries to the social security fund during their productive years. Every dollar spent has a threefold effect. First, it helps the individual live a better and happier life. Second, it serves to bolster the independence of individuals, thus reducing the possibility that they will become a burden on the local and State tax rate; and, third, it allows our older citizens to continue to be an effective force in the economy and not a drag upon it.

SUMMARY

The Nation is becoming aware of the serious problems confronting the elder citizens. In order to take advantage of the potential contributions this growing segment can make to the future of our Nation, the problems of employment, income protection, adequate housing, and health care must be met. I am happy that so much progress is being made in these vital areas and I pledge my continued support to the forward looking programs which are being presented to meet the needs of our elder citizens.

Edouard Cournand, American Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to know Mr. Edouard Cournand for some time. He is a friend as well to our distinguished Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and has been an invaluable aid in many official governmental functions throughout the years.

Mr. Cournand, a successful businessman in every degree, is president of Lanvin Parfums. He is responsible for our ladies wearing such fragrances as Arpege, My Sin, Crescendo, Spanish Geranium, and countless other favorites. Just a few weeks ago Mr. Cournand's color portrait graced the cover of the distinguished "bible" of the business community, Business Week magazine, in a five-page story by Business Week's marketing editor, Mr. William Kroger.

Mr. Cournand's story is the story of an American immigrant who turned into a wonderful success. His donations to charity, his good works in Government, and his dedication to keeping the American woman as the most beautiful in the world will long be remembered. Some of the writings of Mr. Kroger in Business Week are most interesting, but at this time I would like to call to your attention the article on Mr. Cournand which appeared in the issue of August 11, 1962, in Business Week.

It reads as follows:

FRAGRANCE MEASURED IN MILLIONS—FOR EDOUARD L. COURNAND, LANVIN PARFUMS ARE AN $18.1 MILLION BUSINESS

Edouard L. Cournand is an American citizen and an American businessman with a heavy French accent.

He's president of Lanvin Parfums, Inc., and with Gallic cunning tries to trap every American female into feeling that she's undressed if she ever appears in public without wearing fragrance as well as clothes.

He's making progress. Lanvin's Arpege is as well known as another perfume name, and may even be the bestseller. Only the names of Chanel No. 5, My Sin (also by Lanvin), and one or two others come as quickly to mind. Lanvin's 1961 sales—$18.1 million—probably were the highest in the $500 million a year fragrance business, but there's no way of being sure because most of the company's competitors, in addition, make and market cosmetics.

Even so, Cournand laments that although the United States has the world's highest standard of living, "fragrance consumption is lower than that of many other countries."

ROAD TO RICHES

Cournand has been a post-World War I barnstorming flier, shoe salesman to Russians, traveling journalist, president of General Bronze Corp., importer of Vichy water, and manufacturer of plastic canopies for World War II airplanes. "I am a promoter," he says, and in fashioning a woman's lure of amour—a pursuit as ancient as mankind itself—he has at last found the ultimate promotion for a man of French birth and spirit.

The perfume business has given him a delightful life, delightful friends, and has made him very rich. He put $10,000 into Lanvin Parfums in November 1945, and when he sold some of his stock to the public in July 1961, Cournand and his wife netted $8¼ million after commissions. They still own 24 percent of the company; its stock is worth around $50 million at recent prices, and it nets after taxes around 12 percent on sales, which this year will top $20 million.

LANGUAGE OF FLOWERS

Cournand moves in a heady business-social atmosphere—combining the worlds of art, entertainment, science, and politics—between a 14-room apartment on New York City's Fifth Avenue, an estate on Long Island, and a centuries-old chateau he recently bought in France. He is constantly popping up with new ideas to attract attention to Lanvin, and his explanation of why women buy perfume in such satisfying quantities could be banned in Boston:

"To me, perfume is the talk of the flowers. We men, we sing, we whistle, we have a lot of ways to express ourselves. The cat purrs, the dog wags his little end. The flowers, they talk to us with their fragrance.

"Flowers are used in all festivities, we take pictures of our children in the garden. Flowers are in romance. It's very unusual that during the romantic season, the spring, that's when the flowers have tremendous fragrance. To me, they are singing their joy of coming.

"Later on in the season it is not a time of romance, it is a time of reality and all summer flowers have very little fragrance. In the animal kingdom there is no lovemaking at all in winter—only humans have fireplaces to make love in front of. So, if flowers are festive and romantic, when a woman can't wear a bouquet, she wears a drop of perfume. A woman is festive with perfume."

TOP SALESMAN

Cournand shrugs when asked whether others in the business feel as he does. "No. I've never found anyone interested in this subject. Among the chemists, as long as they can sell it, that's all they want," he says.

Edouard Cournand would be the last to denigrate salesmen. Obviously, he's one of the best. He argued his way into the French aviation force in 1914, when he was 17 years old. After the war, as customary for the sons of distinguished families—his father was a prominent physician, as is his brother, Nobel Prize Winner Andre F. Cournand—he idled a while in government service, going to Argentina as part of a military mission to sell war surplus.

In Buenos Aires, he parlayed the interests of two groups of Americans into his first promotional success. One group was trying to sell skywriting equipment, but had neither plane nor pilot. The other group was looking for someone with enough cash for advertising to take on the franchise to sell Eversharp pencils.

Cournand had no cash, but he had access to an airplane and was a pilot. He demonstrated the skywriting, and by spewing Eversharp across the sky got the pencil franchise. "In a year, I was a millionaire in francs—that was $80,000—and I returned home to show my family I was a success," he says. He was 25 years old and in another year was broke; officially, he lost the money in an unsuccessful venture to sell shoes to the Russians, but a between-us-boys twinkle says he enjoyed spending every centime of it.

MIGRATION DEAL

He wanted to get to the United States. "France is too small for me. You cannot be a young general in France." He talked the editor of a French trade magazine into paying his traveling and living expenses to Canada to write a series of articles on industry in the Dominion and in the United States. When he got to New York, he resigned his job and leased Grand Central Palace for a French trade fair. Then he went to the Franco-American Board of Trade and got its backing for the project.

He explains: "I had decided I wanted to be the representative in this country for some French business, and I thought the way to find out what kind of business was to hold a fair and see which booth most people were interested in. Then I would ask that manufacturer to let me represent him." The scheme worked, but not quite that way. He told it unknowingly to the head of Caron perfumes, who was so delighted with Cournand's enterprise that he signed him up on the spot.

THE SCENT

Cournand had to stray from the scent on occasion since, but only reluctantly and by force of circumstances. In 1927 he married the daughter of the founder of a large architectural bronze business, and at her father's insistence joined the company. "In the bronze business I was very unhappy," he recalls. After his wife died, he left General Bronze and took on the U.S. sales agency for Celestine Vichy Water. In 1940, he got the Lanvin franchise, but before he could exploit it the war cut off supplies.

By this time he was an American citizen and went to Washington to sign up with the Army Air Corps. "My old friend Hap Arnold (Gen. H. H. Arnold, head of the Air Force) told me 'Edouard, you and I are too old to fly in this war. You go back to New York and figure out something to make for us.'"

What he figured out was the one-piece plastic canopy for planes. He uses the experience to illustrate why he succeeded in the perfume business: "Everyone else builds from what exists, I look at what should be the base and I build from what should be there. I knew from aviation two things. One was the dogfight. By the end of the war it was a two-second affair. So I said in this war it was going to be a split second affair and everyone had to have visibility. Two, if you are going to make a glass dome and there's an engineering change it takes weeks because you need a steel mold. I had to find a material strong enough that could be shaped easier. When I offered it to Du Pont they said I was crazy."

MASS MARKETING

When he got back to the perfume business, nobody had ever successfully mass-merchandised imported perfume. Coty had tried it before the war, and ran into difficulties that would have swamped a company of lesser size and fewer products. Lanvin even now has only perfumes, toilet waters, bath oils, dusting and talcum powders in seven fragrances—with Arpege and My Sin perfumes and toilet waters accounting for 90 percent of sales—and in 1947 the product line was even narrower. (This summer, though, Lanvin added a suntan cream and has plans for a full line of men's toiletries.)

"Everything in this business," says a man who has made it his life, "tells us a company can't be mass and exclusive at the same time." The giants of the business—Coty, Avon, Revlon—are mass merchandisers of all forms of cosmetics and toiletries. Until Cournand, the other strictly fragrance houses limited distribution to uppercrust outlets. Says Leon Schulman, Lanvin administrative vice president and treasurer: "The industry had tried to cultivate the American abroad, not here. It was snob appeal."

Cournand hired 7 salesmen, giving each a territory so that every city in the country with a population of 50,000 or more was covered. Eventually they signed up 7,500 retailers (drugstores, department stores, and specialty shops), Lanvin backed them with heavy advertising (Now $2.5 million a year), and none of the 7 salesmen was making less than $30,000 a year and 1 was drawing down $90,000.

FRANCHISE PLAN

The business grew faster than Cournand thought his seven men could handle, so in the midfifties he offered them a chance to buy franchises; each would own a piece of the business and set up his own distribution. He's grieved that none took him up on the offer because he had to expand his field force until now he has 43 sales representatives.

Last year, when Lanvin went public, Cournand used another device to make partners of the people who sell his perfume. A special offer of 145,000 shares was made to "associates," including retailers and their employees, and about 3,500 bought Lanvin stock. Since no other fragrance house has stock on the market, an industry figure comments wryly: "You know whose fragrance those people are going to push."

INHERITANCE

In a complicated recapitalization that preceded the public issue, Cournand gave up control of Lanvin Parfums, Inc., to Lanvin Parfums S.A., the French company that originated the business. In good French tradition, Cournand wants the business to pass to Bernard Lanvin, son of the principal owner of Lanvin-Parfums S.A., and to whom Cournand has taught the business as though he were his own son. Cournand and his first wife had a daughter (now a noted ballerina in France), but he and his second wife are childless.

Anyway, at 65, Cournand wants to slow down He sleeps at his New York apartment only Monday and Tuesday nights, and Wednesday evening drives to the estate, on a promontory jutting into Long Island Sound near Huntington. He pampers his gardens—especially strong on tulips and roses—and entertains friends engaged in almost every endeavor except selling perfume.

FRONT MAN

He is the front man and creative thinker at Lanvin; his puckishness takes wild turns with "Hortense," a dummy dressed as a French maid, which is posed in the window of Lanvin's Fifth Avenue salon in any number of situations. His attractive blond wife is executive vice president of the company and in effect the general manager. "I can analyze and see trends," he says, "but I hate patchwork, I hate detail. But my wife, she is well organized and will take care of detail like nobody."

The purpose of Cournand's thinking, the people he associates with, the salon on Fifth Avenue—even the antics of Hortense—are all to create a certain atmosphere for Lanvin fragrances. They should be not quite aloof, but desirable; they should be reached for, but by no means unreachable, for they are in 7,500 stores across the country. "I tell my wife," says Lanvin Executive Schulman, "sometimes I feel I'm pushing dope. Once a woman starts, you can't get her off it."

Textile Imports Threaten Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Clover, S.C., Herald of August 30, 1962:

TEXTILE IMPORTS THREATEN JOBS

(By Rose White)

We've been told that there are only two things certain in this life: Death and taxes. Well, there could be another certainty. Unless something is done to curb the foreign imports which are flooding this country, thousands of men and women are going to be without jobs.

This concern over the failure of the United States to do something about this situation is not new. In February of 1961, I received a reply to a plea to do something about the situation from Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON. He said: "During the past several years I have contacted the President and the Secretary of Commerce time and time again urging that relief be brought about by administrative action. The only answer I received was that the dangers facing American industries were brought about by competition and bad management. Whether the new administration will take a new viewpoint is difficult to say."

In August 1962 there can be little doubt as to where the "new" administration stands.

Officials of the textile industries were told that the Geneva Agreement would hold imports of 1962 to the same level as those of 1961. Now indications show that imports will be 30 percent above 1961.

The "new" administration's views are made crystal clear in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. It is based on the idea that it is proper for the President by trade agreements to grant eliminations or reductions of duties which will necessarily injure American industry, agriculture, and workers and give the President unprecedented power to eliminate some duties completely. The State Department has put constant pressure on the President's office to favor foreign economies at the expense of the "home" economy.

You are no doubt aware of the situation of the Sullivan-Southern Zipper Tape Plant here in York. Mr. J. K. (Jack) Benfield has been to Washington on many occasions in behalf of his company versus foreign imports. Cheap Japanese zipper tapes here in the United States has closed factories in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and New England.

Sulivan-Southern is not the only industry which is watching with increased concern. Mr. Charles Cannon, chairman of the board of Cannon Mills recently stated that the passage of this new trade bill in its present form would "destroy the jobs of many thousands of workers * * * particularly in the textile and garment industries." Mr. Roger Milliken, president of Deering-Milli-

ken Mills, joins Mr. Cannon in his appraisal of this most serious situation.

These industrial leaders have gotten together with Senators STROM THURMOND and PRESCOTT BUSH and six other bipartisan Senators and have come up with a vital revision to the Trade Expansion Act. This revision is called the "Bush amendments."

The Bush amendments would:

1. Require true reciprocity in concessions by foreign nations with provision for elimination of reductions in duties if foreign nations violate the agreement and impose restrictions against U.S. exports.

2. Require other nations to apply the most-forward-nation policy as the United States does; that is, to grant to other nations the same access to their markets which the United States affords to Asiatic and other free-world nations on reductions of duties made to the Common Market.

3. Restore the authority of Congress weakened by the proposed bill, to put into effect Tariff Commission recommendations when such recommendations are ignored or overruled by the President.

4. Strengthen the U.S. bargaining position and export situation by requiring European Common Market countries to receive our exports on terms as fair as we accord their exports.

5. Prevent complete elimination of duties when Tariff Commission finds such reductions would injure domestic producers and workers.

6. Restore and strengthen the present peril point and escape clause procedures.

7. Remove the option to the President to put workers on the dole and give "adjustment assistance" to domestic industries injured by imports in place of enforcing the escape clause and restoring the duties.

8. Provide a solution to the problem of domestic textile industries resulting from the glutting of U.S. markets by Asiatic and other producers by securing for them access to European markets which is now denied and which may continue to be denied under the provision of H.R. 11970.

A number of people, realizing that our industries are in jeopardy, have wired Senators STROM THURMOND and HARRY BYRD (chairman of Senate Finance Committee which completed hearings on the trade bill last week) to offer full support of the Bush amendments.

The time to act is not after the plants are forced to close but before. Mr. Ralph Hoke, superintendent of Cannon Mills and Mr. Benfield report that their respective plants are running well at the present. The vital question is: "What of tomorrow?"

A Hillbilly in the Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the West Virginia Hillbilly under date of September 1:

A HILLBILLY IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS—IF YOU WERE A HABITUE OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, YOU WOULD RUN INTO NATHAN GOFF CARDER, A HILLBILLY AMONG THE BOOKS, BUT SINCE YOU AREN'T, YOU'LL HAVE TO BE SATISFIED READING HIS WRITINGS IN THIS PAPER

(By James L. Creasy)

The mighty Ohio today rolls on past steel furnaces, manufacturing cities, and seething populations, but to one man, at least, it is still the fabulous river of the past. It is the river traveled by George Washington, Daniel Boone, and George Rogers Clark—the beautiful river of Indian and French voyagers.

Known in Washington as Nathan and in West Virginia as Goff, the subject of this sketch, Nathan Goff Carder, uses his full name only when writing articles or stories for publication. Born and reared on the banks of the Ohio in Jackson County, Goff Carder is a graduate of Marietta College, Ohio State University, and did graduate work in Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland. His varied experiences range from that of coal miner to university professor. He is at present employed in the U.S. Office of Education. His hobbies are writing and public speaking.

Living within sight of the Library of Congress, Mr. Carder is a familiar figure around that institution. Here he spends much leisure time pursuing his favorite subject—history. Though of a rather studious and retiring nature, he is a member of several organizations, including the American Legion, Alma Shrine Temple, Toastmasters International, the West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia.

The old maxim about taking a boy out of the country is certainly true of this West Virginian removed from the Ohio Valley. To Goff Carder, the Ohio is not only the river of his childhood, but through his travels and studies has become the river of the ages, the river that flows through the most beautiful country and has the handsomest jade-green water, the river with the richest bottoms, the greatest floods, and rocky hills indented by numerous tumbling streams along the rugged border of West Virginia. And to Goff it is a river of great historical significance. He knows the lore of the valley—of the renegade, Simon Girty; the surveyor, Crawford; and the great Shawnee Chief, Kiashuta, who spent an entire day with Washington where Ravenswood now stands. He is familiar with Christopher Gist's Journal of 1765, the Adventures of La Salle, and other early French explorers.

Mr. Carder's main interest, of course, is in the 19th century and the early steamboat days, the days when river traffic flourished after Nicholas Roosevelt took the first steamer to New Orleans back in 1811. This age, when the river was the main artery of commerce, he considers the natural beauty of its shore lines and bottom lands.

Goff Carder's nostalgia for this mighty river in America's industrial heartland is equal to that of Mark Twain's for the Mississippi. The river was his boyhood, both at work and at play. He earned his first dollar at the age of 7 helping operate a hand ferry, and his only recreation was that afforded by the river. Before the locks and dams were built, many log rafts, shanty boats, dish boats, and even "picture-gallery" boats floated down the open stream through the summer months. People along river towns thrilled to the sound of the steam calliope as a showboat rounded the bend, bringing fun, entertainment, and drama from the city. As a boy, Goff sat on such famous boats as the *Cotton Blossom*, the *Majestic, Bryant's*, and *French's New Sensation*. He witnessed, at an early age, the old favorites—"East Lynn," "Ten Nights in a Barroom," and "Uncle Tom's Cabin."

Mr. Carder is truly a West Virginian with roots deep in our Mountain State. His ancestors crossed the Alleghenies to settle along the Ohio in 1804, and one of them built and operated a floating grist mill at the foot of Buffington Island, the kind of "novelty" mill which became so famous and necessary in the days of Indian warfare.

Long before West Virginia had county schoolbuses, Goff Carder walked daily to high school at Ravenswood, some 5 miles from his home. While a student he became interested in literature and had his first story published in the Ravenswood News. A poor boy with sterling character, Goff left the valley to work his way through college and then to teach in the city. Throughout the years he has continued writing periodically and has had many articles published under various pen names. He has quite a collection of sketches and stories of local color. With an unusual scholastic background and a prodigious memory, he is particularly fitted for the writing profession. But Goff has always considered writing just a means of relaxation, or hobby. His theory is that everyone should have a hobby, something to continue in the halcyon years when professional days are over. After retirement he plans to return, like the sockeyed salmon, to his native hills, live there with his family, and write a history of Jackson County.

Cuba Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, all Americans look with grave apprehension on the events taking place in Cuba. The beaches of Florida are only a short 90 miles from the Communist enclave.

Today I have called for a restatement of the Monroe Doctrine to firm up our policy toward Castro and the Russian intervention in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere. An editorial in the Palm Beach Post, September 4, asks the question, "Are we too firmly committed to the doctrine of 'too little and too late'?" This newspaper has been alert to the problem of Castro from the beginning, and has close ties to the Cuban colony in Florida. I ask that this editorial, "Cuba Doctrine" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Sept. 4, 1962]

CUBA DOCTRINE

President Kennedy is not in favor of "invading Cuba at this time."

However, he does support the Monroe Doctrine, under which the U.S. declares it will regard as "an unfriendly act" any interference with American Republics by a European nation.

President Kennedy has no information that Soviet "troops" have moved into Cuba recently, or that the country has received Soviet antiaircraft missiles.

The President made those statements at his news conference last Wednesday. They are interesting, but not too enlightening.

Each statement opens a new question of vital importance:

1. Does the President favor invading Cuba at some future time?

2. If he supports the Monroe Doctrine, at what point will he move to implement it?

3. When is a technician not a technician? Or, more specifically, what differentiates military technicians from "troops"?

It would appear that we are fighting a battle of semantics. The President intimates the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba would be regarded as an unfriendly act, inimical to the peace and security of the United States.

So long as such troops appear on the roster as "technicians," however, no unfriendly

act has been committed and the Monroe Doctrine is a mere scrap of paper.

Many reliable sources have confirmed that military "technicians" have been arriving in Cuba from Communist bloc countries in large numbers. In one case the "technicians" were even reported wearing Soviet fatigue uniforms.

It can be assumed they are not in Cuba to cut cane. The evidence, in fact, points to a sharply increased militaristic attitude by the Castro regime in recent weeks.

Starting with a series of provocative charges against U.S. violation of Cuban air space and espionage from ships, the Cuban Reds last Thursday fired on an unarmed U.S. Navy plane in international waters.

Probably the best evaluation of this incident came from Senator HOMER CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, "Russia is feeling us out," he said. "The only thing we can do is to retaliate if there are any more incidents."

Such retaliation already has been ordered by President Kennedy. But here again we are following a policy of reaction against the Communist policy of action.

Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., Democrat, of North Carolina, declared: "I think we should have ordered a naval blockade and stopped the Russian ships before they got to Cuba. But it is too late for that now."

Certainly it's too late to stop the ones already there, but it's not too late to stop additional ones from arriving.

If the Monroe Doctrine still is a living policy, why should not our Government notify Russia that no further occupation of Cuba—by "technicians" or troops—will be tolerated; and back up the notification with a naval blockade?

Or are we too firmly committed to the doctrine of "too little and too late"?

Telstar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am happy to enclose an editorial by David Lawrence, noted patriot and columnist in America, from the New York Herald Tribune of August 22, 1962, and the Washington Star of August 29, 1962. These editorials point out the happy resolution by which private enterprise was given the responsibility to develop a communications system through Telstar and other satellites in outer space. I salute Mr. Lawrence for his timely and decisive treatment of the subject, and agree with him as a citizen and in my official capacity and thank him for his comment.

When the question of nationalization, for that is what it was, and private enterprise was presented before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the U.S. House of Representatives, I hastened to side with private ownership. I knew private ownership would be more efficient, speedier, would render revenues and taxes, and had the most use. I am happy that private enterprise won the victory because private enterprise is the basis for a strong and free America, past, present, and future.

I include the fine articles referred to:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Aug. 29, 1962]

VICTORY FOR PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM—PRIVATE ENTERPRISE TELSTAR OPERATION CALLED STRONG ANSWER TO REDS

(By David Lawrence)

People's capitalism has just won a significant victory in the United States. It is a triumph that negates the very basis of Soviet communism.

For the Congress of the United States, by an overwhelming vote and with the support of the President, has just given a private corporation the opportunity to develop a communications business through Telstar and other satellites in outer space.

Had the vote in Congress gone the other way, the Communists would have gloated. For, in the Soviet Union, everything is owned by the government. The Soviets are taught that only the Government can really perform economic tasks and that a system of private profit is wrong.

In the United States, by the latest vote in Congress on the bill that provides regulation for the whole Telstar operation as far as communications are concerned, private enterprise is selected because it is experienced, more efficient and better trained through its talented personnel to do an effective job.

Some of the champions of Government ownership in their recent speeches in both Houses of Congress declared that, since the project was so big and since it might involve relations with other governments in the making of communications agreements, the task should be wholly in the hands of the American Government. The argument was made also that, since the Government had spent a good deal of money in developing the vehicle used to launch the Telstar satellite, the "people" should own the whole communications project.

But there are many things in America for which the Government has at one time or another spent large sums, and yet this has not led to Government ownership. Also, the Government once owned most of the land in the West, but it virtually gave away homesteads to attract settlers. Likewise, during wartime, enormous plants were built that became obsolete for military purposes. Aluminum plants and synthetic-rubber plants which cost many millions were sold for relatively low prices to private companies, some of which thereby got their chance to become big and successful competitors of existing companies in the same line of business.

The new measure, which has gone through both Houses and shortly will be signed by a sympathetic President, gives the public an opportunity to invest in the new corporation. Only half the stock is to be held by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.—otherwise known as the Bell System—and by other communications companies. The other half of the stock is to be sold to private investors at $100 a share.

The communications companies will elect a third of the board of directors, and the private investors will pick a third. The remaining third will be designated by the Federal Government—a very helpful method of keeping the Government posted on matters that come under the heading of Government regulation, such as the fixing of rates to the public. Monopoly is regulated in America where it touches the matter of rates to be paid by the public. Private companies are allowed what is designated as a "fair return" on invested capital, but the public interest is safeguarded against inordinate profitmaking.

The communications companies, such as A.T. & T., the Radio Corp. of America, and the Western Union Co.—all of which are privately owned—have managed under this plan to make America's communications facilities the very best in the world. While the Bell System is the largest of the telephone systems, there are 3,040 independent telephone companies in various parts of the United States owning 15 percent of all telephones.

The Bell System, moreover, like the others in the communications business, is not owned by a single interest. It has more than 2.2 million stockholders, and more than 350,000 of these are employees of the company.

In the last 20 years, the Bell System has earned for the Government of the United States in taxes a total of $9.5 billion and for State and local governments a total of $7.3 billion. This is the highest record of tax money contributed by any corporation in the world.

In other countries, where government ownership prevails, the service to the public is, by comparison, very poor. A private company has the incentive of profitmaking to spur it on to efficiency. Government-operated projects are devoid of such motive, and this is often revealed as a serious weakness.

The new Telstar project may or may not yield profits to the investors. There is no certainty that communication to other points on earth through outer space will be as economical as by cables under the seas or by radio through the atmosphere. But that is why the name "risk capital" has arisen. Investors do take risks, but they may be rewarded with good profits if the enterprises are successful.

Efficiency of service and good dividends usually have been a characteristic of private enterprise, and today there are many millions of citizens who have put their savings into enterprises of all kinds. This is "people's capitalism," and, despite the tirades by Nikita Khrushchev and other Communists who inveigh constantly against "capitalistic" countries, the system has proved successful in bringing the maximum good to the maximum number of people.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 22, 1962]

TODAY IN NATIONAL AFFAIRS—PUBLIC OWNERSHIP POLICY OF LIBERALS SEEN GROWING

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Shall the Government own everything, regulate everything—including prices and wages—and control the whole national economy? For many decades the answer to such a question would have been an emphatic negative, but today the Democratic Party has a substantial number of Members in Congress who openly favor Government ownership as a public policy.

The recent filibuster on the bill covering ownership of the space-satellite communications system—known as Telstar—revealed several Democratic Senators of the so-called liberal group as favoring Government ownership, despite the opposition of the administration.

Also, some Democratic members of the Senate Antitrust Committee now are demanding that the steel companies disclose data on their internal operations, which means that all competitors would see this information. Apparently the drive is on to increase Government control over the making of prices. This is a short step away from wage setting.

Proposed mergers, moreover, of railroads and consolidations of airlines are before governmental bodies today for approval or disapproval. The prospect is that many workers will lose their jobs because of such mergers, though the companies predict that the gain in efficiency will result in improved service and eventually in more jobs.

LABOR RESPONSIBILITY

The labor union leaders would be the last to admit it, but they must assume some responsibility for the plight of those transportation companies which are not able to

get high enough rates to absorb increased wage costs and to meet the expense of "featherbedding"—payment for work not being done. This constitutes a form of subsidy devised by labor unions to benefit their own members.

Companies nowadays have to decide whether to seek an alternative or to try to get along with fewer employees and be content with a smaller volume of specialized products sold at a relatively high price to those who must have such goods no matter what the cost. The alternative policy is usually to endeavor to get a larger sales volume at lower prices. This is theoretically a sound approach, but it depends on the use of automatic equipment and on the development of greater efficiency. This is something to which labor union policy customarily refuses to give cooperation.

Also, to build and modernize plants requires more capital. Investors do not like to lend or invest money in enterprises that are in trouble. So it's a vicious circle. Unless there are satisfactory earnings, the funds cannot be obtained to build better plants to promote greater efficiency and to increase earnings. Yet unless labor costs and work rules can be held in line, employers will soon find their earnings steadily diminished.

Economic principles, therefore, are coming into conflict more and more today with the pressures of groups which uncompromisingly demand the maximum and do not think of the future of the whole economic system.

Then there is the factor of Government competition with industry, as manifested by the Government invasion of the power industry through the construction of dams and the subsidizing of publicly owned power plants, instead of leasing these facilities to private companies that could competitively bid on them.

WHAT IS THE REASON?

The whole system of free enterprise is one of risk capital and hazards, but it nevertheless has managed to build America into the most powerful economic factor in the world today.

What is the reason for the emergence of a new faction in Congress which boldly champions Government ownership? Do the people really understand the fundamental issues? Experience in other lands has shown that when initiative is stifled, competition—with its emphasis on skills and inventive genius—is abandoned and there develops a lazy reliance on the Government to do everything. The result is inefficiency and poor service rendered to the people.

Thus, for example, not a single private telephone or telegraph system exists in the larger countries of the world except the United States. They are all Government owned. America has not only the largest system of private communication anywhere but one that far excels any governmental system in service and convenience. To this fact any one with experience here and abroad can testify.

Yet in Congress a fatal blow is being aimed at the whole doctrine of "people's capitalism," which describes the system prevalent in America today—where the people still have a right to own private companies and share in their earnings, even as the population as a whole shares in the benefits that science and research bring.

The United States now is going through a critical period in its economic history. Will Government ownership come to America, as it has in Communist Russia and in other countries? Or will America retain its system of people's capitalism? This is the issue that seems certain to come before the American people in the national elections in the next few years.

Social Security: A Proposal for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, ever since it has been my privilege to serve in the Congress, representing the 12th Congressional District of Michigan, I have been greatly concerned about improving our Federal social security system. My aim has always been to improve and strengthen it, to make the system more meaningful for the 17 million beneficiaries now on the rolls and the untold millions of people who will henceforth become eligible for retirement, disability, and survivor benefits. Now and then improvements have been made in this law but I have repeatedly maintained that the law is still not adequate to meet the pressing needs of the retired, the disabled, the widows, and the orphans. I have proposed several helpful changes in the system, some of which were accepted and are now incorporated into the social security system. However, some very important proposals are still awaiting action by the Congress. I trust that action can be taken before the Congress adjourns.

Our elder citizens are faced with difficult problems with respect to health, finances, housing, and employment. They have the usual diseases associated with age, diseases which are long in duration and frequently require expensive medical care in hospitals and nursing homes. By and large, they do not have the income to pay for such care. The census data for the year 1960 show that 53 percent of persons aged 65 and over had less than $1,000 annual cash income. Another 24 percent had an annual cash income ranging between $1,000 and $2,000, so that 77 percent of our aged population had less than $2,000 annual income.

Early this year, approximately 17 million individuals were receiving benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program. The amount of benefits paid to these beneficiaries in 1961 amounted to $12.7 billion. Expenditures under this program will continue to grow because of the growth in the labor force, the higher benefit rates to which people come on the benefit rolls, and because of the disability benefit provision under the 1956 amendments. Furthermore, the proportion of older people in our population is increasing and when the insurance program has been in operation for a longer period of time, more individuals will reach retirement age each year and will qualify for these benefits.

There are many retired people today in every State of this Union whose social security pensions are so small they must seek assistance from various welfare and charitable organizations to maintain the barest type of existence. No sound reason has been advanced for permitting this lamentable situation to continue any longer.

There are those who argue that we cannot afford to increase social security pensions and liberalize other benefits because of the great cost. But I feel certain most working men and women throughout the country would be willing to absorb a part of this cost if they were assured they would receive a pension at the time of retirement which would enable them to live decently and comfortably without other assistance.

We have been very generous in our aid to foreign countries to enable them to improve their economies and provide better living conditions for their people. We can ill afford to neglect those at home to whom we owe our first and primary duty.

Basically our social security system is one of the soundest in the world. It is consistent with our free enterprise system where the worker, the employer, and the Government all join together in contributing to a plan which will assure a high standard of living for those who are no longer able to pursue gainful employment. Congress has made many improvements in this basic law since it was first adopted some 27 years ago. But the program cannot stand still. It must be geared to changes in our economic growth and progress in order to meet constantly changing conditions and particularly to keep pace with increased costs of living.

It is all very well to discuss the matter and present theories for a solution—but this is a slow and tedious process. The time has come when we must do something practical about the problem.

Our social security system is based on the sound principle that workers and their employers should contribute a share of earnings each year during their working life toward a source of income when they can no longer work. It recognizes that, for most American families the paycheck represents a place to live, adequate food and clothing, and necessary medical care. When that paycheck stops—because of death, retirement, or disability—the social security benefit indeed becomes the difference between a life of dignity and self-respect and one of humiliating destitution.

Because I am concerned with maintaining a sound and fair social security system, I introduced H.R. 11390, providing principally for hospital, nursing home, and surgical services to all those eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, facilitating retirement at at an earlier age, and increasing benefits. This bill is similar to the one I introduced in the two previous Congresses. My bill has seven principal points which I now wish to explain.

First. Add a new program which will provide for the cost of hospitalization, surgery, and nursing home care for the retired worker, his wife or widow when they have reached retirement age, or at any age for a worker retired on disability, providing his gross income did

not exceed $2,400 for a single individual and $3,600 for a couple.

Second. Reduce the retirement age to 62 for men and to 60 for women, paying full benefits at these ages, thus eliminating the present reduced benefits for those who elect to apply at age 62.

Third. Widows who have remained at home to care for their minor children and who presently become ineligible for a mother's benefit after the children have reached the age of 18 years, would become eligible at age 50—now 62—so that they can qualify for benefits at an earlier age.

Fourth. Raise the minimum benefit from $40 to $75 to to help reduce the need for supplementation of social security benefits through the "needs test" public assistance program.

Fifth. Increase present benefits generally by 5 percent. The new maximum benefit would be $155.40 but this would not become effective for several years to come because a person would have to have an average monthly wage of approximately $500 to receive the maximum benefit.

Sixth. Raise the wage base for tax and benefit purposes from $4,800 to $6,000 per year.

Seventh. Liberalize the definition of total and permanent disability and the qualifying period in present law so more people can qualify for benefits under this program.

1. MEDICAL, NURSING, AND HOSPITAL CARE

One of the most important features of my bill is a provision for medical, nursing, and hospital care for those people who are on the social security retirement rolls.

The rising cost of medical care, and particularly hospital care, over the past decade has been felt by everyone, but especially by older people. They have larger than average medical needs. As a group, they use approximately 2½ times as much hospital care as the average for persons under 65 years of age, and many have special needs for long-term institutional care. Their incomes are generally much lower than those of the working population, and in many cases are either fixed or declining in amount. They have less opportunity than employed persons to spread the cost of medical and hospital care through health insurance. A large number of our older citizens must, therefore, turn to public assistance for payment of their medical and hospital bills. It is imperative that a satisfactory solution to this pressing problem be found.

My bill recognizes the inability of numerous retired people to pay out of merger pensions which are now available to them for the cost of medical care associated with hospitalization. My plan would pay the cost of hospital care and surgical services provided in the hospital up to 60 days for people eligible for social security benefits. If further care in a nursing home is indicated by the physician, additional costs up to 120 days of combined hospital and nursing home care would be provided.

The method of confining payments to those hospital services where cost schedules have already been tested by Blue Cross plans, also preserves the professional independence of doctors. It is designed simply to provide a form of insurance protection for those people on social security whose income is so limited that they cannot afford to pay the premiums for this kind of prepaid care.

We must make this forward step because I am convinced our older people are not getting their share of the modern but increasingly costly miracles of medical care. The high cost of medical care is felt more acutely by older people, moreover, because their illnesses are usually of longer duration.

According to the most recent nationwide survey of medical needs and costs, conducted for the Health Information Foundation in 1957–58, the average annual cost for private care for people 65 and over was $177 as compared with $86 a year for persons under age 65, or more than double. If public and philanthropic expenditures are added to the private costs of medical care for the aged, the per capita average cost would now be more than $290 per year or a total of almost $5 billion.

The wider application of preventive measures which we are setting today will lead to less infirmity in older years in the future. This is one of the reasons why I am not persuaded by the argument sometimes presented that my proposal would lead eventually to excessive medical costs. Another is that I am confident the doctors of this country are competent enough, and honest enough, to insure against any abuse of this provision.

While progress is underway toward the goal of providing better voluntary prepayment coverage for older people, the fact still remains that although 71 percent of our people under 65 have some form of prepayment insurance, only 46 percent of people 65 and over are now insured. Moreover, among these older people, the proportion with insurance declines with advancing age so that fewer than one-third are insured among those aged 75 and over.

Many older people are without adequate medical care protection not because of negligence. It is simply because it is not available to them at a price they can pay, or they had been refused insurance, or had it canceled. Thus, by plan is designed specifically to meet the medical care needs of people with a low retirment income who would otherwise be self-sufficient. We will not only be preserving individual self-respect, but we will also be helping hospitals to meet the mounting costs of providing the best kind of medical care for people who cannot now afford it.

2. REDUCTION OF RETIREMENT AGE

My second change—a reduction of the retirement age to 62 for men and 60 for women without a reduction in benefits—is also one of the most important features of my bill. It will reach down to provide social security benefits for millions of men and women today who have been arbitrarily retired from their jobs and must now wait months and often years, a period during which savings are depleted, assets are liquidated, and often charity must be solicited from friends, relatives, or public funds, until they can qualify for their social security benefits. For the truth of the matter is that, even under the present law, less than 10 percent retire voluntarily to qualify for social security benefits. Most people retire because of company retirement provisions or because of ill health.

Too often the eligibility age for social security is confused with a compulsory retirement age. Yet, 27 years of experience with the system has shown us that the man or woman who is able to work beyond retirement age—and is allowed to work beyond that age—will almost invariably continue on the job. The fact that the average social security benefit for the retired worker today at age 65 is $77 a month is one understandable incentive.

Another compelling reason for lowering the retirement age is the tragic fact that older workers, who are the special victims of plant relocations and retooling operations, find it almost impossible to secure new jobs or the opportunity to develop new and marketable skills. It is an anomaly of our times that the new machines which add so greatly to our productivity as a Nation are viewed with fear and apprehension by older men and women who, after a long working life, find their jobs threatened by the age of electronics. One necessary way of adjusting to this fact is by lowering the floor for eligibility so that the displaced workers of our modern productive plant can begin to receive benefits at an earlier age if they have been forcibly retired before they are 65.

3. ELIGIBILITY OF WIDOWED MOTHERS

My third proposal—to make widowed mothers eligible at age 50, instead of requiring them to wait until they are 62 as in present law—will round out the purpose of the 1939 amendments which took special account of the fact that the widows and orphans of workers who die prematurely are entitled to protection against wage loss caused by the death of the family breadwinner. Under this provision each child was made eligible for a benefit during his minority and the widowed mother received her own benefit until her youngest child reached the age of 18. The purpose of the amendment was to make it possible for the widowed mother to remain in the home and care for her children—in the same way she would have done had her husband not died—by providing social security benefits in lieu of his wages. This is, indeed a laudable purpose and one which I heartily endorse. But it does not go far enough. Too often, I am afraid, the cancellation of the benefit check because the children are grown works a cruel hardship on the mother who, having raised her family, finds herself, in middle age, thrown off the social security rolls. At the end of the year 1958, approximately 40 percent of the women receiving mother's benefits were between the ages of 40 and 50. After age 50, as could be expected, the number of eligible mothers tapered off abruptly.

My proposal would accomplish two purposes:

First. For those mothers who are 50 or over when the youngest child reaches

18, the benefit would be continued for the rest of their lives.

Second. For those mothers who are younger than 50, when the youngest child reaches 18, the waiting period for benefits would be cut by 12 years because they would be eligible for benefits at age 50 instead of at age 62.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that all evidence shows that it is extremely difficult for women without work experience to find a job after 50. Approximately half of the women age 45 to 54 are in the labor force today and of those who have jobs, the great majority are in the low-pay service jobs in private households, business establishments, and industry. Therefore, this change is of the most urgent importance.

4. INCREASE MINIMUM BENEFIT

The fourth improvement I propose would increase the amount of the present minimum benefit from $40 to $75 per month—a change which would be of particular importance to those people who can qualify for social security only on the basis of low wages—especially domestic workers and those agricultural workers who do day work. Obviously, the present minimum benefits of $40 a month, cannot even be described as a subsistence income in our high-cost economy of today, yet about 10 percent of the people now receiving social security benefits receive this minimum amount. Because this benefit is so low, it is necessary for the public assistance agencies to supplement these social security benefits to bring them up to the barest minimum required for existence.

5. CHANGING BENEFIT FORMULA

The fifth provision would make a related increase in benefits for all people now receiving benefits and those who will apply for them in the future.

As I have previously stated, the minimum under my proposal would be $75, or an 87 percent increase over the present minimum of $40. This percentage would gradually decrease until those who are now receiving approximately $71.50 and over would receive a 5-percent increase. Moreover, since my bill would credit earnings up to $500 a month—instead of $400 under present law—the maximum old-age benefit which eventually could be paid when the new $6,000 annual wage base goes into full effect would be $155.40 per month instead of the present maximum of $127.

This revision in the benefit formula recognizes the fact that social security benefits must reflect the increases that have taken place in the cost of living. I am sure I do not need to emphasize the fact that a cost-of-living adjustment is urgently needed by our older people. For they are the special victims of the sharp rise in the price of meat, and milk, and medical care. They are trying to exist on a fixed income which buys less and less with each passing day.

6. INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY WAGE BASE

The sixth change proposed in the system is to bring the social security wage base, for benefit and tax purposes, more closely in line with modern price and wage levels. The original wage base of $3,000 covered the full earnings of 97 percent of all workers in covered employment in 1939. For the wage base of $4,200 the figure was only 72 percent, and for the present wage base of $4,800, the figure is 75 percent. Of men with earnings during the whole year, only 47 percent have all their earnings covered under the present ceiling of $4,800. Thus, for a majority of men who are regularly employed, the present ceiling puts a dead stop to further benefit increases no matter how much their earnings rise. Under my proposed $6,000 wage base, 90 percent will have their entire wages covered.

7. LIBERALIZATION OF PERMANENT AND TOTAL DISABILITY

My seventh proposal would establish a more liberal definition of permanent and total disability for the benefits which were authorized by the 1956 amendments and modify the stringent length of service requirements. These more realistic provisions would not only apply to the benefits payable to people aged 50 and over, but also to the disability freeze which applies to workers at any age.

I presume that every Member of Congress has received mail from people who have considered themselves qualified for these payments but have been rejected by the Social Security Administration. The definition of disability in the law is strict and it is even more strictly administered.

This conclusion seems to be borne out by the facts. In September 1956, right after the act was passed, it was estimated that about 400,000 people would qualify the first year. The President's budget message in January 1957 dropped the figure to 380,000 and later in the year the bureau of old-age and survivors insurance issued a revised estimate of 275,000. Actually as of June 1961 some 558,000 disability beneficiaries were on the rolls.

The change I propose would modify the requirement in present law that the disabled person must be unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity by stating that he must be unable to engage in a substantial gainful activity which is the same or similar to the occupation or employment last performed by him on a regular basis before the onset of such impairment. This latter terminology is closer to what Congress really intended in passing the 1956 amendments and will insure administration of the act in a way that will give the American worker real protection against crippling injury or disease.

My bill will also reduce the quite stringent requirements that an individual to qualify, must have 20 out of the last 40 quarters of coverage before he is disabled. I propose that this period be reduced to 15 out of the last 30 quarters. Such a revision, I believe, will take care of some of the tragic cases of middle-age workers who are incapacitated in the early years of their coverage under this system.

In conclusion, let me say that we must keep our social security system up to date because we believe in the inherent dignity and worth of each individual.

If the welfare and security of our social security beneficiaries is to be properly protected, the Congress must no longer postpone action on these vital matters. My bill embodies the much needed changes presently required in our social security program. I sincerely hope the Members of this Congress will enact this program into law.

Platform of Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 23, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the platform adopted by the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State at their 15th biennial convention held recently in New York City. This platform is to be presented to the Democratic State Convention which is scheduled to be held in Syracuse, N.Y., beginning on Monday, September 17. My good friend, Harold R. Moskovit, is the State president of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York.

The platform reads as follows:

PLATFORM ADOPTED BY THE 15TH BIENNIAL STATE CONVENTION OF THE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS, INC., OF NEW YORK STATE, AUGUST 24, 1962, AT THE HOTEL PICCADILLY, NEW YORK CITY

Once again the people of the State of New York exercise the solemn responsibility of selecting those to whom the government of this State shall be entrusted for the next 4 years, and of electing a U.S. Senator and a congressional delegation to represent them in Washington.

The Affiliated Young Democrats of New York State, therefore, without being hampered by narrow partisan advantage has for an extended period been analyzing and evaluating the multivarious policies and problems that confront the present State administration and will confront future administrations.

It is therefore with a profound degree of mature reflections and serious consideration that the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., as it has done for almost three decades of dedication to the concept of good government, respectfully submits herewith its platform for the 1962 State elections.

We have always stated clearly and without equivocation our position on the vital issues, and we do so now.

1. Reapportionment: We favor at once a program of reapportionment that would give the urban areas of the State a more equitable representation in the legislature by population.

2. Primary elections: We advocate the speedy passage of legislation permitting and requiring statewide primaries.

We recommend that all primaries are to be held on a definite day in the spring of such election year.

We urge that change of voting in national elections to 2 days, the first Monday and Tuesday in November.

We support the enactment of legislation permitting presidential preference primaries giving the voters in each party the right to indicate their preference for candidates for President and Vice President of the United States and to elect delegates committed to the nomination of such candidates.

3. Presidential vote: We favor the abolition of the electoral college and the election of a President and Vice President by direct popular vote pending such amendment to the Federal Constitution, and in order to obtain an equitable division of the electoral vote. We urge the enactment of legislation at Albany permitting the allocation of the State's electoral vote among the candidates for President and Vice President in direct proportion to the popular vote.

4. Home rule: We favor a reexamination of the city-State relationship, with a view to effectuating a greater degree of home rule for the cities.

5. Education: We urge a study be made as to the reasons for the great degree of dropouts from high school and other such distressing data that so adversely affects the young, to ameliorate this condition and to institute programs to correct this disturbing situation.

We also favor a study to determine how to keep our teachers in the school system and how to attract talented and able people to the teaching profession.

We favor an increase in State aid for education so that New York City and other municipalities will receive a fair share of the taxes paid by their residents.

6. Higher education: We favor the restoration of the mandate assuring free tuition at city colleges.

We endorse granting parents for deduction for tuition costs of their children attending college.

We also favor free tuition at all community colleges.

We urge the building of a new science college in our State to help meet the new advances in science.

7. Housing: We urge the building of more middle-income homes to meet this need in our State.

We favor a bill to extend the ban on racial discrimination in housing to all multiple dwellings and to one or two family houses throughout the State.

8. Could care: We advocate a program of State aid for child day care in the public schools.

9. Eighteen-year-old vote: We again urge that the right to vote be given to those 18 years of age.

10. Board of elections: We favor a revision of the board of elections in New York City that the Counties of Queens, Bronx, and Richmond have representation on this board as well as Kings and New York Counties have now.

11. Taxes: We favor a more equitable distribution of State revenues, whereby New York City would receive a commensurate proportion from the State.

We urge a reduction of State taxes to the greatest extent compatible with a solvent State government.

12: Fair sabbath law: We favor the enactment of a law permitting the city of New York to enact a fair sabbath law.

18. Home rule: We urge a reexamination of the city-State relationship, with a view to effectuating a greater degree of home rule for the cities.

14. Subway fare: We favor maintenance of the present 15-cent subway fare in New York City by requiring the State to contribute its fair share to the cost of operating the subway system.

15. Juvenile delinquency: We favor a study of the entire penal system as it relates to the juvenile and to recodify the statutes in order to properly resolve this grievous problem of our own society.

We also favor a crash program which will coordinate all the facilities of the relevant agencies in order to guide and help our young to help themselves.

16. Off-track betting: We favor off-track betting by a referendum by each city or community that wants this legislation.

17. Pollution: We favor a study and research to be conducted to help curtail the pollution of our air and water.

18. Natural resources: We favor legislation for an extensive program by our State to conserve and develop our natural resources.

19. Public health: We urge more State aid for public health, more assistance to the mentally ill, and to build more rehabilitation centers.

20. Liquor laws: We favor the raising of the drinking age to 21 years.

21. Old age care: We favor a system that would render medical care to the aged without requiring that the recipients submit to a degrading means test.

22. Narcotics: We favor a study of the problem of drug addiction to ascertain an effective means where possible for treatment and for the prevention of this dreadful evil. Urge Federal narcotics hospital be built in New York State.

We also urge more stringent penalties to dispensers of narcotics and the purveyors of this poison.

23. State bonus: We urge a State bonus for Korean veterans.

24. Transportation: We urge the building of more roads and better transportation to all our suburban areas of our State because of the fast growing of these communities.

We favor a transit agency that would study and attempt to coordinate and to integrate the public and private facilities available to make access to the various cities of our State more effective.

25. Motorists: We support the exclusive allocation of funds collected from gasoline and motor vehicle licenses to the development of the State highway system.

We favor examinations of all motor vehicle operators to be given every 3 years to help curtail automobile accidents.

26. East Hudson Parkway Authority: We urge repeal of the law creating the East Hudson Parkway Authority, and a return of the Westchester County Parkway and the responsibility for their maintenance to the county authorities.

27. Three-day weekend plan: We favor the 3-day weekend plan that celebrates all holidays with the exception of religious holidays. on Monday and a bill be enacted to bring this about.

28. Legislature: We again advocate that a printed record be published and made available to the public of the full proceedings of the legislature.

National Wool Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, this body, and our colleagues in the Senate have, since 1954, expressed a sincere interest and confidence in the sheep industry of our Nation through the passage of the National Wool Act and its extension. This is a unique piece of legislation in many ways, and one of the most important parts is section 708, often referred to as the self-help section.

In effect, section 708 provides the mechanics whereby members of the sheep industry can join Government in a contract which says, in essence, "you have given us financial help through legislation and we, in return, pledge a part of these funds to a program to help ourselves". Section 708 is the vehicle used by all sheepmen to finance advertising and promotion of wool and lamb. The aim is to broaden markets for these products and thereby strengthen the entire industry.

The American Sheep Producers Council was formed in the fall of 1955 after sheep owners from coast to coast had given strong approval of the basic idea through a referendum. The ASPC is owned, financed and directed by these people who own sheep. Delegates and directors are selected in accordance with our democratic principles and these men and women establish policy and employ staff members to put the policy into action.

Since this program began, the industry has faced great problems, suffered substantial reverses and enjoyed few victories. In spite of circumstances which were anything but favorable, the ASPC has made substantial progress.

Some critics have pointed out mistakes with evident relish, but the directors of the council are human and have used these errors as steppingstones to a better, more efficient operation.

Since the early spring of this year, substantial modifications of the basic council program have been made and results seem most encouraging.

In 1959 industry members were asked whether or not they still approved of the basic plan for promotion through a referendum. Approval was voiced by a larger number of voters and by a larger majority than in the first referendum conducted 4 years earlier. The Secretary of Agriculture has called once more for an expression from the people who pay the bill—sheep owners.

This referendum is scheduled for the period from September 10 through September 21, 1962, and is being conducted by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service county offices, which are mailing ballots this week to all known woolgrowers. The question is whether or not the membership of this great industry have enough confidence in themselves and their way of life to again step forward and sign our mutual pact of practical cooperation. It is my sincere hope that the program of the ASPC will be continued and that all sheep owners will so express themselves when they vote. Any producer not receiving a ballot should contact his local ASCS office and request one—and vote. By approving this self-help measure, sheep owners have reaffirmed their desire to do their part in improving their industry through the medium of promotion and advertising under section 708 of the National Wool Act.

A Tribute to Representative Kathryn E. Granahan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE D. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 27 our very able and gracious col-

league the gentlewoman from Philadelphia, Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, was the recipient of the extremely high honor. At the Golden Jubilee National Convention of Theta Phi Alpha she was initiated an honorary member of this great women's fraternity—the sixth woman to be so honored in its 50-year history.

As chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN], has been waging a vigorous and unrelenting campaign aimed at ridding the U.S. mails of traffic in obscenity and pornography. Her speech before the convention, which deals with this very important problem and the moral rot it can bring to our society, follows. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues who, I am sure, will agree with me that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] is herself a perfect example of the forces for good which she feels we need more of in this modern age of secularism, materialism, and indifference:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE GOLDEN JUBILEE, NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THETA PHI ALPHA FRATERNITY, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Madam President, distinguished guests, and my wonderful new friends in Theta Phi Alpha, to say that I am thrilled and overwhelmed at the great honor you have bestowed upon me here today would indeed be the biggest understatement I have made in the entire course of my life.

Mere words simply cannot do justice to the overpowering sense of humility, gratitude, and pride that I feel at becoming an honorary member of this great fraternity. Thank you all so very, very much.

I assure each and every one of you that I will continually strive to merit the confidence you have placed in me and to live and work always in the spirit of the high ideals and traditions of Theta Phi Alpha.

How often, over the years, as I have come in contact with Theta Phi Alpha and the fine influence it exerts, have I marveled at the tremendous force for good that it has unleashed, not only among Catholic womanhood, but into every aspect of our national life.

And how many times also have I thought how sorely we need today in this era of secularism, materialism, and indifference more such forces for good.

I am probably prejudiced, but it is a strong conviction of mine that our greatest potential force for good today here in America rests in American womanhood. And I say "potential" advisedly.

I do not think anyone can dispute the fact that American women have always been the strongest force in setting the moral climate in which our Nation was born and in which it has flourished. To them in the very earliest days of our fledgling democracy and over the span of years since has been the responsibility of preserving and nurturing the high moral standards of ethics and decency upon which this Nation was founded.

But as we look at our country and the world today, can we honestly say that this particular great force for good has realized all its full potentials?

Individually and collectively, do you not think it is time that we all reexamine our lives and our conduct and ask ourselves if we are exerting the full force for good that we are capable of? Should we not reassert and reaffirm our unified intention to do more? Should we not particularly rededicate ourselves to the protection and enlightenment of our greatest national heritage—the children and young people to whom we soon must pass the torch of freedom and godliness in a world troubled with strife and atheism?

I firmly believe, and this is a matter close to my heart, that there is no area where this force for good can achieve as productive and worthwhile results today as in Government and politics. But women in the Congress of the United States and in other governmental units are still too few to exert the influence for morality and godliness in the affairs of the Nation that they should. There are only 17 women among the 437 Members of the House of Representatives. While representation at State and local levels no doubt may be better, it is still too little—though I hope not to late.

The life of St. Catherine of Siena, patroness of Theta Phi Alpha, is the best example we have of what we all can accomplish by exerting a force for good in public life.

Though at an early age she consecrated herself to God, her good works in His behalf were mainly confined to tending the sick, serving the poor, and working for the conversion of sinners.

These were great works, indeed, and enough to give complete fulfillment to any ordinary life. But our Lord had recognized St. Catherine's great potential for good and in a heavenly vision He commanded her to enter the public life of the world.

And enter into public life she did—with such zeal and devotion that she became the greatest single force for good in the entire 14th century. Her accomplishments were enormous and she left an imprint on the world that has been felt even to this day.

How very much I would lick to see St. Catherine be able to bring her powerful force for good to work today on the problem of obscenity and pornography, which has concerned me so much as chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the House of Representatives. She would find an appalling situation existing that, I am sure, would inspire her to devote every force of her will to correcting.

Every day, youngsters between the ages of 8 and 18, in every city and town and hamlet across the 50 States—in Philadelphia and Cleveland, in Pittsburgh and in Boston, in Los Angeles and in Omaha, in every place you can name, are bombarded with the most revolting kind of filth through the mails, in magazines and books, in some movies, and even now in millions of phonograph records. Every known media of visual and oral communication is laced through with vicious appeals, cleverly and shrewdly designed to arouse improper, immoral, and and destructive thoughts and acts in boys and girls and adolescents. The hucksters of immorality use the natural curiosity of a boy or girl about life as their springboard, and coax and direct this natural curiosity into unhealthy and dangerous avenues with pictures and writings and songs and sounds brimming with depravity, sadistic crime, perversion of natural instincts, and distorted versions of sex.

Not so many years ago, if anyone wanted to read a dirty book or look at a dirty picture, he had to find some out-of-the-way, dirty little shop, hidden away and shrinking from public notice as if to acknowledge its shame—or meet some sneaky character in a dirty alley. Our own recent memories cover news accounts of ominous black cars lurking, covert figures outside of schools and schoolyards—peddlers who took children's lunch money and carfare for their filthy wares.

Well, today everything is different. The suddenness of the change, without our awareness, in itself is shocking. The producers and the marketers of filth have emerged brazenly into the light from their slimy haunts, and some even seem to glory in the achievement of notoriety our society has permitted them to attain.

Today if you want dirty stories or dirty pictures or dirty rhymes and songs, you need not search for a slum hole-in-the-wall shop or sneak into a dirty alley. You don't have to wait for the big black car or the slinking figure of a few years back. You can walk into any one of the thousands upon thousands of bookstores, stationery stores, candy stores, drugstores, bus, rail, or air terminals, subway arcades and so on—and you will find row after row and rack after rack of neat, handy little magazines, paperbacks, books, greeting cards—all manner of fiendish contrivance—openly displayed, with content that would turn the stomach of any vice squad detective.

These things represent billions of dollars a year in the pockets of pornography peddlers—but they represent something else—something much more important. They represent the thousands and thousands of children, in our cities and suburbs, in our towns and villages, whose lives may well have been twisted and perverted through their addiction to them.

Psychiatrists and psychologists have told us that, after their first introduction to these lewd, sex-filled books, the youngsters may soon become "addicts." They're "hooked" by their insatiable curiosity.

A point legislative committee in New York reported in 1958 that over 25 million dirty magazines were sold each month in that State alone, and that at least 70 percent were sold to youngsters. A special U.S. Senate subcommittee reported in 1957 that 75 percent of all American children already had been reached by this kind of obscenity. Both committees agreed, and my subcommittee studies have confirmed the agreemeet and we are supported by law enforcement officials, medical and psychiatric experts, and other lay and church authority, that these magazines glorify sin, distorted sex ideas and practices, perversion, and crime.

This rotten philosophy is as near to our children—or grandchildren—as the little candy store, down the block—or around the corner—where they buy their cokes, and comic books and bubble gum. No community is immune—and no child is safe.

All that is necessary to start any child on this road to physical, mental, and moral ruin, is an intermediary—another boy—or another girl—who has already been introduced to this filth—and who may introduce our children to it. And remember this—the "nice" kids are just as curious as the others. Some unscrupulous newsstand dealers have even been known to give a couple of magazines to a group of youngsters—knowing that their curiosity will insure him many future sales.

The record of every police department of every big city in this country is written proof of the effect of this salacious material on crime—especially juvenile crimes.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, recently had this to say about the problem:

"I say that we can no longer afford to wait for an answer. What we do know is that in an overwhelmingly large number of cases sex crime is associated with pornography. We know that sex criminals read it, are clearly influenced by it.

"I believe (and I am still quoting) that pornography is a major cause of sex violence. I believe that if we can eliminate the distribution of such items among impressionable school-age children, we shall greatly reduce our frightening sex crime rate."

One police officer who testified before my subcommittee could not recall a single arrest in a juvenile sex case in which quan-

titles of pornography were not found in the offender's possession. Inspector Harry Fox, of the Philadelphia Police Department, told us recently:

"My men search all juveniles taken into custody. I wish I could lay before you the pile of obscene pictures ripped out of magazines and valued as cherished possessions by these boys. We destroy them with a lecture—but many times this is 'closing the door after the horse has been stolen.' The damage has been done."

Two blocks from my office on Capitol Hill there is the old but very beautiful St. Peter's Catholic Church. Being convenient, it is visited often during the day by many of the Catholic people who work on Capitol Hill. We find it especially convenient for attending mass on holy days of obligation.

Several weeks ago this holy sanctuary was the scene of an event that shocked and horrified the entire Nation's Capital. A young woman secretary to a Member of Congress, paying a visit to the church on her lunch hour, was attacked and stabbed nine times by a man who had been lurking in the shadows while she knelt in silent prayer at our Lord's altar.

The man has been apprehended, thanks to an aroused citizenry that demanded and got prompt action from the police.

He admitted, not only the stabbing attack in the church, but confessed to three recent rapes.

But, let me read to you at this point from the front-page story that appeared in the Washington Post on August 9, the day after the arrest was made:

This is the lead paragraph:

"A 24-year-old Southwest Washington man was seized early yesterday in connection with the stabbing of a Congressman's aid and in three recent rapes."

This paragraph is in the middle of the story:

"He has a long police record and has been charged several times previously as a sex offender."

Now, here is the last paragraph of this two-column news account which can be found continued over among the advertisements on page 23 of the newspaper:

"In a suitcase under Jones' bed police found a large quantity of what they described as sex magazines, showing pictures of nude women."

Do you suppose I will ever again be able to kneel in the holy quiet of St. Peter's without seeing over and over the agony that was wrought there before the Blessed Sacrament by a mind crazed and tormented by the "merchants of filth"?

I have been mainly concerned here tonight with alerting you to the fact that there does, indeed, exist in our country today a very serious problem of obscenity and pornography. It is with us, it is big-time business, it cannot be ignored.

I would have liked to have told you more about the work of my subcommittee in this field, particularly about some of the new legislation which we have been responsible for and about further legislation that I feel is desperately needed.

I could have spent the entire evening discussing with you the recent series of incredible Supreme Court decisions which apparently seek to establish a pattern of life here barren of prayer but abundant with obscenity.

But, in the limited time available, I am content simply to alert you to this terrible menace because I sincerely feel that only when the public is fully informed will we be able to stem the ravages that are caused by filth and smut. I have enough faith in the moral and spiritual backbone of this Nation to know that when thinking men and women get to know the whole sordid story of pornography for profit, they will not long stand by and do nothing.

They will demand, and they will get, better laws and more strict enforcement of these laws. They will form their own community groups to clean up this muck on the local level. They will fight to rid their communities of this cancerous growth which, if unchecked, will insidiously destroy the moral tissue of our great Nation. They will not need be reminded of Edmund Burke's admonition:

"All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." But the things that proceed out of the mouth come from the heart, and it is they tha defile a man. For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, immorality, thefts, false witness, blasphemies.

This is as true today as it was when it was uttered by our Lord to the scribes and Pharisees many, many years ago.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N.C*
Alford, Dale, *Ark*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn* 4501 Conn. Ave.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Andrews, George W., *Ala* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N.Y*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N.J* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Barry, Robert R., *N.Y* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N.H*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont* 217 Slade Run Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Becker, Frank J., *N.Y*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Beermann, Ralph F., *Nebr.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Bennett, John B., *Mich* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala* The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*
Bromwell, James E., *Iowa*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* Alban Towers
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Bruce, Donald C., *Ind*
Buckley, Charles A., *N.Y*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio* 5540 Colfax Ave., Alexandria, Va.
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derounian, Steven B., *N.Y*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio* 800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* 2816 N. Jefferson Arlington, Va.
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N.Y*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* 1719 New House Office Building
Durno, Edwin R., *Oreg*
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa* 3725 Macomb St.
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Finnegan, Edward R., *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* 1235 New House Office Building
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* The Congressional
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N.J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garland, Peter A., *Maine*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Glenn, Milton W., *N.J* Capitol Park Apts., 800 4th St. SW.
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* 3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George, *Ala* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Harding, Ralph R., *Idaho*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*
Harsha, William H., Jr., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N.Y*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S.C*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horan, Walt, *Wash*
Hosmer, Craig., *Calif*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa* 2120 16th St.
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johansen, August E., *Mich*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* 5906 Harwick Rd.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N.Y*
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex* 4807 Newport
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N.C*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Kyl, John, *Iowa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Langen, Odin, *Minn*

Appendix

The Tocks Island Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 7, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on March 8 and March 27 of this year I asked this distinguished body to consider the Tocks Island project. On both dates I presented newspaper articles which gave cogent arguments on behalf of the bill's passage. Recently another newspaper, the Camden Courier Post, of August 28 spoke out editorially about Secretary of Interior Udall's views on the Delaware Valley basin development, commenting that "Udall's views on the proposal speak eloquently for the vast majority of interests in our area who share them."

This comment is of the greatest importance. It graphically shows how those most affected by the proposed legislation support it. The editorial dwells upon three effects of the legislation. The first would be to offset the drought conditions that occur in the area; the second would be to control flood threats; and the third would be to provide additional recreational areas for those tramping the hinterlands in search of green-acres leisure.

Since this project is of vital concern not only to the residents of New Jersey but to those interested in conserving our national resources, I again ask my colleagues on this distinguished body to approve the detailed plans of the Tocks Island project when it comes before this body. In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have the aforementioned editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO FACETS OF BASIN DEVELOPMENT

Vacationers and others traveling up and down the Delaware Valley at this peak tourist season can make two observations in connection with plans for development of the basin's resources.

One is the effect of recent serious drought conditions, which the multimillion-dollar long-range project would offset in future years, and the other is how additional recreation areas, planned in conjunction with the resources control, will complement existing facilities.

As adopted last March by the Delaware River Basin Commission, the initial program calls for development of water and recreational as well as power resources. The Bureau of the Budget has given its approval and the Kennedy administration has decided to press for congressional approval this year.

Included would be construction of eight dams north of here, featuring a giant dam and hydroelectric facility at Tocks Island above the Delaware Water Gap. A major recreation area would be established along the 31-mile lake, to be created between New Jersey and Pennsylvania by the Tocks Island Dam, under the administration of the National Park Service.

Cost of the Tocks Island project has been estimated at $122 million, of which $64 million would cover cost of water supply, electric power and flood control systems, while $58 million represents cost of land and recreational facilities and part of the reservoir.

The 8 dams are part of an overall proposal calling for construction of 58 reservoirs in the basin to meet water and power needs for the next 50 years and to provide flood control.

The $591 million price tag placed tentatively on the entire project, of which the Federal Government would pay $232 million and the States involved $359 million, makes the improvements seem too vast to visualize easily. And the full benefits will not be realized for years to come.

But the summer's prolonged dry spell emphasizes the need for conserving water resources, just as the next or past flood threats point up the need for those controls. The added recreational areas can't come too soon for the localities and visitors now tramping the hinterlands in search of green-acres leisure.

The basin commission has just made the first changes in its initial program, changes that undoubtedly improve it. One change incorporates 90 existing municipal water supply and waste disposal units, 60 existing recreational areas, and more than 100 existing gaging stations in the plan. Another is the adoption of prevailing water quality standards in the four States.

Since these standards average about 20 years in age, and do not cover new pollutants and technological processes that may affect water purity, they will need revision. The commission is well aware of this fact. But it is correct in continuing with the present standards, as Philadelphia's Water Commissioner Samuel S. Baxter says, until the time when the necessary research and planning for setting up adequate new standards can be completed. Projects toward that end are already underway.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall seems particularly enthused now about the proposed Tocks Island Recreation Area. He feels it would benefit more Americans than any other single recreation project.

Udall says an area of this quality would constitute a superb outdoor recreation resource anywhere, but located where it is it is a resource of compelling significance. The area lies within 100 miles of more than 30 million persons, or 15 percent of the Nation's population.

The Interior Secretary's testimony was offered before a Senate Public Lands Subcommittee which has before it a bill to establish the recreation site and authorize purchase of 47,000 acres of land surrounding the reservoir. Udall's views on the proposal speak eloquently for the vast majority of interests in our area who share them.

Western Electric Co. Public Affairs Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues and the citizens of this country, the public affairs program of the Western Electric Co.

The obligations of citizenship today are becoming ever more complex. There is a tendency to respond to this situation by ignoring it, a tendency that is intolerable when this Nation's responsibilities extend throughout the wide world and even into outer space. In view of this situation, efforts to improve the caliber of citizenship are especially welcome.

Many businesses, aware that their employees have not been meeting their full responsibilities as citizens, have inaugurated programs in recent years to encourage a reversal of this trend. Among these is the Western Electric Co., which recently published a booklet describing its public affairs program. I should like to cite a portion of this booklet which has come to my attention. It says that Western Electric "feels that when increasing numbers of people become increasingly interested in and concerned about government, the quality of government will be increasingly improved and there will be better government at all levels." And by better government, the company means government that is more strongly representative of all of the people governed, government that is benefited by the active, informed participation of the greatest number of its citizens:

The ultimate advantage the company envisions extends to everyone. For the company's part, it feels that better government at all levels also means a better climate in which to do the work of business. Considering the size of government and the multitude of factors that affects its decisions, the influence of Western Electric people alone may be a small one. But it is the accumulation of small influences that finally directs the course of government.

According to this booklet, Western Electric hopes to see its employees—indeed, it urges them—"to join in the task of shaping policy and conducting the crucial business of self-rule for which the concept of democracy makes every man an instrument."

A concept of citizenship such as this is applicable to every citizen of the

United States. It would be to the Nation's advantage if more of our citizens could be exposed to an educational program, such as Western Electric's democracy-in-action course, which teaches the rudiments of political processes, as well as its informational program, which is embodied in objective profiles of the meaningful but complex problems of our times.

Programs such as this merit the support and gratitude of all of us.

Agricultural Delegation to Iron Curtain Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 7, 1962

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the United States conducts its foreign relations in an almost infinite variety of ways. Perhaps one of the most effective is the people-to-people program. Certainly in terms of taxpayer cost, it is the most efficient.

Late in the month of August 20 outstanding agricultural leaders from the State of Idaho began a people-to-people journey to four Iron Curtain countries. Under the leadership of Mr. Seth Forgren these ranchers and farmers plan to spend almost 3 weeks abroad, comparing agricultural notes with their counterparts in those countries. From their first point of embarkation, Brussels, the Honorable Douglas MacArthur II, Ambassador to Belgium, sent me this letter. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA,
Brussels, August 29, 1962.

The Honorable FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I was delighted that I was able to return to Brussels in time personally to brief the fine delegation of Idaho agricultural leaders under the direction of Mr. Seth Forsgren about whom you wrote me on August 2.

This outstanding delegation did credit to the State of Idaho. Its members represent the type of people that we like to see coming through Europe as ambassadors of goodwill for the United States.

We spent 2 hours together during which we reviewed and discussed the past and current Belgian scene, the new Europe, the Common Market, the President's trade bill, and many other topics brought out in the question and answer period.

The Embassy also made appointments for the delegation to be briefed by members of the U.S. Mission to the European Communities, and our friends in the Belgian Ministry of Agriculture sponsored a farm tour. I think that they found their stay both useful and enjoyable.

I remember with much pleasure the very interesting luncheon organized by Senator JOE CLARK of Pennsylvania in 1961, when I had the pleasure of talking with you and some of your Senate Colleagues about our Far Eastern policy, notably our policy with respect to Communist China.

With every good wish and warm personal regards,

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II.

The New Horizon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the New York Journal of Commerce on September 5 had some encouraging things to say about advances in our Nation's merchant marine. Coming at a time when we have had some discouraging news concerning that industry, it was most welcome. I insert it in the RECORD for the information of Members who have not heretofore seen it.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Sept. 5, 1962]

THE NEW HORIZON

Every now and then somebody tees off on the American-flag merchant marine just because some other nation makes some technological changes in shipbuilding that so far have not been taken by the U.S. industry.

They point out that this country is trying to compete with foreign-flag lines with a horse-and-buggy merchant marine already over the hill.

But these critics become strangely silent when American flag shipping comes up with something noteworthy just because it doesn't contain some Buck Rogers innovations that make colorful reading but little else.

We have in mind the new U.S. cargo liner *American Challenger*, first of a new fleet presently under construction, and Farrell Lines' new *African Comet*, initial vessel in the company's "third fleet" which made her maiden voyage here yesterday.

Unfortunately, these ships, like many others turned out by other lines in this country's ship replacement program, differ very little from other vessels in that they contain few automated changes.

Their real claim to fame is not that they are automated to the degree of cutting down manpower requirements. Rather it is that their powerplants, probably the finest in the world, gives the vessels speeds previously unheard of in cargo ships.

For example, the trim *African Comet* can clip 4 days off the old sailing time to South Africa, a notable achievement in these days of high speed. On the North Atlantic run the *American Challenger* can clip hours off the run to United Kingdom and the Continent. The same achievements have been chalked up by the new Lykes Bros. fleet which break some new speed record on almost every voyage.

The same thing can be said for Moore-McCormack Lines and American Export Lines on the east coast, and American President Lines, Pacific Far East and States Steamship Co. on the west coast.

That speed is important can be attested to by the statement of high South African officials who see in the *African Comet's* reduced sailing time a closening of the ties between the two countries because of the effect it has on the South African economy in getting the country's goods into the hands of buyers earlier than ever before.

At the same time it has the effect of aiding this country's balance of payments by faciliating trade movements in U.S. vessels.

And the end is not yet in sight. The current program of major ship construction during the next decade has been described as the most ambitious plan of shipbuilding ever undertaken in the United States in peacetime.

Which all boils down to this—the U.S. merchant marine despite a cargo famine on a worldwide scale, some of the toughest competition it has even been called on to face, and some other headaches, is not yet ready to play dead as many believe it should.

A few more shots in the arm such as those by the *African Comet* and the *American Challenger*, are going to go a long way toward restoring this country's seagoing prestige. It requires only a little time and patience plus some real encouragement at home and from the powers in Washington to do the job.

Persistent Price Fixers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 7, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Washington Daily News for Wednesday, September 5, contains a very short, but to the point, editorial. This editorial is entitled "Persistent Price Fixers" and deals with the so-called Quality Stabilization Act, Senate Joint Resolution 159. This is a commendable editorial which reveals that the purpose of this bill is to establish a national policy of price fixing. I believe that every Member of the Congress should be alerted to the menace of this bill and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 5, 1962]

PERSISTENT PRICE FIXERS

While a Senate committee is busy investigating price fixing in industry, a House committee has approved a bill to legalize price fixing. This bill, in fact, practically makes it illegal not to fix prices.

In general, the purpose is to give manufacturers the law-backed right to fix retail prices, and to enforce these prices on retailers who might wish to sell for less.

This is the old "fairtrade" dodge, lobbied through a number of State legislatures and repeatedly declared unconstitutional by State courts—this year in Alabama. The U.S. Supreme Court upheld such a decision from Georgia.

But the price fixers have not given up. Last year they called it "fair competitive practices." Now it is a Quality Stabilization Act. The implication is that all this is being done to safeguard the consumer. Actually, it is a scheme to take risks out of merchandising by limiting competition.

The Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission are opposed to these bills.

The Government has no business fixing prices and Congress has no business passing a law to encourage price fixing—especially with so many laws on the books aimed in the opposite direction. So let us not let the "quality stabilization" boys kid us about what they are after.

Appendix

Wisconsin Primary Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, tomorrow the citizens of Wisconsin will have an opportunity to exercise once again the precious privilege of voting in the Wisconsin primary.

In a weekend address over Wisconsin radio stations, I discussed the great importance of maximum turnouts—not only in primaries, but in general elections.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of my address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On Tuesday, September 11, you will have an opportunity to exercise your precious right to vote in the Wisconsin primary elections.

In a free republic, you have a voice, not only in selecting officeholders to serve you in public life, but also in shaping State and National policies.

As a political right, this then is also a great opportunity (for which millions of people yearn elsewhere on the globe); and a great responsibility.

By your selections, you contribute to shaping the future of Wisconsin and the Nation.

Unfortunately, early predictions for the primary estimate that only 30 percent, or about three-quarter million of the State's more than 2,300,000 eligible voters, are expected to vote.

For myself, I sincerely hope this will not be true. Rather, I would urge all of you, regardless of political party, to go to the polls and speak with your voice in government.

Traditionally, too many people fail to realize the significance of their staying away from the polls. What does it mean?

First, a small turnout may result in selection of a candidate by a minority, not a majority, of the voters; second, nonvoters deprive themselves, not only of a voice in the election of candidates, but also of a voice in government—which creates the policies and programs affecting our daily lives and national destiny; third, failing to vote gives an extra strong vote to someone whose views may directly oppose your political philosophy; fourth, apathy toward voting reflects apathy toward the overall responsibilities of citizenship.

In a republic, the electoral process, then, is the means by which you, the voters, control the governmental machinery established to carry out the business of the people.

If we allow somebody else to tend our business, there can be a dangerous loss of freedom.

Prior to voting, all of us naturally need to educate ourselves upon the candidates and their qualifications, including records of the past and programs for the future; the issues of the times, such as promoting peace, U.S. security, sound economic progress, and human well-being; and then make our best judgment as to which candidate can best serve us at this critical time in history.

As citizens of a free, wonderful country, we—you and I—then possess a great power: a vote.

The ballot, then, is the means by which "we the people speak."

If we speak together, then, the laws and national policies of Wisconsin and the Nation will reflect our will and we can build a better, brighter future.

Let's all vote, and get our friends and neighbors to vote, in the primary on Tuesday.

The Fifth South Pacific Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which I have received from Prof. Knowles A. Ryerson, dean emeritus of the University of California College of Agriculture and senior U.S. Commissioner of the South Pacific Commission. I am sure that Members of Congress will be interested in his comments on the recent Fifth South Pacific Conference and the ensuing meeting of the South Pacific Commission, both meetings held in Pagopago, American Samoa.

Professor Ryerson's letter follows:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
Berkeley, Calif., August 16, 1962.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN,
House of Representatives,
U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KIRWAN: I have just returned from the recently held fifth South Pacific Conference and the short meeting of the South Pacific Commission which followed—both held in Pagopago, American Samoa. I only wish you could have mingled with the delegates from the 18 island territories stretching from New Guinea to Tahiti and heard their expressions of pleasure and appreciation at the splendid facilities made available through the providing of the new school and other facilities at Pagopago and completed in time for the use of the Conference.

Governor H. Rex Lee has told me of the fight you made to secure the additional funds in the deficiency bill and of the special trip you made to American Samoa to see for yourself the conditions there and the necessity for our cleaning up this disgrace to our country. Your continued support and the successful outcome has the warm appreciation of myself and all of my associates on the Commission from this country and abroad.

The completion of the jet airstrip, its dedication by Secretary Udall as the first event on the opening day of the Conference, the dedication of the splendid new auditorium in which the principal sessions were held—all of these made a tremendous impression on the visitors as well as our own American delegation. We can truly point with pride now on visiting American Samoa and not turn away in disgust. Your principal part in this achievement will long be remembered.

We have been most fortunate in having Governor Lee in that position during this period. I have spent about half of my adult life in Government service and the other half in the university. Rarely have I been so moved by the imagination, drive, energy, and understanding which he possesses. It has been a real privilege to work with him on Conference and Commission matters.

I hope you may be able to go to Pagopago again and see the results of the program you and your associates in Congress made possible.

Very sincerely,
KNOWLES A. RYERSON,
Dean Emeritus, Senior U.S. Commissioner, South Pacific Commission.

Must State Aid Be Fatal to Art?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a recent address by August Heckscher, Special Consultant on the Arts to President Kennedy, as delivered before the convention of the American Library Association in Mimai, Fla.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend Mr. Heckscher for the excellent case he makes for Government assistance to advance the arts in this country. To those alarmists who express fear over any type of Government assistance in cultural affairs, I recommend most heartily that they read this fine speech.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 2, 1962]

MUST STATE AID BE FATAL TO ART?

(By August Heckscher)

(These excerpts are taken from a recent address by Mr. Heckscher, special consultant on the arts to the President, before the convention of the American Library Association in Miami.)

When I consider the role that Government will play in the next stage of our cultural development as a Nation, I find a most suggestive precedent in the Library Services Act of 1956. Here, for the support of a cultural institution, was invoked a long-

established American practice, the giving of grants in aid.

Since 1862, we have found this an effective and satisfactory way of encouraging and stimulating activities deemed important to the national interest. We have used this principle to stimulate qualified applicants both public and private; we have used it to help set standards and to improve administration as well as to give substantial financial support on the basis of matching funds. The Library Services Act aimed particularly to help libraries in communities under 10,000 population.

It might have had a severe defect in that it spread the available funds thin, but in its administration the act was wisely used to strengthen State library agencies and to organize and coordinate services rather than merely to scatter them.

No one has talked about the libraries being subverted—nor, for that matter, has it appeared that the Nation was going through dangerous fiscal waters as a result of these expenditures. The experience is sobering to the alarmists, and encouraging to those who would like to believe that the Government can act in the field of culture without harming the ends it seeks to serve.

It was right that we should have recognized the development of libraries as demonstrably related to the broad national interest. One day, not too far off, we may come to recognize that the development of certain other institutions is also a matter for national concern. We may decide that the growth of theater groups in States across the country is connected with our capacity as a people to perceive the deeper issues of man's fate, to realize the strange admixture of good and evil in the world, and in general to become more confident and mature as individuals.

The theater, or poetry, or music, may seem as significant as libraries were recognized to be in 1956—or as educational television was recognized through similar legislation in the current session of Congress. I hardly want to predict that so wonderful a thing will happen. But I think we can argue, on the basis of experience derived from the libraries, that when such a day comes we shall have methods and precedents which will permit us to put the Government safely in the service of these new cultural goals.

I say I cannot predict when the day will come which will see the American people consciously affirming that the institutions of the arts represent a significant national interest—that they embody resources which we waste at our peril and answer to needs which cannot safely be ignored. Yet I will predict, after all. I believe such a day will come sooner than many now think—especially those who have been disheartened and wearied by a long struggle for the arts which has seemed to face insurmountable obstacles. When things begin to change in this country, they sometimes change very rapidly. And there has been a change in the way people look upon the resources of their cultural life.

Why there should be this fresh burgeoning of hope and desire it would be complex to analyze. When we are in a position to look back upon these times we shall see, I believe, that the development of the arts was linked with all the principal developments—political, economic, and social—taking place within the great modern community.

Technology has brought new leisure; and the people are coming to know that leisure will be a debasing force except as it is animated by the pursuit of beauty and excellence.

Finally, I suggest that in the development of our civilization as a whole a new determination has been formed: the determination not to be a lopsided people, excelling only in material benefits. For the individual we want the fullness of life which comes from enjoyment of the arts in all their guises. For the Nation as a whole we want the richness and diversity of cultural activities, combined with an outward scene—a landscape both natural and manmade—which reflects the inner qualities we strive to attain.

Castro Presents Danger Which Must Be Checked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been much written and said about the military assistance which Soviet Russia has been supplying the Communist regime in Cuba—a matter of grave concern to all Americans. This week in my weekly newsletter, Capitol Comments, I have discussed the Cuban situation and have pointed out that we must be prepared to move against Castro and his communistic regime.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert my newsletter today in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It follows:

SOVIET MILITARY AID TO CUBA IMPOSES THREAT—CASTRO MUST BE ELIMINATED

All Americans may well be concerned over the recent developments in Cuba which have seen moves by the Soviet Union to strengthen the military power of the Castro regime in Cuba.

The receipt of antiaircraft defense missiles, radar, electronic equipment, and other military supplies from Russia plus the landing of several thousand military technicians to operate and train Cubans in the use of these weapons has caused grave concern among Washington officials and among all our citizens.

Cuba, under the Castro regime, is a piercing thorn in our side and poses a threat to all nations in the Western Hemisphere. Without a doubt, dictator Castro and his leaders must be eliminated and freedom and liberty restored to the Cuban people.

President Kennedy has pointed out that present Russian military assistance to the Cuban Government is considered primarily as defensive and for internal use and has made it clear that the "Castro regime will not be allowed to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force."

The United States will use whatever force may be necessary to prevent the further spread of communism within the hemisphere, the President announced. This must be our firm policy.

There is no doubt but that the United States could launch a successful invasion of Cuba and rid the nation of Castro and his Communist followers. We could send the Marines into Cuba and with our naval and Air Force capabilities blast Cuba into a quick surrender and capitulation. To do so at this time would make us the aggressors and warmongers in the eyes of our Latin American allies and the world. It is felt that the Cuban situation must be considered as a part of the worldwide threat of communism and weighed in connection with our total commitments around the globe. We have established American airbases and defense commands around Soviet Russia in a containment action. These as well as our important Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba must be maintained and additional bases established. The issue must be dealt with in such a manner that it will not endanger our relations with the other free nations of the world which look to the United States as the citadel of democracy and democratic action.

The United States was successful at the Punta del Este Conference in having Cuba excluded from the Organization of American States. The OAS members also agreed at this recent inter-American Conference that should Cuba launch any aggressive action, either overtly or covertly, that the member nations would take appropriate joint action to overthrow the Castro regime.

While Russia is increasing its military assistance to Cuba, there are numerous indications that the Castro government has largely been a failure among the Cuban people.

Cubans have been unable to operate successfully many of the industries which were previously under American management. There has been grave dissatisfaction and unrest in the operation of the Cuban agricultural policy which has seen production dwindle, tighter controls on all food stuffs, and strict rationing policies enforced. There are also reports of dissatisfaction and even some fighting in certain outlying provinces by anti-Castro forces. Failures of the Communist system in Cuba, particularly in the field of agriculture and the strict regimentation of the Cuban citizens, will not go unnoticed among other Latin American nations where the beginning operation of the Alliance for Progress is giving assurance of hope along with peaceful reform and needed improvements.

The Communist Castro regime in Cuba poses a serious problem for the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere. We must not allow the cancer of communism to spread but must be prepared to move against Cuba and communism at the opportune moment. Certainly if joint actions fail the United States must move unilaterally and alone to stop the spread of communism in this hemisphere and assure that Castro be eliminated.

Hon. Phil Conley, Respected West Virginia Author and Publisher, Continues "Know Your State" Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in recent months West Virginia author and publisher, Hon. Phil Conley, has received widespread acclaim and appreciation for his series of interesting and enlightening articles entitled "Know Your State." Mr. Conley's writings, aimed at providing our citizens with little-known and useful facts concerning the history and heritage of West Virginia, have been widely read and well received in every part of the Mountain State, and throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the four most recent installments of the "Know Your State" series, written by the Honorable Phil Conley, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the installments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOW YOUR STATE: BUTTERFLIES OF NORTH AMERICA

(By Phil Conley)

William H. Edwards spent many years at Coalburg, a few miles east of Charleston, W. Va., where he raised and studied hundreds of butterflies and moths.

This great naturalist was born in Greene County, N.Y., in 1822, and died in Coalburg, W. Va., on April 4, 1909. He graduated from Williams College in 1842. He was admitted to the bar and began the practice of law in New York. In 1846, Mr. Edwards made a voyage up the Amazon River in South America for the purpose of collecting specimens of natural history.

In 1849, Mr. Edwards came to the Kanawha Valley to inspect lands which his family had purchased sight unseen from promoters. He became one of the first large-scale coal operators in West Virginia.

While developing large business interests, and building a huge fortune, Edwards found time to complete a monumental work of three volumes, "Butterflies of North America," which still is an authoritative treatise on the subject. Edward raised, studied carefully, and sketched in color a great variety of butterflies.

By personal search and collecting and through wide correspondence with other entomologists he obtained eggs and caterpillars of at least 165 species of American butterflies, most of which had previously been unknown. He reared them to maturity at his home in Coalburg. He wrote full and accurate descriptions and made elaborate drawings of these insects in all their stages.

His three volumes, "The Butterflies of North America," 1879, 1884, 1897, are recognized as the outstanding classics in this particular field of natural history.

At Edwards' death the American Entomological Society passed a resolution in which it said: "As an investigator and author of the first rank, he became widely known through his magnificent and epoch-making contributions to our knowledge of North American butterflies."

Mr. Edwards was an entomologist of the old school of thought. While he was a practical businessman and an industrialist, he studied insects from the standpoint of scientific culture.

During the Civil War, due to numerous raids in the Kanawha Valley, Edwards was compelled to close his mines. But near the close of the war he had a steam tug built at Wheeling at a cost of $30,000. He put it in service to transport coal from Cannelton to Cincinnati. This tug was capable of handling 12 barges, each one carrying 10,000 bushels of coal. At that time the market price per bushel at Cincinnati was 19 cents on the river.

In addition to the three noted volumes about butterflies, Mr. Edwards wrote a book in 1847 entitled "Voyage Up the Amazon." In 1900 he wrote another book, "Shakesper Not Shakespear."

KNOW YOUR STATE: THE FIRST LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEER

(By Phil Conley)

The first steam locomotive was built in England by George Stephenson. It made a successful trial run on July 25, 1814, between a coal mine and a port 9 miles distance. After that, the railroad began carrying passengers and freight on September 25, 1825. Prior to this, throughout the centuries, the most rapid means of transportation was by horses or sailboats.

It was a red-letter day in the history of travel when the first locomotive proved to be successful. The engineer on this locomotive was Ralph Swinburn. This man later lived in West Virginia for 40 years. After the death of George Stephenson, Swinburn came to the United States and arrived in New Orleans in January 1851. From here he traveled to Cincinnati. At this place he met one of the owners of the Winifrede coal mines on Fields Creek, about 12 miles east of Charleston. After a discussion of his experiences with the first railroad in England, he was employed to come to West Virginia and build a railroad from the Winifrede mines to the Kanawha River. This was 20 years before the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad was built through the Kanawha Valley to the Ohio River.

This was the first railroad built in southern West Virginia. In fact, it may be claimed the first completed railroad in the entire State. The Baltimore & Ohio entered West Virginia in 1838. It was completed to Wheeling on Christmas Eve, 1852, and the first through train from the Atlantic Ocean to the Ohio River reached Wheeling on January 1, 1853.

Before a steam locomotive was secured, the Fields Creek Railroad was operated by oxen that pulled the cars up the hill and after they were loaded they were lowered to the river by gravity. Later a locomotive was built and was brought to Fields Creek on a river barge.

After a few years Mr. Swinburn tired of railroad construction and operation and bought a farm in 1856 on Davis Creek, about 6 miles from Charleston. He lived there until his death in 1895. He was ordained as a minister of the Baptist Church and engaged in religious work. He built and operated a small water power grist mill on his farm.

In 1893, 2 years before Ralph Swinburn died at the age of 90, George W. Summers, editor and publisher of the Charleston Gazette, interviewed him.

In Mr. Swinburn's interview he recalled that the early locomotive had two upright cylinders with a crosshead over the boiler and two rods from the crossheads to the wrist pins. It pulled from 16 to 20 cars, holding 2½ tons of coal each. He said the great difficulty was in making steam fast enough.

When he resigned from his position as engineer of the railroad in England, his workmen presented him with a gold watch and chain. On the back of it this inscription was engraved: "Presented to Ralph Swinburn by the plate (track) layers and others under his charge, on the Manchester & Leeds Railway, as a token of respect and esteem, October 9, 1847."

In the interview given to the Gazette in May 1893, is the following statement: "The fact that the oldest railroad man in the world lives within a few miles of Charleston may not be known to many readers of the Gazette, but such is the case. Rev. Ralph Swinburn was associated with George Stephenson, who constructed the first successful locomotive and operated the first locomotive railroad. Mr. Swinburn actually ran Stephenson's first locomotive as engineer and was superintendent of the railroad upon which a locomotive was first successfully run."

KNOW YOUR STATE: A PLOT TO FORM A NATION

(By Phil Conley)

An elaborate plot to capture the Spanish-speaking colonies in the South and Southwest of the United States and form a new nation was hatched in West Virginia shortly after the turn of the 19th century. It began when Aaron Burr paid a visit to Blennerhassett Island in the Ohio River a short distance below Parkersburg on May 5, 1805.

Burr had served as a lieutenant colonel in the Revolutionary War, as U.S. Senator and as Vice President. He was a candidate for President against Jefferson. After the election they were tied in the electoral college. The choice was thrown into the House of Representatives where after 36 ballots Jefferson was declared elected and Burr took the office of Vice President.

Burr became embittered toward Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury under Washington. He challenged the latter to a duel. When the two men met on the field of honor on July 11, 1804, Hamilton was mortally wounded. Public opinion turned against Burr for killing such a popular man.

Shortly after this event, Burr started west. He and Garbriel Shaw who accompanied him left Pittsburgh in a boat on April 30, 1805. They arrived at Marietta on the morning of May 5. Burr wrote, "several gentlemen came to offer me civilities and hospitalities." He landed late that afternoon on Blennerhassett Island.

Harman Blennerhassett, son of a wealthy and influential Irish family, had arrived in New York on August 1, 1796. That autumn Blennerhassett and his talented wife crossed the Alleghenies to Pittsburgh where they engaged a boat and traveled to Marietta, Ohio, where they remained during the winter. They learned about two islands about 16 miles south of Marietta. They bought one of the islands, about 170 acres, for $4,500. They erected a mansion at a cost of $60,000 and bought the best furniture obtainable in the East. It became a show place.

The Blennerhassetts were happy to entertain such a distinguished guest as Burr. Soon the plot unfolded to establish a great nation over which Burr would be virtually a dictator. Burr had enlisted the services of Gen. James Wilkinson who had been ordered to drive the Spaniards out of disputed territory along the Sabine River.

The conspiracy was for the Texans to take over the region from the Sabine to the Rio Grande. Blennerhassett was an innocent victim of scheming power-hungry Burr. In September the two men placed an order for 15 boats with Woodridge & Co. of Marietta Ten of the boats were to be 40 feet long and five were to be 50 feet long. They estimated this fleet of boats would transport 500 men. An additional keel boat was to be built 60 feet long to transport arms, ammunition and supplies. Blennerhassett was to recruit men.

In the meantime Burr visited Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee. But all was not serene in the neighborhood of the island. A meeting was held at Parkersburg where the citizens passed a resolution and formed a military organization to defend themselves and their property. Col. Hugh Phelps was made chairman. When he called upon Blennerhassett, the latter assured him this was not a treasonable plot but a plan to purchase and colonize a large tract of land in the Southwest.

President Jefferson heard about the plot. He disliked and distrusted Burr. He referred to him as a "crooked gun." Hamilton had called him an "embryo Caesar." Jefferson sent John Graham, secretary of the Orleans territory, to make a thorough investigation of the plans that were afoot.

Graham met Blennerhassett about the middle of November 1806. The latter thought he was a confederate and revealed Burr's plans to him. Burr was arrested and tried for treason in Richmond in 1897, but there was no evidence worth considering and he and his confederates were acquitted.

In 1808 Burr went to Europe still intent upon his plan to conquer the Spanish colonies. He soon realized that he could not get England or France to help him.

The Blennerhassetts, victims of a conspiracy which they little understood, were the losers. Their mansion was burned and their friends in Marietta deserted them. They went to Canada and later to the Isle

of Guernsey where Blennerhassett died on February 1, 1831, at the age of 67.

This chapter in American history is of interest because of the consequences that would have resulted if Burr's plot had been successful. It is an "if" in our history that might have been fatal to the United States had Burr been able to bring it to fruition.

KNOW YOUR STATE: WEST VIRGINIANS RATIFIED THE CONSTITUTION

(By Phil Conley)

The Constitution of the United States is the most important body of laws ever written by the hand of man. But it was merely an interesting document until it was ratified.

Virginia was the most influential of the Thirteen Colonies. It had about double the population of any other one, and it produced the outstanding statesmen of that period. A convention was called to meet in Richmond on June 2, 1788, to consider the ratification of the Constitution.

Most historians who have written on the subject express the opinion that it was necessary for Virginia to ratify the Constitution to make the Government a success. George Bancroft wrote: "Without Virginia, this great country would have been shivered into fragmentary confederacies or separate independent States."

The opponents of ratification were headed by the brilliant lawyer, former Governor, and the greatest orator of his day, Patrick Henry. He was assisted by George Mason, a member of the Constitutional Convention and one of the outstanding statesmen of the country. Richard Henry Lee, a member of the Continental Congress from Virginia, attacked the Constitution and tried to arouse public opinion in opposition to it.

Washington did not attend the Virginia convention, but his influence outweighed that of all the opponents. As soon as he returned to his home from Philadelphia, where the Constitution was drafted, he began writing letters to influential men in every section of the country. He wrote to Charles Carter: "My decided opinion on the matter is, that there is no alternative between the adoption of it [the Constitution] and anarchy." This message was published in many of the Virginia papers.

Washington's name was frequently referred to by both sides, always with the highest regard and respect. Patrick Henry mentioned him as "That illustrious man who saved us by his valor." Mason, his friend and neighbor, said: "For the President there seldom or never can be a majority in favor of one great man who will be unanimously elected." Monroe wrote to Jefferson: "Be assured Washington's influence carried this Government."

At the close of the Convention in Philadelphia on September 17, 1787, Franklin asked all of the delegates to sign the Constitution. Two from Virginia refused to put their signatures to the document—Randolph and Mason. Randolph made the statement that he would probably regret this action as long as he lived but he felt he could not conscientiously accede to the request of Franklin. However, at the convention in Richmond, Governor Randolph joined with Madison and others and argued for the ratification.

There is no question but that the Convention which met in Richmond in June, 1788, was one of the most important meetings ever held on the North American Continent.

When the vote on the subject of ratification was taken on June 25, 1788, it favored by the close margin of 79 to 89. There were 16 delegates from what is now West Virginia; 15 of them voted for ratification. If half of the delegates from what is now West Virginia had voted with Patrick Henry and his little group of opponents, the Constitution would not have been ratified.

We have a right to claim that the delegates from what is now West Virginia actually were responsible for the adoption of the Constitution of the United States.

A Mother's Plea for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the summer issue of the Ladies' Home Journal by Margaret Hofmann entitled "A Mother's Plea for Peace."

The article follows:

A MOTHER'S PLEA FOR PEACE

(By Margret Hofmann)

(A housewife from Texas recently sent us a small, privately printed booklet, "A Key to Survival," into which she had poured all her hopes for peace. We were so moved by it that we decided to share part of it with our readers.

(Mrs. Otto Hofmann was born in Germany, but fled East Germany after the war. She came to this country, and 3 years later met her husband, a Texan of German extraction. Mr. Hofmann builds custom-made pipe organs in a shop in the rear of their home. They have four children.)

Heidi is my youngest. She has just learned to walk. Every few minutes she makes her way to where I am sitting and leans her head on my lap as though to strengthen herself for new adventures. In her dark brown eyes is reflected such confidence in me that I am obliged to ask myself, "What have I done and what am I doing to insure a happy, peaceful future for her, her brother and her sisters?"

Again and again, when I attempt to visualize this future, I see myself in the ruins of what once must have been a court of law. My children are confronting and accusing me: "You were a free citizen in a free country. Why did you not speak up?"

Their argument continues: "You knew as few American citizens did what happens to a people who do not speak up. Our grandmother was deported and killed. You knew the horrors of war. You had us get polio shots; you had us vaccinated. You spared no effort to give us a happy childhood. Yet you did not voice your protest as the destiny of our country was being shaped.

"As we understand it, your parents, and their generation in Germany, did not speak up because they were afraid. You knew that this lack of courage and this apathy cost them first their freedom, then their lives.

"Why did you not speak up?"

Today I hope to do just that.

Had anyone told me 20 years ago that someday I would have a family with whom I might live in freedom, comfort, peace, and safety, I would have doubted his sanity. All of us lived from day to day, from one bomb-shelter visit to the next. Our standard reply to "How are you?" was: "Still alive." In those days I did not believe in any kind of future.

Today, my memories of the war are becoming ever more vivid. I recognize many parallels between now and then; and the more clearly I see them, the more clearly I am beginning to understand my responsibility; namely, to make available to the citizens of the United States my knowledge, solidly based on personal experience, of the contrast between the theory and the reality of war.

I would not be so terrified, so strongly moved to share my concerns with my fellow Americans, if I did not find ever more similarities between our present attitude toward war as a theoretical possibility and the attitude adopted in my native prewar Germany. Except that then hardly anybody dared raise a warning voice. Now, in the United States, we dare and we must.

What I am about to relate are facts, not horror stories. This is reality, not theory. Oh, I could write about theory too. We also had our civil-defense drills. When I was a little girl in school, every so often the bell would ring and we would file into the basement. When the bombs fell, we would be safe in our basement. It's a good thing that when the bombs did fall they came during the night when we were at home. The school burned down.

We were admonished to move valuables from the higher stories to the lower ones, since they were likely to be safer there. What happened? The fourth floor remained intact, while the first floor burned out. We were advised to remain inside our shelters until the all-clear sounded; but after the worst raids, naturally, the sirens were knocked out.

Ah, for all that theory which put us teenagers into such an eager and adventurous mood. We were taught, if an incendiary bomb hit, to rush up and toss it where it would do no damage. But it wasn't long before these bombs were outfitted with a small quantity of an explosive, and after a few blownoff hands that was the end of that theory. This little illustration, however, serves to make a very important point: War is unpredictable. As soon as we believe we have a foolproof defense system, the enemy simply pulls the rug out from under it.

I spent the war years in several different cities: Düsseldorf, Krefeld, Aachen, and Potsdam. All of them were bombed. In Aachen, half the basement in which I had taken shelter blew up. The remaining half managed to hold up under the load of collapsed house about it. In Potsdam I was in the center of town, definitely within the main target area. We would cover up our ears to shut out the noise, yet we could still hear the bombs whistling through the air as they came down in chains of four or five, each one exploding nearer our house.

Much research is being done to determine what man's instinctive and emotional reactions to the bomb are likely to be. I will here present my own experiences.

In the beginning, when the raids were still small and I was still a child, we would walk miles just to see a damaged house. We children collected shrapnel fragments and compared them to see who had the biggest or the most. We matched exciting stories of "the night before." Who had been closest to a detonation? Whose windows were broken? Windows, by the way, fall out as often as in. They are sucked out and shatter a fraction of a second before the bomb hits.

After the major raids began, all this changed. All the windows were broken, so we marveled if we saw one which was still intact. We collected no more shrapnel. The streets, or what used to be streets, were littered with it. Instead, we kept our eyes open for duds. Many people who had survived the air raid itself were killed hours, days, even years later by duds, or time bombs which had been "humanely" triggered to go off later.

Leadership during the raids themselves was at once desirable and dangerous. Desirable

if it was the result of real thoughtfulness; dangerous because in such unnerving moments I have found people willing to follow even the most panicky leader. A person whose own knees have turned to butter, but who still has enough presence of mind to prevent hysteria, to guide people away from fire and suffocation through dust, smoke, darkness and explosions under the constant whistling of bombs, is certainly welcome, but is a rare, rare individual. The best training in this field is often worthless, while the person of whom it is least expected may rise to great heights, only to wonder afterward how he ever did it. In fact, the trained ones often make great nuisances of themselves. Many of them feel that they must lead at any price, and everyone must obey them.

During the height of fear and danger, when explosion follows explosion, and when each second may be one's last, people may do any of the following—and I think I have done all of them during one air raid or another: Tremble, or be literally numb with fear; stare at one's watch, hoping for a few minutes to pass; find reassurance in the proximity of a congenial person; pray, scream, or remain perfectly calm as though nothing were happening; even get a conversation going in the total darkness (the electricity is shot, of course, and there is not a candle or battery left in the country), incongruously making lighthearted remarks—this can be done, too, once initiated by a true leader.

During the very worst, class distinctions and individual dislikes are almost forgotten, but this doesn't last long. As the raid subsides, thoughts turn from the present to the immediate future. We are alive. So now what? Who of our family has survived? Is our apartment still there? If it is, is it threatened by fire? How can I save it? How can I save myself if the fires should spread?

And then the reaction to the nervous strain sets in, and one may find that one has gone crazy. One may stand in the street as my father once did, watch his possessions burn, and laugh, laugh, laugh.

All those who have survived are like one family. All the objects that can be retrieved from the fire or dragged out of the rubble, or are found on the street, seemingly belong to everybody. At this stage, this is not necessarily plundering. People who have lost their home move into someone else's house, just anybody's house, without much asking, and the owners don't object.

These moments of solidarity are valuable, but short-lived. Within hours one's reactions are back to normal. Where will I obtain groceries? Is my friend, who lived at the other end of town, still alive? How about my school, my place of work? Since my coat burned at the cleaners, what will I wear? And how can I notify relatives across the country that I am still alive?

After years of air raids, fear, and ruins whever I looked, my greatest desire was to move to a city untouched by bombs. I was obsessed with longing for a place that was undemolished, that still had streets and intact buildings. I was fortunate to find work in just such a city. Its name was Dresden, one of the most beautiful cities on earth. Here were clean streets, well-kept lawns, buildings with unbroken windows. Sirens often did not wail here for months at a time, because Dresden was so located that no planes on their way to other cities needed to pass over. Though opera performances were forbidden this late in the war, one could still go to concerts. One could even take a cruise down the Elbe. Somehow, the war seemed far away.

Here, away from heavy industry, surrounded by art treasures, castles, and cathedrals perhaps unsurpassed anywhere in Europe, I felt safe. And so did most other people, as evidenced by the fact that there were no public bomb shelters in Dresden. On this city devoid of military targets, no enemy would waste his bombs. There were only a few signs which read "to the Elbe" and "to the park," so that in case of fire or danger of suffocation, people would know which way to turn.

The peacetime population of Dresden was about 600,000. Toward the end of the war this figure had probably nearly doubled. For one thing, Dresden, as an undestroyed city, offered shelter to many people who had become homeless. It was the site of innumerable hospitals and sanatoriums and, since nothing could possibly happen to Dresden, camps full of children who had been evacuated from industrial cities. Also, the city was swamped with refugees from those sections of Germany which had already been captured by the Russians. When finally there was nowhere else to go, and the hotels and private homes had filled up, they camped by the thousands on the bare floors of public buildings.

I lived and worked in a suburb 6 miles from the center of town, halfway between Dresden and Meissen. On the evening of February 13, 1945, 12 weeks before the end of the war, I was downtown, waiting for a streetcar to take me home from night school.

Fortunately for me and for everybody else awaiting it, the 9:30 car appeared. If it hadn't, as very often it didn't, I wouldn't be sitting here now.

The warning came when we were only about a mile from where I was rooming. The streetcar stopped at the first sound of a siren, and everybody was supposed either to walk or ask for shelter in a nearby building. I took my time. Why hurry? Nothing had ever happened during the 5½ years of the war. But when I heard an unusually great number of planes above me (to this moment the sound of planes at this particular altitude at night terrifies me) and saw something like fireworks not too far away, I finally ran home as fast as I could.

At the beginning of every major air raid, the first planes to arrive at the scene would place flares, "Christmas trees" as we called them, suspended in the air to outline the area to be attacked. Within this area the bombing would be arbitrary.

Our house was a rather new building, with not much of a basement. We spent a good deal of the next 2 hours in front of the house. We would race inside when we heard a new wave of planes approaching, but then again, afraid that the house might blow up and bury us, we would run back out.

The ground remained in constant vibration. It was so light outside that at one time we thought somebody had left the porch light burning. But it was only the light of the Christmas trees, the reflection of the huge fire in the city, and what seemed to be a fiery rain coming down from the planes. I don't know how this phenomenon was to be explained, but it looked as if the planes were not only dropping the standard fire bombs, but were also actually pouring out burning masses.

After 2 hours no more planes could be heard and, since I had to be at work at 6 in the morning, I went to bed. I had acquired sufficient training in going to sleep even after the most nerve-racking raids.

Never, to my knowledge, had a city been exposed to two major raids in one night. When the sirens howled 2 hours later I paid no attention to them. There were always some planes around after raids to take pictures of the effects. Besides, the warning systems were usually knocked out of order, and sirens either wouldn't work at all or would carry on for hours. I was about to drop off to sleep again when my landlady shook me. She said only two words: "Christmas trees." I was up and dressed. It was surely a mistake. There couldn't be another raid. Two more hours of continued bombing? But so it was. At 4 in the morning at last a relative silence set in. At 5 I got ready to go to work.

Around noon the next day there was another terrifying raid, the third one in 24 hours.[1] I shall never forget it. My place of work was a small plant which manufactured typewriter parts, and its basement offered little protection. I had stepped outside to find out what was going on and saw hundreds of planes approaching in orderly formation.

Planes are not dangerous while they are straight above, but as long as they are approaching—When I heard them come, I hurried inside. How many more seconds were we to live? My knees shook, and I was so scared I felt as if my whole sides had been taken out of me. Some of us screamed when the radio announcer declared, "Planes are approaching the northwest of the city. A major attack will have to be counted on." These hard words meant for each of us, including the announcer, perhaps death, crippling, and the destruction of our homes.

Miraculously, our suburb remained untouched. Our stomachs seemed to settle back into their places. Our legs began to support us again. The paralyzing fear was replaced by bewilderment. Had we survived? And for how long?

When I returned home that evening, an endless stream of people, some in torn clothes, some scantily bandaged, all dirty from dust and soot, carrying their children (the ones they had saved) or bundles and baskets, dragged silently through the streets. I was ashamed, even scared, to be cleanly dressed.

I waited 3 weeks before I decided to walk into town; of course there was no transportation. Perhaps I shouldn't have gone.

The city was absolutely ruined. In other cities, after major raids, you might still find one house here or there. Not so in Dresden. I could not find even the familiar streets. The magnificent silhouette, as painted and photographed so often from the far shores of the Elbe, was a shambles.

Even after 3 weeks there were still bodies scattered over the streets and piled up on horse-drawn cars. Some were terribly mutilated, torn to bits by explosions, or half burned. I would turn my head in the direction of a certain odor, and there would be lying a head or a hand or a leg. To this day I cannot forget the stench.

There had been the signs pointing to the park and to the Elbe. I had been told by several people that the first two raids had concentrated on the downtown section of the city, and that the third one had concentrated on the park and on the shores of the river to which thousands of people had fled. I walked through the park, and there were the charcoaled bodies still hanging in the charcoaled trees.

A quarter of a million people were estimated killed during that 24-hour period. Ac-

---

[1] From "The Army Air Forces in World War II," vol. 3, p. 731, University of Chicago Press. 1951: "The 8th Air Force devoted 2 days' effort beginning with Feb. 14, 1945, to the central German railway centers which were believed to serve armies opposing the Russians in the east. Three hundred and eleven Fortresses dropped 771 tons on Dresden * * * Dresden, which the heavy bombers had left alone until [now] had received a terrible bombing from the Royal Air Force the previous night. Smoke was still rising to 15,000 feet when the Americans arrived to make their attack * * *. But if casualties were exceptionally high and damage to residential areas great, it was also evident the city's industrial and transportation establishments had been blotted out."

tually, we will never know how many died. There was no way to check among such groups as the refugees. It is a miracle that anybody survived.

All this has happened nearly 20 years ago, but another 50 may pass and I am not likely to forget one detail. Many people have managed to forget, and perhaps they are more fortunate. I do not dare forget, lest I allow myself again to consider war a "possibility," a "solution," something to be considered the "lesser evil." Lest I fail to make every personal effort to prevent it, to help find a better remedy for the world's ills. Lest I neglect my duty to inform all who can be induced to listen of the horror, the terror of war.

Labor Contribution to U.S. Progress and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in creating our Nation, labor has provided the man and brain power, not only for progress, but for security.

On Labor Day, I was privileged to discuss the significance of labor to our national life.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For the future, the Nation—as in the past—will depend upon the working men and women of America for the manpower and brainpower to promote progress in this most productive economic system in the history of the world.

Labor Day, now, offers the Nation an opportunity to: Pay tribute to, and create greater understanding of, the great, unique contribution of labor to our national progress and security; dedicate itself to resolving serious problems—such as too high unemployment of workers of Wisconsin and America; crystallize a more effective national labor policy; and establish greater goals for the years ahead.

In a land of freedom, as contrasted to communism, every worker remains entitled to and must have protected fundamental rights and rewards of work including: the taken-for-granted right of choosing his own vocation; a good wage (reflecting proportionately the value of his productivity); a place of stature and respect in the community; economic security for himself and his family; and a voice in creation of policies affecting his well-being, rights, and future.

Nationally, the voice of labor, through organization, expresses itself strongly on formulation of national labor policy. Generally, working men and women are utilizing such power to obtain a fair share of the rewards of productivity—including fair wages, better working conditions, warranted retirement benefits, and job security.

Labor, also, speaks with a powerful voice in the shaping of other national policies for domestic progress and security.

With such a growing power, however, goes hand in hand a responsibility to serve not only the working force, but the overall interests of the Nation.

The challenges confronting labor, then, include: (1) Adhering to—and further improving—a national labor policy that will best serve, and protect, the interests, not only of the worker, but of the Nation; (2) sharing in—and contributing to efforts to resolve economic problems, including unemployment resulting from: automation; less-than-full-capacity operations of business and industry; and other factors; (3) greater voluntary efforts to dedicate its great power and resources to meeting human economic needs of our citizens; supporting civic-national causes legislation for national progress; (4) serving freedom—and combating communism—by further exporting free trade unionism—together with the story of how it may serve workers and national needs elsewhere in the world.

In the world of tomorrow, our Nation will demand, and require, an even greater sense of public responsibility from the leaders and rank-and-file members of labor, management, and all walks of life. The purpose: to assure our Nation the capability to meet the challenges of its security and fulfill the needs of its people.

With this creative, farsighted, dedicated sense of civic and national responsibility, we, as a nation, shall—I am confident—win victory over communism and create an ever-better life for our people—and, yes, mankind around the globe.

A Salute to Those Who Conserve Our Priceless Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include in part a copy of a letter with a proposed short speech to Mr. Wendell Pellett, Atlantic, Iowa, chairman of the Committee on Arrangements for the Iowa State Plowing Match to be held close to Atlantic, Iowa, on September 13, where Mr. Pellett invited me to speak. But since my duties in Congress demand my presence here at that time, I have sent the following to Mr. Pellett, requesting it be read by someone:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 5, 1962.

Mr. WENDELL PELLETT,
Atlantic, Iowa.

DEAR WENDELL: I deeply appreciate your invitation to be present and to make a short talk at the Iowa State plowing match to be held close to Atlantic on September 13.

* * * * *

Many of my good friends in the Soil Conservation Service, including yourself, with whom I have enjoyed working for almost a quarter of a century in the all-important program of conserving our priceless soil, have told me they expect me to be present at the State plowing match. I can only offer my sincere regrets for the reason above stated. If I were present and made a talk, this is what I would say:

Mr. Chairman and friends, I deem it an honor to speak here today, and to commend everybody most highly for the part they have played in conserving our priceless soil. I especially want to commend Wendell Pellett and his committee for all the days and weeks they have spent in arranging this day.

At the outset, I must say that I take great pride in the fact that the farmers of the Seventh Iowa District, with the able leadership of the county commissioners and the soil conservation technicians, have built more miles of terraces and have more acres of contoured land, and more watersheds completely constructed, under construction, and in the planning stage in the Seventh Iowa District, than in any comparable area in the entire United States.

Hence, they have rendered a great and lasting service not only for themselves and their country, but an even greater service to those who come after us. I say that advisedly. As proof of that statement, look across the seven seas to the many lands where for hundreds upon hundred of years past, the people, chiefly the thoughtless, powerful land barons, permitted their priceless topsoil to wash, blow, and erode away, and there, with no exception, the people suffer the ravages of communism, hunger, strife, and revolution, and you may be sure that scourge will continue in those many nations of this troubled world until the rulers and all-powerful land barons awaken to the fact that all wealth springs from Mother Earth, and that a nation's economy depends entirely on how well Mother Earth is treated. We are indeed fortunate that we learned this great lesson from the preachings and teachings of that great and good American, the late Hugh Hammond Bennett, the father of the Soil Conservation Service, starting only 27 years ago, and following the formation of the first soil conservation district in the United States.

I am very certain that the great majority of the American people will agree that when God created heaven and earth, He made heaven perfect in every detail, but that He purposely left the earth imperfect in many respects. Had he not done so, the first people on earth would have lived in ease and earthly comfort and long before our time all those humans would have perished as do the drones in the beehive.

Also let us never forget that history records major wars, with hardly a single exception, have been won by the side that had the greatest supply of food, feed, and fiber; for example, the Civil War, World Wars I and II, just to name a few.

Even in this atomic age, no nation or group of nations where multitudes cry for bread, and where freedom is gone, are their rulers anxious to become involved in a hot war with us and our peace-loving friends in other lands, where those people also conserve their soil and maintain high production, but should the day ever come when our good earth has lost its bounteous yield, that will be the day we become fair prey for the Communists or some other godless gang to defeat us in mortal combat.

So let us be worthy of the many blessings that have been showered upon us, and pray our children, and their children likewise, will enjoy the abundance which springs from our priceless soil, well kept.

So again I say, hats off to you who till the soil and keep it productive, even as now, with an oversupply of food and feed and fiber. How blessed we are, compared to the people in many lands who are this very minute praying just for a loaf of bread.

I hope this message will be read by someone at the State plowing match on September 13, where I would very much like to be in person.

I send greetings and my very best wishes to all assembled, while looking forward to seeing many of you after Congress adjourns.

Most sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

APARTMENT 11,
New York, N.Y., July 9, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: There will be a possibility to rally more support for the House Resolution 211 during the coming Captive Nations Week in the New York City area.

In this connection a number of individuals and organizations have asked for copies of the said resolution so that they may be better prepared to ask others for the support of House Resolution 211.

Inasmuch as those who are approached for the support of the said resolution have frequently expressed the desire to have the original copy of House Resolution 211 as it appeared in the House of Representatives, I shall appreciate as many copies of it as you can spare being sent to me at your earliest convenience.

With best wishes for success, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
STEPHAN CHEMYTSCH.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I believe your proposal, House Resolution 211 is the best and the most appropriate at the present time to do battle against the totalitarians of Moscow.

Sincerely yours,
_____ _____.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 12, 1962.*

BALTIMORE WOMAN'S COMMITTEE
FOR CUBAN FREEDOM,
Baltimore, Md., June 25, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a member of the Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom, I wish to convey my support of your House Resolution 211 calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

I would also like to point out the fact that Cuba, a nation enslaved by communism, has not been included in the committee, and urge you to please consider its inclusion as a member of the captive nations.

Very truly yours,
Mrs. ILEANA CUERVO.

METUCHEN, N.J.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I, Tichon Komaroff, a Cossack by origin, lawfully admitted to and residing presently in the United States, respectfully urge you to support favorably the enactment of the Flood resolution.

Very truly yours,
TICHON KOMAROFF.

RIVERSIDE, CALIF., *July 4, 1962.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It has been brought to my attention that you are sponsor of House Resolution 211, a bill that would establish a permanent House Committee on Captive Nations. You are to be congratulated for your efforts toward this cause. I feel such a committee would go far toward informing the American people as to conditions under which the citizens of the captive nations live.

Furthermore it would remind us that people still live under the most miserable conditions and that we should encourage our Government to do all in its power to obtain their release from the tyranny of godless communism. So again let me extend my congratulations to you and urge you to keep up the work you seem to be doing so well.

Sincerely,
JAMES V. HROVAT.

Commanding General Sewart Air Force Base Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. Frederick J. Sutterlin, who served as commander of the 839th Air Division at Sewart Air Force Base, Tenn., for more than 2 years, has recently been assigned to another Air Force base.

General Sutterlin's tour at Sewart Air Force Base was an outstanding one and through his efforts as commander of the 839th Air Division, exceptionally fine relations between Sewart and the civilian community were established. As a demonstration of their affection and high regard for General Sutterlin, both the mayor of Smyrna, the Honorable John Sam Ridley, and the mayor of Murfreesboro, the Honorable A. L. "Jack" Todd, Jr., presented General Sutterline with the keys to these two cities which are near to Sewart Air Force Base and provided him with a certificate of appreciation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert these commendations in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The commendations follow:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the 839th Air Division (TAC) with headquarters at Stewart Air Force Base, Tenn., has for several years been a key factor in the national defense of our Nation; and

Whereas the personnel and resources of the 839th Air Division have also played a vital role in strengthening the strong ties existing between the town of Smyrna, Tenn. and the military establishment at Sewart Air Force Base, Tenn.; and

Whereas Brig. Gen. Frederick J. Sutterlin has commanded the 839th Air Division since June 22, 1960, and in such capacity has manifested outstanding qualities of leadership, loyalty, integrity and courage; and,

Whereas, during his tour of duty as commander of the 839th Air Division, General Sutterlin has, through his sincere interest, aggressive leadership and unselfish service cemented the already strong ties existing between civilian and military communities; has by prompt and decisive action made available to the citizens of the town of Smyrna an adequate and pure supply of water during a period of serious emergency, and has through the depth, vigor and strength of his personal leadership and character enhanced not only the prestige and reputation of the 839th Air Division in the community, but has brought it recognition by the entire State of Tennessee and by the U.S. Air Force; and,

Whereas military duties now require that General Sutterlin depart from our community to assume vital duties elsewhere, and the mayor and board of commissioners of the town of Smyrna desire to manifest the affection and appreciation of all the citizens of the town of Smyrna: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the deep respect, affection and appreciation of all of the citizens of the town of Smyrna, Tenn., be, and the same hereby are expressed and conveyed to Brig. Gen. Frederick J. Sutterlin; be it further

Resolved, That the warm best wishes, prayers and fond memories of all of the citizens of the town of Smyrna shall forever follow General Sutterlin and be with him; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the official minutes of the town of Smyrna and that certified copies be furnished to Brig. Gen. Frederick J. Sutterlin and to his appropriate superiors.

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned hereby certifies that he is the duly elected and acting mayor of the town of Smyrna; that the foregoing is a true, perfect and exact copy of a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the mayor and board of commissioners of the town of Smyrna at its regular meeting on July 10, 1962 and that the same appears in the official minutes of the town.

JOHN S. RIDLEY,
Mayor.

CITY OF MURFREESBORO,
Murfreesboro, Tenn., July 18, 1962.

GENERAL SUTTERLIN: On behalf of the citizens of Murfreesboro and Smyrna, Mayor Sam Ridley and I present to you our key to our city and a gift as a token of the high

esteem and regard we all have for you, and also in appreciation of your outstanding services while commander at Sewart to our communities. Let us assure you that we will always have a soft spot in our hearts for you and will always remember you, not only as an outstanding commander, but as a gentleman, a true friend and neighbor.

We wish you Godspeed in your next assignment.

JOHN S. RIDLEY,
Mayor of Smyrna.
A. L. TODD, Jr.,
Mayor of Murfreesboro.

Kansas Hurt by Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, last April I joined with other Members of the House of Representatives in introducing legislation which was designed to correct the continuing threat of excessive oil imports. Efforts were made in the Ways and Means Committee to attach this legislation as an amendment to the Trade Expansion Act. However, the committee failed to approve this action and the House was unable to act because of the closed rule under which the trade legislation came to the floor for debate.

Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the August issue of Independent Petroleum Monthly prepared by Richard C. Byrd, chairman of the State Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas, emphasizes the impact which oil imports have had upon the economy of the Kansas petroleum industry.

The simple facts are, that despite present mandatory import controls, the imports of foreign crude continue to increase while the market for Kansas crude continues to decrease.

Earlier this year I pointed out that the Kansas oil industry as it exists today, with steadily increasing imports, is suffering grievous attrition, market after market, served for years is being lost.

It is more than obvious that unless imports are cut, Kansas oil, especially the independents, who do not have the resources of the major companies, are in for serious trouble.

Throughout this 87th Congress we have received numerous requests from the administration for new programs designed to stimulate the economy, alleviate unemployment, and assist business and industry. However, the plight of the domestic petroleum industry goes almost unnoticed by the administration.

We have seen employment in the industry decline, the numbers of students seeking degrees in petroleum engineering and geology have decreased, and production reduced.

The importance of the domestic petroleum industry to our national security is emphasized by the worsening of the Berlin controversy and the strengthening of the Communist grip on Cuba.

America cannot afford to let one of its most vital industries wither by default, for want of vigorous action. Oil imports must be controlled so as to permit the domestic industry to have its fair share of the domestic market, replace its depleted reserves, maintain an efficient distributive system and a strong financial structure. Only then can America retain its position of world leadership and prosperity in peace as well as a posture of strength to meet any military situation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Byrd's illuminating report on the impact of oil imports upon Kansas, along with several tables which help illustrate the need for thoughtful action by the Congress and the administration:

KANSAS HURT BY IMPORTS, ESPECIALLY FROM CANADA

(By Richard C. Byrd)

Kansas, historically, has been the fifth largest oil-producing State in the United States. In 1960, the State slipped to sixth as production decreased to its lowest level since 1950. Figure I (below) shows annual production for the 1950–60 period, showing an 8.6-percent decrease in the 4-year period of 1950–60. Total production for 1961 was in excess of 112 million barrels, the fifth consecutive year of decline.

Another interesting fact in figure I is the average daily production and average daily barrels per day per well. This decrease occurred despite an increase of 10 percent for refined products during the same period.

Since the Kansas Corporation Commission, by statute, is charged with the obligation of conserving the oil and gas resources of the State of Kansas, any factor which affects the market demand for Kansas crude is of vital importance to the commission and to the State.

That the importation of foreign crude and refined products affects the demand for Kansas crude is obvious. Kansas exports to other States both raw crude and refined products. In 1960, in excess of 47 million barrels of Kansas crude was transported out of the State. It moved, ultimately, to New York, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, and Oklahoma. Any foreign crude imported to reach markets in those States could vitally affect the market for Kansas crude.

The refined products of Kansas refineries are even more widely distributed. There are 12 active refineries operating in the State with a total daily capacity of 346,990 barrels. As stated before, foreign crude imports have a vital effect on the demand for crude oil in Kansas and for Kansas crude oil products. The continued increase in the flow of foreign crude into the United States has caused the Kansas commission, in its market demand determinations and allowables based thereon, to reduce the allowable production in Kansas to its approximate legal minimum.

By Kansas statute, our commission is prohibited from reducing the production from a well capable of producing in excess of 25 barrels per day to less than 25 barrels per day. Thus, our legal minimum allowable is about 300,000 barrels per day. If the market demand for Kansas crude continues to decrease as a result of foreign crude imports, equitable proration will be impossible and pipeline (purchaser) proration will prevail. Under such conditions, correlative rights cannot be protected.

In addition to the violation of correlative rights, a continued decrease in market demand for Kansas crude to a point below the legal minimum could cause physical waste. This would occur as a result of our necessarily reducing production from secondary recovery projects which now produce at a rate in excess of 25 barrels per day minimum. An interruption or restriction in the production from these secondary recovery projects would result in the ultimate loss of otherwise recoverable crude oil.

The present health of the oil industry in the State of Kansas can best be summarized by a quotation from a letter to the Governor of Kansas from the president of one of the State's refining companies. After noting that refined products in Kansas have deteriorated $1.47 per barrel since January 1961, he wrote: "You can readily see that the oil industry in Kansas is 'sick' and something must be done immediately or scores of producers, refiners, and marketers will be bankrupt."

As a further indication of the industry's condition in Kansas, figure II (below) sets forth the decrease in the estimated number of employees in the petroleum and related industries in the State. The average number of rotary rigs operating in Kansas has decreased from 168.7 in 1956 to 102.4 in 1961. Close-downs and mergers of refining facilities have been prevalent in the State since 1956.

Another indicator of the industry's condition can be seen in figure III (below), showing the enrollment in petroleum engineering and geology classes in our State universities. Considering the increased gas production in the State since 1957, tax revenue from oil production has decreased substantially.

The stated purposes of the mandatory imports control program are commendable. A sound domestic petroleum industry must be maintained to meet the needs of this country during periods of emergency. Unfortunately, at least so far as the State of Kansas is concerned, these stated purposes have not been achieved. Imports of foreign crude continue to increase; the market for Kansas crude continues to decrease. Proven reserves in Kansas have decreased each year since 1957 as shown in figure IV (below). In addition, new reserves, reserves and extensions of proven reserves and production are shown for each year, as well as the relationship of new reserves to production.

Foreign crude imports, plus excessive refinery runs, constitute a continuing threat to the domestic crude oil price structure. Such a climate deters exploration and development. Sworn testimony before the Commission in June 1960 indicated that the cost of discovering and producing a barrel of new oil in central Kansas in 1959 was $3 or more. Certainly, the oil industry cannot be expected to invest capital needed to maintain or improve our reserves if the price of crude oil falls below the cost of replacing existing reserves.

Lack of market for Kansas crude and petroleum products is having a devastating effect on the oil producers in Kansas. Changes in the present mandatory oil imports control program must be made. The total amount of foreign imports must be reduced. Specifically, I would recommend that a limitation be placed on the volume of Canadian crude that can be imported in the United States.

Such a recommendation is valid in view of a recent action. For several months Kansas crude has moved to a New York market through existing pipelines. Volume of this crude has been about 7,000 barrels per day. There is no other home for that crude right now. The marketer of that crude has been notified of cancellation of the purchase of this Kansas crude due to their planned importation of Canadian crude. If Canadian crude is imported into the Illinois, Indiana and Ohio areas, Kansas crude will be shut in for lack of a market. It is conceivable that Canadian crude, absent

any limitations, could be delivered to Kansas refineries via new crude lines from Canada to Montana—those would be new lines—and through connecting carriers to Kansas.

The estimated maximum production capacity in Kansas, with the existing facilities, is about 360,000 barrels per day. This volume could be obtained immediately. To maintain this present maximum capacity, the drilling and exploration rate in the State must be increased at least 30 percent over the present rate. This cannot be accomplished with the market situation as it now exists.

FIGURE I

KANSAS PRODUCTION

Crude oil and lease condensate

Year	Production (thousand barrels)	Rank in United States
1950	107,586	5
1951	114,522	5
1952	114,807	5
1953	114,506	5
1954	119,317	5
1955	121,669	5
1956	124,204	5
1957	123,614	5
1958	119,642	5
1959	119,514	6
1960	113,500	6

Daily production (actual barrels)

Year	Average barrels produced daily	Daily average barrels per day per well
1956	339,664	9.2
1957	338,956	8.9
1958	330,518	8.4
1959	329,595	8.4
1960	310,109	7.7

FIGURE II

Estimated number of employees in petroleum and related industries (Kansas)

Year	Refining and related	Production	Total
1956	4,900	16,900	21,800
1957	4,800	16,800	21,600
1958	4,800	15,900	20,700
1959	4,900	16,000	20,900
1960	4,700	14,900	19,600
1961	4,600	14,400	19,000

Source: Kansas Department of Labor.

FIGURE III

Enrollment and graduation of students in geology and petroleum engineering departments

Year	University of Kansas		University of Wichita [1]			Kansas State University
	Total	Grads	Total	BA	BS	
1956	81	9	104	20	1	Since jobs with oil companies past 5 years have been virtually nil, number of students in geology has dropped from 200 in 1956 to about 40 in 1961.
1957	83	17	89	5	0	
1958	69	16	46	35	0	
1959	34	16	42	29	1	
1960	25	18	37	23	0	
1961	23	9	12	18	3	

[1] Geology only.

FIGURE IV

Kansas proven crude reserves (thousand barrels)

Proven reserves		New reserves		Revisions and extensions of proven reserves		Production		Proven reserves			
Date	Barrels	Date	Barrels	Date	Barrels	Date	Barrels	Date	Barrels	Year change (barrels)	Percent of United States
Jan. 1, 1957	1,018,000	1957	34,000	1957	+119,719	1957	123,614	Jan. 1, 1958	1,048,000	+30,000	3.13
Jan. 1, 1958	1,048,000	1958	28,000	1958	+83,639	1958	119,942	Jan. 1, 1959	1,039,000	−9,000	3.10
Jan. 1, 1959	1,039,000	1959	18,000	1959	+74,302	1959	119,514	Jan. 1, 1960	1,011,000	−28,000	3
Jan. 1, 1960	1,011,000	1960	20,000	1960	+61,500	1960	113,500	Jan. 1, 1961	979,000	−32,000	2.8

Our Secret Economic Weapon: The Price System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, President W. Allen Wallis, of the University of Rochester, who was formerly dean of the Graduate School of Business at the University of Chicago, prepared a paper which was delivered before the Tax Foundation, Inc., meeting in Pittsburgh entitled "Our Secret Economic Weapon: The Price System" which I believe deserves the attention of all Members of Congress.

His address follows:

OUR SECRET ECONOMIC WEAPON: THE PRICE SYSTEM

(By W. Allen Wallis, president, University of Rochester)

The unhappy episode of the rise and fall of the price of steel in early April did not go entirely unnoticed, even outside Pittsburgh. Nor has it been entirely forgotten. But what was noticed at the time was trivial compared with what was not noticed. And what the incident is remembered for today is minor compared with its major permanent effects.

To be specific: At the time, in early April, what was noticed was that the price of steel stayed down. What was far more important was that our whole economic system sometimes described as a price system, sometimes as a system of free market, was shaken.

What the episode is remembered for now is the stock market crash. But a far more serious effect was that our whole governmental system, sometimes described as a system of individual civil liberties, sometimes as a rule of law, was shaken.

First, consider the short-lived increase in steel prices. To an economist like myself, outside the steel industry, this increase did not make sense. I'm not questioning whether the steel industry "needed" a price increase. What I question is whether market conditions at the time would have supported a price increase. In point of fact, steel was not bringing even the full prices already in the official lists at that time, and the industry was operating well below capacity. Under such circumstances, it just doesn't seem reasonable to think you can get a higher price than the one you are already failing to get. The electric refrigerator industry learned that lesson last spring. Like steel, it announced higher prices, only to have to cut them back.

Furthermore, when costs and market conditions do support price rises, they are not likely to support uniform percentage increases for all products.

Finally, an industry that has been described as "a lightning rod for the wrath of all recent Presidents" would seem well advised to achieve a higher average price by lowering some prices while raising others, in such a way as to provide the White House both with bewilderment and with possibilities for face saving.

My own opinion is that administration's actions had nothing to do with the failure of the price rise to stick. That resulted from weak market conditions, just as in the case of refrigerators. If the President had said to the steel industry, "Congratulations, gentlemen, you need the increase if you are going to play your part in the growth of our economy," or if he had said, "This price increase is due to the wage increase negotiated by Richard Nixon, but no price increase will be necessary when the Goldberg wage increase goes into effect next July," I think that steel prices would still be no higher today than they actually are. I am talking, of course, not about published lists of prices, but about actual transactions, taking account of extras, quality, delivery, the cash actually paid, and the speed of payment.

So I think the price increase was a mistake. But—and this is the important point—it really doesn't matter whether I (or anybody else) is right that the increase was a mistake. If it was a mistake, it was harmless because it would not have caused inflation, which is a term that refers to a rise in the average level of all prices, not just to a rise in some one price. The notion that when steel prices change all other prices change proportionately is just poppycock.

It was harmless also in a more important way; namely, that if it was a mistake it was a self-correcting mistake. Another piece of poppycock is the notion that the steel industry is characterized by enough collusion and monopoly power to enforce a price rise that the market won't sustain.

That is my first point then: that the real reason why the price of steel returned to its previous level, and in some instances even fell below it, is to be found in market condi-

tions, not in the words and acts of the administration.

Nevertheless, the administration's actions were a blow at the foundations of our economic system because those actions were an overt, explicit move toward the further regulation of individual prices by the Federal Government.

The Federal Government has a right and a duty to control the general level of prices—in other words, to prevent inflation and deflation. That is the duty of the Federal Reserve Board through its control of the quantity of money, and of the Congress through its control of Government deficits.

But the Government has an equal duty to see that individual prices remain free and flexible. Our system of market prices is the very heart and secret of our economic strength.

EXCEL IN ABILITY TO DECIDE

It is probably true that the Russian economy can do anything we can do, and even do it better. I mean that they can do any specific thing better, not everything simultaneously. For example, they could unquestionably build a bigger, better supermarket than any now in the United States, or a bigger and more automated bank. All they have to do is take a few dozen top scientists and engineers off their space programs and put them to work on a supermarket or on a bank.

But a far more important capacity, and one in which we excel them by far, is the ability to decide properly whether to build a supermarket and how super to make it, or whether to automate a bank and how automatic to make it.

Consider the problem of distributing food to the residents of a certain area. Is it more efficient to have one supermarket or a dozen Pa-and-Ma-type stores? The supermarket will involve a good structure, lots of capital equipment, and fairly high quality labor. It will need land for parking. People will come to it from considerable distances in their cars.

The Pa-and-Ma-type stores can be half basements using little capital and the labor of retired people. Customers will come only from short distances and on foot.

Which is the more efficient way of distributing food? Obviously, that depends on literally thousands of details. For example, it may be that some elderly couples who could do nothing else productive could run small grocery stores. If so, the supermarket has to be enough more efficient to offset total loss of the labor of the elderly couples. On the other hand, the type of employee who works in a supermarket may have many other opportunities that are just as productive. In that case, the Pa-and-Ma type store needs only a small margin of efficiency to dominate.

Again, the small stores can perhaps be tucked into space that has little if any alternative use, whereas the supermarket requires land and good buildings that might be more valuable if used for other purposes. The comparison requires knowing what else could be done with the land and buildings and being able to evaluate the other uses accurately.

Another range of complications arises because not only do the two kinds of stores use up different kinds of resources, whose values must be compared, but they render different kinds of services.

For each kind of store the total value to all the customers must be compared with the total cost. Only then can the two kinds of stores be compared, and the decision made that is best for the country.

Decisions like that must be made millions of times every year. The overall efficiency of the economy and our rate of economic growth are greatly affected by the accuracy and promptness of these millions of individual decisions.

The Russian economy, like all collectivist economies, makes these decisions poorly. But everyone understands the machinery by which the decisions are made. It is an administrative machinery, based on handing down orders from above.

Premier Khrushchev indicated the magnitude of the problem by presenting the following data: As of January 1, there were many millions of square feet of completed factory space that could not be used because the machinery required for those factories was not available. At the same time in other parts of the country there were hundreds of millions of dollars worth of machinery of various kinds standing idle because the factories, mines, and other installations for which this machinery was designed were not yet ready.

The American economy makes these decisions well, but the method of making them is seldom understood and is widely misunderstood. We make them through the price system. The price system, in fact, may be called our secret economic weapon.

In our economy, prices are the messages that tell people what ought to be done. If the price of something is high, that is a message to producers to try to produce more and to consumers to try to use less. How high the price is tells how hard to try. The prices of raw materials, labor, land, and equipment are the messages that tell how things should be produced, for these prices reflect the amounts of the inputs available and the importance of the alternative uses for them.

Prices are self-enforcing messages. A producer who does not produce what is wanted, or produces it inefficiently, or does not adjust to change, soon finds that he is not taking in enough money to continue to buy his inputs. He is forced to stop wasting our resources. He is stopped just as forcefully as if he had received a cease-and-desist order from a Federal Bureau of Efficiency—indeed, more forcefully, for his Congressman or his trade association might have more influence with the bureau than with his bank.

The price system functions efficiently only insofar as the prices are free and voluntary. If the prices are set other than through free markets, either because of private monopoly or Government intervention, the overall efficiency of the economy is reduced.

The threat of direct price control made explicit by the President's handling of the steel situation, and more recently by the Solicitor General's speech at Harvard, and earlier by bills introduced in Congress as early as 1959, is a very direct threat to hobble and eventually cripple our economy. Not only the administration but the public also are alarmingly willing to move toward direct price controls, at least if the Gallup poll is any criterion. The June 8 poll reported that, of the 86 percent of voters who have an opinion about whether prices and wages ought to be frozen, 47 percent are in favor and only 53 percent opposed.

PROSPECTS OF INFLATION GREATER

So my second point is that the major economic consequence of the steel episode was not the effect on the steel industry; it was to jeopardize the central source of our economic strength.

As to my third point, the relation of the steel episode to the stock market, let me say first that the only thing I really know for sure about the cause of the crash is that nobody knows the cause, including me. (If anyone tells you he knows, ask him whether he sold short last winter.)

We can discard the idea that the collapse resulted from diminishing fears of inflation. For one thing, there has been very little, if any, inflation in the United States in the past 10 years. For another thing, the prospects of inflation within a couple of years are greater now than at any time in a long while.

We have to admit, also, that the market may simply be foreshadowing a recession; it has foreshadowed all postwar recessions, though recessions have not followed all of the market's drops.

But we have to consider—and I myself think this is an important factor—that the basic threat to our economic progress that results from the likelihood of direct price and wage controls may have been a major cause. Furthermore, my fourth point, the threat to our system of government, may be the most important cause of all.

To bring out my fourth point, let me contrast the actions of Presidents Truman and Kennedy when they got mad at steel. President Truman took certain actions to control the steel industry in ways to which it objected. The industry thereupon resorted to the courts. The Supreme Court ruled that the President did not lawfully have the power he had tried to exercise, but that is irrelevant; the important point is that the courts could be appealed to by those who felt that their rights were violated.

President Kennedy, on the other hand, used powers which are perfectly legal, but he used them to achieve purposes that are entirely outside the law. Since the powers he used, such as investigating individual income tax returns, are perfectly legal, redress through the courts is probably impossible and certainly improbable.

Charles Reich, of the Yale Law School, wrote in the New Republic of April 30:

"Each of the powers the President used was a legitimate one, and nothing he did was beyond his lawful authority. That is not the issue. The issue is whether the President made proper and responsible use of his powers. The evidence is overwhelming that the actions taken or inspired by the President were primarily for the purpose of intimidating and coercing the steel industry. The previous indulgence of steel industry practices, the use of so many drastic powers in concert, and the willingness to relent after the surrender all confirm this.

"Such use of power, whether its objectives are good or bad, is dangerous. Income tax investigations are legitimate, but should they be undertaken specially, with dramatic fanfare, to frighten someone who opposes administration policies? Should a man's passport application be delayed if he does not fall into line on some economic issue? Should the goodwill of a business be destroyed by official denunciation if it proves stubborn in collective bargaining? The very immensity of Government power demands, on the contrary, that it be used in a disinterested manner, and only for the exact purposes intended. Any other use gives a President the ability to force people to do things which under the law he has no right to require. It means that people offend the President at their peril.

"The spirit of our Constitution is the spirit of limitation on all powers, of disinterested enforcement of the laws, of equal protection, of due process. It was dangerously wrong for an angry President to loose his terrible arsenal of power for the purpose of intimidating and coercing private companies and citizens.

"* * * The President has no right to force his economic policies on an unwilling industry without legislation. Unless Congress acts, the fact is that in a free society there can be no unitary public interest, no single, authoritatively fixed idea of 'the public good.' Freedom has little meaning if it only allows action that 'responsibility' conforms to the President's idea of the national interest.

"Even if everything that has just been said about President Kennedy's methods and objectives is wrong, his victory is still dis-

quieting. It demonstrates how much power Government has today. Such power, no matter how wisely exercised, is hardly less frightening because the victim forced to surrender was a group of corporate giants and not a small business or a private citizen.

"Much of what Mr. Kennedy accomplished by pressure of Government power he will hereafter be able to command by the subtlest suggeston. * * * President Kennedy's victory may have advanced peace and plenty, but it did no service to freedom."

So my fourth and final point is this: Far and away the most important and most distressing aspect of the steel episode was not the effect on the steel industry, nor the effect on the stock market, nor even the threat to our economic system, but the fact that it represented a long step toward authoritarianism. The very root and essence of authoritarianism is the idea that a central government has the authority to determine what is in the national interest, and to pursue that interest as defined by itself through any and all means.

But there is a silver lining. A long step was taken toward authoritarianism, yes; but it leaves a considerable distance yet to be traversed. Second, it was not a step from which there is no turning back. I am inclined to believe that it was an inadvertent step, an amateurish step, into which the administration felt almost pushed as an unforeseen consequence of earlier steps taken, when they rather naively assumed responsibility for labor negotiations, guidelines on wage settlements, and avoiding strikes.

The job before us then, is to make sure that the turning back occurs. That requires a fuller understanding, by the administration and by the public, of the processes of a free economy, and of the longrun evils of many shortrun benefits. Economic education is a difficult challenge but not an insuperable one. I, for one, retain some hope.

Equal Employment Opportunity Over 45

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, in all of the talk about equal opportunity for employment there is a category of our citizens which nobody seems to mention. One of my constituents, Mr. Arel R. Cunningham, has called attention to this group which is either forgotten or overlooked in their need for an equal opportunity for employment.

Mr. Cunningham's letter says:

CUNNINGHAM ELECTRIC,
St. Cloud, Fla., August 8, 1962.

Hon. SYDNEY HERLONG, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HON. MR. HERLONG: It has been brought to my attention in numerous plants about Florida there is a sign reading, "This is an equal opportunity employer." When asked about this equality I am told that it is for the Negro people which has been specified by our Government.

With this in mind, would it not be possible to stretch this a little further and provide employment for our senior citizens, between the ages 45 to 65 years of age in the same manner. It is a deplorable thing for our people who have carried the tax burden of our country thus far to arrive at the autumn of life and find that he or she is no longer needed and are suddenly turned down on employment, due to age, by companies working on Government contracts, which their tax dollars are paying for.

Please.

Respectfully yours,

AREL CUNNINGHAM.

Police Science and Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the new program in police science and administration for the term 1962–63 offered by the Community College of Temple University is of such value and importance to peace officers and those who may be interested in police activities that I have included the entire brochure for the benefit of the Members.

The course in police science and administration, the first of its kind in the Philadelphia area, was established at the Community College of Temple University in September 1960. The course leads to the degree of associate in science.

This program was recommended after the needs were analyzed by the Law Observance Conference of the Federal Bar Association which is headed by Harry O. Shargel, Esq. All law enforcement personnel, attorneys or individuals in professional police activities are eligible.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following descriptive brochure explaining the program:

A PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM IN POLICE SCIENCE AND ADMINISTRATION WITH THE DEGREE OF ASSOCIATE IN SCIENCE, COMMUNITY COLLEGE, OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The curriculum in police science and administration, the first of its kind in the Delaware Valley area, was established at the Community College of Temple University in September 1960.

The need for an organized program in police science and administration was recognized at a Law Observance Conference held by the Federal Bar Association. A committee of local education and law enforcement officials, under the leadership of Mr. Harry D. Shargel, analyzed the needs and recommended a program of study which resulted in the curriculum in police science and administration which offers the degree of associate in science from the Community College of Temple University.

The following sponsoring organizations and individuals jointly announced the establishment of the police science and administration program: Dr. Millard E. Gladfelter, president of Temple University; Dr. Allen H. Wetter, superintendent of schools; Mr. Albert N. Brown, Philadelphia police commissioner; Mr. Denis W. Gealer, past president of the Delaware Valley Association of Professional Police Officials; Mr. G. A. McLaughlin, president of the Police Chiefs Association of Southeastern Pennsylvania and superintendent of police, Lower Merion Township; and Mr. Francis D. Deegan, superintendent, Fairmount Park Police.

The police science and administration advisory committee is composed of Mr. Albert N. Brown, Philadelphia police commissioner, chairman; Mr. Howard Leary, deputy commissioner, Philadelphia Police, secretary; Lt. Col. Henry Bassetti, provost marshal, Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot; Capt. Joseph Bonner, president, Delaware Valley Association of Professional Police Officials; Inspector Philip J. Cella, Fairmount Park Police; Dr. Dalibor W. Kralovec, Philadelphia Board of Education; Supt. James J. McNamee, Philadelphia Police Academy; Dr. William A. Schrag, dean, Community College and Technical Institute of Temple University; Staff Inspector Edwin S. Schriver, Philadelphia Police; Mr. Harry D. Shargel, Federal Bar Association; Mr. Frank A. Sweeney, chief of police, Borough of Jenkintown, president, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc.

CERTIFICATE PROGRAM, PROFESSIONAL COURSES LEADING TO A CERTIFICATE IN POLICE SCIENCE AND ADMINISTRATION

	Semester hours credit
Police supervision and leadership	2
Criminal investigation	2
Criminal law	4
Social aspects of police administration	2
Police organization and administration	2
Juveline delinquency and laws pertaining to children	2
Court, probation, institution, parole	2
Laboratory techniques	2
Evidence and court procedure	4
Social science in police work	2
Homicide investigation	2

Upon the successful completion of 16 semester hours a certificate will be awarded. All law enforcement personnel, attorneys, or individuals interested in professional police activities are eligible.

ASSOCIATE DEGREE

These 16 certificate credits may be used to satisfy part of the requirements for the associate degree in police science and administration.

To apply for degree status, you must file a Temple University application and take the community college aptitude test.

Advanced standing toward the associate degree may be requested for comparable degree courses taken at accredited colleges.

For class schedule and tuition, write to the office of the dean of the Community College, Cheltenham Avenue and Sedgwick Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

An American Idea in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, a very unusual man, Mr. Burton Browne, came upon an idea which has since revolutionized entertainment in the United States. Mr. Browne, like many of us, loved the "good old songs"; he liked the styles of the past century and the gracious living that took place. In those days man was king in everything he did, but today there are few places where the rush of business and the shortness of time, enable man to really take the time to graciously relax. Mr. Browne found the solution in his Gaslight Clubs which are now right here in our own Washington, D.C., in my

home State of New York, in Chicago and even a branch in Paris, France. In the Gaslight Clubs, the decor is that of the turn of the century, the food boasts the original recipes of Commodore Vanderbilt. Here the old songs are sung to the accompanyment of a piano as old and tuneful as the songs themselves. The Gaslight Clubs have become an institution and are immensely popular. To be a member of the Gaslight is a key to prestige in any community.

Now Mr. Browne is embarking on another endeavor which involves the Gaslight Clubs, but also involves the Government of the United States. He is opening a Gaslight Club in the Republic of Korea, a club that will primarily serve the troops of the United Nations, the diplomatic corps, and the local business community. Here in the Korean Gaslight Club, the early American decor will be transformed to the East and American hospitality will prevail. United Nations troops, enlisted men and officers alike, will have a safe place and a place with the finest reputation in which to spend their leisure hours.

In this Korean Gaslight Club there will be no financial profit, for Mr. Browne is reinvesting all moneys earned in local Korean industry, thereby making this visit to a foreign country a favorable one, not only for us, but for the Government and country of Korea as well.

Burton Browne is leading the way, his idea is sound and generous and we hope it will meet with much success. Our boys away from home surely need and will much appreciate his generosity just as our men at home enjoy and appreciate his friendliness and the joyous spirit of his Gaslight Clubs.

County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors Takes Action Supporting Allowing Permissive, Nonsectarian Prayer in Public Schools—Editorials Referred to Also Herewith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call your attention to the following resolution by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and the editorials referred to:

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif.

No. 224

On motion of Supervisor Bonelli, unanimously carried, this board hereby adopts as an order the motions set forth in the following statement by Supervisor Frank G. Bonelli:

"I move that the board of supervisors commend the Herald-Examiner for their front-page editorial of Wednesday, June 27, 1962, 'God and the Law,' and the Los Angeles Times editorial of Thursday, June 28, 1962, 'A Very Upsetting Little Prayer.'

"These two learned and factual editorials sum up entirely the substantially strong feeling of millions that the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court denies the Nation's basic faith in God and, if not clarified by constitutional amendment, will result in added decisions of denial against the use of God's name by the American people and a further drift toward godlessness.

"The U.S. Supreme Court has, by the Constitution itself, the authority to interpret constitutionality and the people have the right of recourse also provided by the Constitution through a formal amendment by an act of Congress and a vote of the people.

"I would further move that the board of supervisors wholeheartedly support congressional action in support of an amendment to the Constitution allowing permissive, nonsectarian prayer in public schools, thus allowing schoolchildren who wish to join in prayer recitation to do so, and thus not denying them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our Nation.

"I further move that copies of the editorials and this order be forwarded to Members of our State's congressional delegation in Washington, D.C."

I, Gordon T. Nesvig, clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of an order which was adopted by the board of supervisors of said county on July 3, 1962, and entered in the minutes of said board.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the board of supervisors this 6th day of July 1962.

GORDON T. NESVIG,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, June 28, 1962]

A VERY UPSETTING LITTLE PRAYER

Article I of the Bill of Rights begins: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

POLITICAL PENALTIES

When it was proclaimed in 1791 it was a constitutional sanction without precedent in the Western Christian world, where every state had an established religion, usually by the choice of the sovereign, and where toleration was a specific permission to one dissenting sect or another to worship in its own churches. There was no absolute religious toleration anywhere. In England, one of the most liberal of the European monarchies, the king's subjects might worship as they pleased in 1791, but if they professed any but the established religion, they suffered political and economic disabilities. Although they were taxed to support the state church, they were deprived of the rights to vote and to hold public office. Catholics and Jews in the United Kingdom did not have these public rights until well into the 19th century.

At first, article I only restrained Congress—the Federal Government—from imposing religious establishments upon the States. But the 14th amendment, adopted after the Civil War, extended the Bill of Rights' privileges and immunities from the States to the persons of all citizens of the United States. Then no government at any level could impose a religion or penalize anybody for professing a religion of his choice. The ideal condition of religious toleration seemed to have been achieved.

But this, it turns out, was a delusion. The guarantee of religious freedom has come by degrees to mean (to some people) that because Government cannot impose a religion it should not officially acknowledge the existence of religious feeling—or should discourage this sentiment, however generalized its expression may be, whenever it intrudes into public affairs.

The Supreme Court of the United States now accepts this interpretation, which seems absurd to us. It has found that a 22-word prayer, with which the school children of the State of New York invoke the blessing of "Almighty God" on themselves, their parents, their teachers and their country, is a constitutional peril to the Nation. So in a 6-to-1 decision the Court struck down the prayer. It did this not because of the wording of the prayer, which is appealingly simple, but because it was composed by State officials and uttered by public school teachers and therefore put the Government in a position of establishing religious belief.

The nonsectarian "Almighty God" of the prayer bears a resemblance to "Nature's God," the "Creator" and the "Divine Providence" of the Declaration of Independence. The authors of that document (and presumably its signers) asserted their reliance on this authority and clearly expected him to bless their enterprise. We wonder whether the precious dissenters who carried their case to the Supreme Court would start another action if the New York State Board of Regents were to direct a reading of the Declaration by teachers and schoolchildren.

At first one is outraged by this perverse decision. But then one is alarmed. For six Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States have been persuaded by a small group of guardhouse sophists to make a burlesque show of the world's first complete declaration of religious toleration.

THE ONLY DISSENTER

Mr. Justice Stewart, the only dissenter on the Court, put it better: "I cannot see how an official religion is established by letting those who want to say a prayer say it. I think that to deny the wish of these schoolchildren to join in the reciting of this prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our Nation."

Amen.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald-Examiner, June 27, 1962]

GOD AND THE LAW

The Hearst newspapers believe that the U.S. Supreme Court decision outlawing a school prayer is a misinterpretation of the Constitution.

Using the religious liberty guarantee in the first amendment as its reason, the ruling is a deprivation of liberty and a denial of the Nation's basic faith in God.

We urge immediate use of the recourse provided by the Constitution—formal amendment—to insure that the letter of the law is not again used to negate the intent of the Founding Fathers who wrote it. We will support such amendment as it is initiated in Congress.

Although the Supreme Court ruling was made in the case of a prayer in the New York State public schools, legal authorities agree that the decision has wider effect.

It could be applied to cover not only schools, but prayer in connection with any governmental or public function.

The same thinking could prohibit mention of God in public ceremonies, thus striking at court oaths, legislative formalities—even the words "In God We Trust" on U.S. coinage.

The New York school prayer had been carefully worded to avoid offending any minority faith. It was nonsectarian and not mandatory for any child. Here it is:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

The first amendment bans any law "respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Its au-

thors, led by James Madison, made no mystery of their intention to aid "tranquility of the public mind" by insuring that "there cannot be a majority of any one sect to oppress and persecute the rest."

We do not impugn the sincerity of most of those who favor the Supreme Court decision, many of whom are themselves devoted to religion. But they are in serious error if they think nonsectarian prayer to God, not forced on anyone, is a violation of rights.

Rather it is the Supreme Court decision which is guilty of violating the "free exercise" of religion guaranteed by the Constitution.

Eminent men of law have already spoken up against the ruling as based on mere legalistic quibble.

Let us not continue the hair splitting, but instead amend the Constitution to clarify once and for all the right of the American people to use God's name in prayer as they wish to do.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, Jr.

New Program for Term Loans for Small Business Product of Cooperative Effort Between American Bankers Association and Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, over a long period of years the House Small Business Committee has been concerned with the problem of providing term loans for small business. Large companies have ready access to the equity markets, but small business does not have such advantages. Therefore any constructive efforts to supply this type of financing for small business are of extreme importance.

A new program to provide term loans for small business has just been announced by the Honorable John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Mr. Sam M. Fleming, president of the American Bankers Association. This is a most commendable program and reflects cooperation between the private banking system and the Government. Much of the credit for this program is due to Mr. Arthur F. Maxwell, president of the First National Bank, Biddeford, Maine. Mr. Maxwell cooperated fully with Mr. C. R. Lanman, Deputy SBA Administrator for Financial Assistance, in developing this project.

From time to time I have been critical of the American Bankers Association, but I welcome this opportunity to give the ABA a pat on the back for getting behind a much-needed program. I understand that the ABA is circulating information on this cooperative effort among the 14,000 members of the association.

At this point I should like to have inserted in the RECORD the press releases issued by the SBA and the ABA, together with an SBA brochure explaining "SBA's Simplified Bank Participation Loan Plan With Early Maturity Feature."

The material follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PRESS RELEASE, SEPTEMBER 6, 1962

A new program to provide term loans for small businesses was announced today by John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and Sam M. Fleming, president of the American Bankers Association.

"I wish to commend the American Bankers Association for its efforts in helping us to develop this new bank participation program," Mr. Horne said. "This cooperative effort on the part of the Government and the banking industry to help meet the credit needs of small businesses is most gratifying.

"Under this new program it should be easier for small businesmen to obtain secured term loans—up to 10 years—from their banker, with the Government underwriting a large part of the transaction.

"The essence of the program is this: The banks will make and service the loans for Small Business Administration, and will provide a large share of the loan funds. The bank's share will be repaid before the SBA starts collecting a cent on its share of the loan principal."

Here is the way the program works: If a small businessman needs $100,000 for qualified business purposes—and he can repay the loan in 10 years—the SBA will advance up to $50,000 of the money, with the bank taking a corresponding share.

For servicing the loan, the bank may deduct from the interest collected for the account of SBA one-half of 1 percent a year on the unpaid balance of the SBA portion of the loan—plus its regular interest on its own share. All repayments on the principal of the entire loan will go to the bank for the first 5 years. The SBA will defer collection on its share until after the bank's share has been retired.

The new loan program was developed by C. R. Lanman, Deputy SBA Administrator for Financial Assistance, and Arthur Maxwell, chairman of the Small Business Credit Committee of the ABA.

Mr. Lanman said, "One of the greatest needs of small businessmen is long-term loans to help them expand and create more jobs. We are aware that banks have ample resources to finance small business, but many banks are understandably reluctant to enter the term financing field, particularly as to the longer maturities. Yet longer maturities often are essential to properly finance some needs of the business concern.

"We believe we have developed a loan plan which meets our dual objectives of providing small business financing, while at the same time utilizing the resources of the private banking system," he said. "SBA will, in most instances, rely susbtantially on the bank's credit judgment, but, since the plan is still selective from SBA's standpoint, sufficient safeguards are provided to protect the Government's interest.

"The American Bankers Association not only has assisted us in working out this new loan program," Mr. Lanman said, "it also is cooperating with us in explaining the program to the Nation's 15,000 commercial banks."

Mr. Fleming said, "I am pleased that the American Bankers Association and the Small Business Administration, working together, have entered into this cooperative venture which should make it possible to greatly increase the amount of credit extended to the small business concerns of this country by commercial banks.

"Ultimately, we hope that the program will produce the desirable result of decreasing Government lending in the small-business area, with commercial banks and other private lenders increasing loans in keeping with their traditional role.

"I hope," Mr. Fleming said, "that ABA member banks will participate in the new program to the fullest extent possible so that we may give more help to small business and also reemphasize the principle of providing private rather than Federal Government credit for this important segment of the Nation's economy."

Here are the essential details of SBA's new simplified bank participation loan program with the early maturity feature:

All loans under this program will be of the immediate participation type only, that is, SBA stands ready to advance its share of the loan as soon as the bank is ready for disbursement. The loans will be serviced by the banks. As a service fee the banks will be permitted to deduct from the interest collected for the account of SBA one-half of 1 percent a year on the unpaid principal balance of SBA's share of the loan.

The bank's participation will be the greater of (a) 50 percent of the total amount of the loan, or, (b) an amount equal to the bank's loan or loans to be repaid with a part of the new loan.

These loans shall be amortized on a level principal payment basis, plus interest.

The period of time during which the bank's share will be repaid will be based on the same proportion of loan maturity that the bank's participation bears to the total amount of the loan. For example, the bank would be repaid over a period of 3 years if it participates 50 percent in a 6-year loan; the bank would be repaid over a period of 6 years if it participates 60 percent in a 10-year loan, etc.

Since SBA will not receive any repayment of principal for at least the first half of the term of the loan, it will be necessary that these loans be adequately secured generally by fixed assets, and that the reasonable depreciated value of the fixed assets will at all times be in excess of the outstanding loan balance.

No preference shall be established in favor of the lending institution in any collateral security for the loan.

Applications for such loans will be made by the bank on SBA's simplified one-page form No. 527. Because of statutory requirements, a one-page certification is required from the bank's borrower. With the exception of the note, the bank may use its own forms of mortgages, agreements, etc., and need not submit copies of the loan documents to SBA until after the bank has received the funds from SBA and effected disbursement.

It is contemplated that the banks will submit only the stronger credits for loans under this program—not the weaker or marginal ones.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., September 6, 1962.

To all Commercial Banking Institutions:

In cooperation with the American Bankers Association, the Small Business Administration has developed a new lending program which we believe will be mutually helpful to the banks, to their small business customers, and to the Government.

Under this program the SBA will join with the banks in making loans to small businesses under our simplified loan plan—with the added feature that the bank will receive repayment for its share of the loan before SBA collects its share.

The program also offers other attractive features for the bank. For instance, SBA will pay the bank for servicing the SBA share of the loan a service fee of one-half of 1 percent per annum out of the interest collected for the account of SBA, on the unpaid balance of the SBA portion of the loan. This

is, of course, in addition to the regular interest the bank will collect on its own share of the loan.

We believe that under this program many thousands of banks will be able to give their small business customers greater service by providing them with term financing—which they might not otherwise have been able to provide.

The SBA has 60 field offices in principal cities throughout the country from which the full details of this new loan program may be obtained. These offices are listed in the enclosed brochure, which explains the new program.

We believe you will like this new program. We stand ready to cooperate.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. HORNE,
Administrator.

THE FACTS—SBA'S SIMPLIFIED BANK PARTICIPATION LOAN PLAN WITH EARLY MATURITY FEATURE, ENDORSED BY THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Purpose: The Small Business Administration and the American Bankers Association cooperatively are making an effort to provide qualified small businesses with term loans from their primary source of credit, commercial banks. The SBA's simplified bank participation loan plan with the new early maturity feature is designed to help make it possible for a bank to profitably offer financing to customers it previously may have wanted to accommodate but had not been able to do so.

Benefits to the bank: The plan offers a bank several benefits. The early maturity feature of the plan permits the bank to be repaid its share of the loan before repayment of SBA's share begins; SBA has simplified its procedures bring them more in line with bank loan procedures, and the plan offers profit advantages to the bank.

Type of loan: All loans under the new plan will be immediate participation loans, i.e., upon the bank's request SBA will advance its share of the loan as soon as the bank is ready to disburse. The bank's share will be the greater of (a) 50 percent of the total amount of the loan, or (b) an amount equal to that of any loan or loans to be repaid the participating bank with part of the new loan. The bank services the entire loan.

Profit for the bank: A bank can increase its business by now being able to offer to many of its small business customers additional financing it previously has not been able to furnish, and the bank may deduct, from the interest collected for the account of SBA, a fee of one-half of 1 percent a year on the unpaid balance of SBA's share, for servicing the loan.

Early repayment to bank: The period of time during which the bank's share of the loan will be repaid is based on the same percentage of loan maturity that the bank's participation bears to the total amount of the loan. For example, a bank will be repaid in the first 5 years if it takes a 50-percent participation in a 10-year loan; in 3 years if it takes 50 percent in a 6-year loan, and in 6 years if it takes 60 percent in a 10-year loan. After the bank's share has been repaid, the bank will be released from the participation but may, if it desires, purchase a new participation in the balance of the loan. Such new participation then will be repaid in the same manner as the original participation. Any default of payment not cured within 90 days will result in freezing the respective interests of SBA and the bank. Thereafter, any future payments will be prorated.

Bank's option: The bank always has the option to purchase SBA's share of the loan at any time.

Simplified application form: The bank applies for SBA participation in the loan on SBA's simplified one-page form 527. A one page certification is required of the applicant customer. With the exception of the note, the bank uses its own form of mortgage, agreements, etc., and need not submit copies of the loan documents to SBA until SBA funds have been received and disbursed.

Loan security: Since SBA does not receive any repayment of principal for at least the first half of the term of the loan, the loan must be adequately secured, generally by fixed assets, and the reasonable depreciated value of such assets must at all times exceed the outstanding balance.

Amount of loan: The size of individual SBA loans is limited by statute to $350,000 in Government funds. However, to conserve the agency's funds, pending adequate appropriations, there is currently an administrative limit of $200,000 in Government funds for each loan, except loans for defense needs.

Loan maturities: Loans are amortized over a period not to exceed 10 years, except in cases where construction is involved. Then the loan maturity can be extended to include the time needed to complete construction. Loans for working capital are generally limited to 5 years but may be considered on a longer basis if extenuating circumstances exist.

Interest rates: Interest on SBA's share of the loan is 5½ percent. Banks are permitted to charge their customary simple interest rates, on their share, if they are reasonable. In officially designated major unemployment areas the interest rate on any share advanced by SBA is reduced to 4 percent.

Use of loan funds: Loans may finance business construction, conversion or expansion; the purchase of equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies or materials, or supply working capital.

General credit requirements: Loans should be adequately secured. Sufficient capital should exist in the business so that, with loan assistance, operations can be carried on in a sound financial manner. Past earnings and future prospects should indicate reasonable ability to pay the loan and other fixed obligations out of profits from the business. This program is intended to accommodate the stronger credits, not the weaker ones.

Eligibility of small firms: Some businesses, primarily agricultural, may not be eligible for SBA loans. Likewise, under certain circumstances, loans may not be granted. For a full explanation please call or write the nearest SBA field office and obtain the SBLP brochure "Here's How America's Banks Can Strengthen Their Communities and the Nation."

What the small business must do: The small businessman deals entirely with his bank for this type of loan, and will rely on the bank's direction in preparing the necessary credit information.

What the bank must do: Agree to take at least a 50-percent share of the loan; submit simplified Bank Request for Loan Participation (SBA Form 527) with required credit information and agree to service the loan.

Remember: The Small Business Administration feels the new plan makes it possible for qualified small businesses to obtain needed financing from their primary source of credit, commercial banks, and furthers the agency's policy to supplement the lending activities of the banks, not to compete with them. The American Bankers Association feels that the program can benefit its member banks; has fully endorsed the plan, and has offered its full cooperation.

SBA offices in any of the cities listed below will be glad to furnish more detailed information about the simplified bank participation loan plan with early maturity feature: Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Anchorage, Alaska; Atlanta, Ga.; Augusta, Maine; Baltimore, Md.; Birmingham, Ala.; Boise, Idaho; Boston, Mass.; Charleston, W. Va.; Charlotte, N.C.; Chicago, Ill.; Clarksburg, W. Va.; Cleveland, Ohio; Columbia, S.C.; Concord, N.H.; Dallas, Tex.; Denver, Colo.; Des Moines, Iowa; Detroit, Mich.; Fargo, N. Dak.; Hartford, Conn.; Helena, Mont.; Honolulu, Hawaii; Houston, Tex.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Jackson, Miss.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Kansas City, Mo.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Little Rock, Ark.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Louisville, Ky.; Lubbock, Tex.; Madison, Wis.; Marshall, Tex.; Miami, Fla.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Montpelier, Vt.; Nashville, Tenn.; New Orleans, La.; New York, N.Y.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Omaha, Nebr.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Portland, Oreg.; Providence, R.I.; Richmond, Va.; St. Louis, Mo.; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Antonio, Tex.; San Francisco, Calif.; Santurce, Puerto Rico; Seattle, Wash.; Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Syracuse, N.Y.; Tulsa, Okla.; Washington, D.C., and Wichita, Kans.

THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., September 5, 1962.

To all member banks:

I am pleased to announce that the American Bankers Association and the Small Business Administration, working together, have entered into a cooperative effort which should make it possible to increase greatly the amount of credit which can be extended to the qualified small business concerns of this country by commercial banks.

Formally entitled "Simplified Bank Loan Participation Plan With Early Maturity Feature," the approach under this new SBA program has the twofold purpose of encouraging greater commercial bank participation in SBA loans and of deferring repayment of SBA's participation to the later maturities. This will enable commercial banks to channel a larger amount of their funds into these loans.

For example, a bank participating to the extent of 50 percent of the total amount of a straight 10-year maturity loan would be repaid during the first 5 years of the loan. SBA would receive its repayment of principal after the banks share has been repaid. This arrangement will have the effect of placing private funds in the forefront of small business loans and deferring repayment of the Government's participation to the later period when Government lending would be most needed.

Ultimately, we hope that the program will produce the desirable result of decreasing Government lending in the small business area, with commercial banks and other private lenders increasing loans in keeping with their traditional role.

The accompanying letter from John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and the accompanying brochure more fully explain the program under which the SBA is seeking greater commercial bank participation for meeting the needs of small business. We commend Mr. Horne and his associates for affording us this opportunity. The program offers commercial banks a chance to demonstrate their interest in aiding credit-worthy small businesses in their communities.

The enclosed SBA brochure outlines the existing simplified bank loan participation plan, introduced last September, in which many banks are already taking part, and also describes the new program. The major factor to bear in mind is that the new program allows early maturity participation loans to be made under procedures similar to the current simplified plan.

There are several important points which I would like to make in connection with this additional cooperative effort on the part of ABA and SBA.

First, I want to make it perfectly clear that endorsement of the simplified bank loan participation plan and its early maturity feature by the American Bankers As-

sociation does not change the association's overall policy on Federal credit programs. The new SBA program represents a step toward decreasing the scope of the Federal Government's activities in the credit field consistent with our objectives.

Second, it should be emphasized that the program does not automatically bind SBA to participation with banks on any loan application. Although the SBA has said that it relies substantially on a bank's judgment, it still must be selective and will want to examine briefly each loan on its own merits.

Third, the SBA is subject to statutory and policy loan limitations which prevent it from extending funds under certain circumstances. Each SBA field office can furnish information regarding loan eligibility requirements.

Fourth, I strongly urge that our member banks take care of the financing needs of the small business concerns in their communities to the maximum extent possible without relying upon participation by the SBA and join with SBA only when this is essential to supply the credit needs of their customers. Certainly there are many small business concerns with financing requirements small enough to be serviced adequately by commercial banks wtihout participation with SBA.

Further inquiries to obtain additional information about the program should be directed to SBA field offices. A list of these offices is provided in the brochure.

It is evident that the SBA is moving in the direction of further reliance on the support and assistance of commercial banks. I sincerely hope that ABA member banks will participate actively in the new program so that we may give more help to small business and also reemphasize the principle of providing private rather than Federal Government credit for this important segment of the Nation's economy.

Sincerely,

SAM M. FLEMING.

Canine Corps' Effectiveness Produces Community Recognition and Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call your attention to the following article appearing in the Washington Star on August 22, 1962:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 22, 1962]

POLICE PRAISE OF CANINES INSPIRES GIFT

Glowing praise of the Canine Corps' effectiveness by Sgt. William Wright brought dividends yesterday—a check for $150 toward the purchase of another dog.

The gift came from the Sertoma Club of Washington after a luncheon at which the sergeant described how the 49 German shepherds now on patrol were cutting down street crime and saving Metropolitan Police time and money.

Accompanying Sergeant Wright was 4-year-old Fritz, one of the first dogs acquired by the Canine Corps, and his handler, Cpl. John Drass. Fritz was a stand-in for Cito, the sergeant's own dog, which was reported indisposed today.

Sergeant Wright stressed the psychological edge which a dog gives the patrolling officer. He cited a case in which a fugitive "came out of the bushes with his hands up" when he heard that a dog was on the way. The dogs also save many man-hours in searches of large buildings and open areas, he said.

Captain Breazeale, in charge of the Canine Corps program noted that the corps has never yet purchased a dog, relying mainly on contributions from owners of German shepherds who find them a bit too much to handle.

But he added that money earmarked for the purchase of dogs is set aside and will be used when the present limit of 50 dogs is raised by Congress. A bill providing for an unlimited number has already passed the House.

Vulcan Materials Horatio Alger Story of Industry and Southern Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the following article which appeared in the Birmingham magazine, a publication of the Birmingham, Ala., Chamber of Commerce, concerning one of the outstanding industrial firms of this country, Vulcan Materials Co., which, in less than 6 years, has grown from a small local family company to one of the 500 largest U.S. corporations.

It is a success story that is not unparalleled in the history of American free enterprise, but it shows once again what individual initiative can accomplish under our governmental system.

I believe that the Members of the House would be interested in reading the "success story" of the Vulcan Materials Co.

I insert the article herewith:

SOUTHERN ENTERPRISE FORMS INDUSTRIAL GIANT: VULCAN MATERIALS

In altering its scope of operations from that of an industrial company primarily serving four States of the Deep South to that of a supplier of the national market, Vulcan Materials Co. in less than 6 years has become one of the Nation's largest producers of crushed aggregates, that is, the sand, gravel, slag, and stone that go into construction. Other activities, such as its signs and stampings operation located in Birmingham, give Vulcan a substantial footing in other phases of the giant construction industry. Vulcan has also achieved stature as a major producer of industrial and agricultural chemicals, electrolytic tin and high-yield steel scrap.

In 1956 sales of Vulcan's predecessor, Birmingham Slag Co., were about $15 million. In 1961, the farflung Alabama-based Vulcan had sales of approximately $117 million. Vulcan's more than 125 facilities stretch from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the gulf to the Great Lakes. Divisions are Birmingham Slag, the parent of today's assemblage; Chattanooga Rock Products (Chattanooga); Concrete Pipe (Atlanta); Consumers (Chicago); W. E. Graham & Sons (Winston-Salem); Lambert Bros. (Knoxville); Stockbridge Stone (Atlanta); Frontier Chemical Co. (Wichita); and Vulcan Detinning (Sewaren, N.J.).

Expanding Birmingham Slag into a national company was an idea that its president, Charles W. Ireland, had turned over for several years before the move was made. By 1956, it had become apparent that the company was at the crossroads as far as its future growth was concerned and the time had come to make a decision as to what would be the best course to follow to provide future prosperity. Three possible alternatives had continually presented themselves: Birmingham Slag could continue as then constituted and remain a relatively small and closely held family corporation; it could be sold to a larger company; or it could merge with some publicly held company. One major event forcing a decision was the passage of the Federal Highway Act of 1956, which provided for the building of 41,000 miles of limited access superhighways, the construction to be spread over approximately 13 years. The management of Birmingham Slag saw that this legislation would materially expand the existing market for aggregates and this in turn would mean that Birmingham Slag would have to greatly enlarge its facilities in order to realize its fair share of the construction material requirements of the new highway program. This observation, in addition, of course, to other considerations, led to the ultimate decision to seek out a merger with a publicly held company whose operations were of a nature compatible with those of Birmingham Slag.

The Vulcan Detinning Co., a New Jersey corporation specializing in reclaiming tin and steel scrap from waste products, had a 55-year history as a successful, stable enterprise, and was a highly liquid company with ample reserves of cash and marketable securities. On the other hand, Birmingham Slag at that time had found a place to go, but wasn't large enough to finance the trip by itself. Their complementary interests led to a merger of the two companies in December 1956. As a result, Birmingham Slag changed its name to Vulcan Materials Co. and its stock listed on the New York Stock Exchange.

Shortly after Vulcan began operating under its new name, several other companies, primarily in the construction material field, appeared on the scene as possible merger candidates, the two largest being Union Chemical & Materials Corp., of Chicago, and Lambert Bros., Inc., of Knoxville. Both Lambert and Union were already engaged in construction materials activities. Union, moreover, had important chemical operations. After several months of negotiations between the several parties, two mergers were simultaneously consummated, one between Vulcan and Union and the other between Vulcan, Lambert and seven smaller construction material companies. Union consisted primarily of two separate and distinct types of businesses. It operated a chemical company under the name of Frontier Chemical Co. and a construction materials business under the name of Consumers Co. Those two businesses are now operated as divisions of Vulcan.

All of these mergers had taken place within a period of 12 months, and vigorous internal revamping was needed to match the demands of this expolsive growth. Each of the merged companies had its own system of accounting; its own operating practices and policies; its own employee relations policies; its own benefit program and the like. Business had to be continued on a profitable basis and management began an intensive program designed to streamline the corporate organization. These and other problems were solved through the use of a team of seasoned executives.

In April of 1958, Vulcan was most fortunate to obtain the services of B. A. Monaghan. He had enjoyed a brilliant career as a lawyer and had served Birmingham Slag and Vulcan as legal counsel for a number of years. It was he and Charles W. Ireland, then president of Vulcan and now chairman of its board of directors, who had played

the most important roles in effecting the various mergers and acquisitions and consequently Monaghan was, through his skill and intimate knowledge of the company, eminently qualified to fill first the office of executive vice president and then the office of president, which he now holds. Vulcan was also fortunate in employing additional high caliber management personnel to augment its own capable but small corporate staff.

In the course of the 6 years since it became Vulcan Materials Co., startling changes have taken place in Vulcan's structure. Long-term debt was approximately $1,925,000 at the end of 1956. At the end of 1958 long-term debt had risen to approximately $17 million but at the end of 1961 had been reduced to about $9,250,000. It currently has $17,153,300 worth of preferred stock outstanding. A very great reduction from the total of $23,931,796 outstanding at the end of 1958. The net worth of the company since the not-so-long-ago days of Birmingham Slag has climbed from approximately $9,250,000 to more than $75 million. In 1956 Birmingham Slag had less than 25 stockholders. Today Vulcan stockholders, residing in every State of the Union, number in excess of 12,000. Birmingham Slag employed approximately 1,000 persons in 1956 while Vulcan currently has over 5,000 employees.

What Vulcan has done in these last 6 years is to create a national company in an industry that has always been local in nature. The aggregate business in this country is a large one, providing raw materials for over $50 billion in new construction and over $20 billion in annual maintenance. In 1961 the industry sold well over 1 billion tons of aggregate. Interestingly enough, however, these sales were split between approximately 6,000 different companies, most of them small and family owned. Only a handful of aggregate companies in the United States have sales in excess of $10 million. Aggregates are Vulcan's main business, and even with its growth to its present size, it can claim no more than 2 percent of the aggregate business in the United States.

Vulcan moved its headquarters to its present location in suburban Birmingham in 1958. The headquarters building, constructed for the most part of glass and concrete, is ideally suited for a large corporation. Birmingham is proud to be the home of Vulcan Materials Co., a company that is changing the classic picture of the aggregate industry and a company that has climbed to national prominence via a reverse-order northward invasion from the Deep South. Vulcan Materials Co. has taken its place as an important factor in the Nation's economy, with a drive that can be characterized as southern enterprise and aggressiveness.

The So-Called New Look at Chicago's Radio Station WYNR

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, 1962, the McLendon Corp. acquired ownership of radio station WGES in Chicago and promptly changed its call letters to WYNR. The new owners also introduced a drastic change in the programing policy completely inconsistent with the sworn statements which they presented to the Federal Communications Commission at the time they applied for assignment of the license issued to WGES.

Jack Mabley, one of the outstanding journalists in America whose column appears in Chicago's American, had the following observations on this new look at WYNR in his column of September 6, 1962:

Gordon McLendon, the Texas man who bought Chicago's WGES and changed it to WYNR, has gotten a lot of publicity mileage from throwing out foreign language shows and programing the station for Negroes.

I listened to the station while driving home Tuesday. Chicago's Negro community should feel insulted by the bilge being beamed at them.

It is the cheapest kind of rock 'n roll, or whatever they call it now—screeching, whining, idiotic, caterwauling fit for morons.

The news presentation had some merit, but it is difficult to imagine intelligent Negroes listening to almost continuous screeching for occasional bits of news for Negroes.

An Editor's Sound Appraisal of the Cuban Situation and the Reserves Standby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 15, 1962

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include three thoughtful editorials which appeared in the Evening Telegraph of Alton, Ill., in the past week.

The editorials reflect a sound appraisal of the Cuban situation, the Geneva disarmament conference, and the President's request for standby authority to call up Reserves.

The first editorial appeared in the Evening Telegraph on September 6, 1962. It follows:

WAIT TILL YOU SEE

President Kennedy is following an old injunction to "wait till you see the whites of their eyes"—just as useful in these modern tense times as it was in the Nation's earlier history.

Wednesday he called a meeting of Latin-American ambassadors to fill them in on this Government's findings about the Cuban buildup.

This action followed up a statement Tuesday night in which he cautioned that the weapons being sent to Cuba by the Russian Government lacked offensive capability but the United States would use every means necessary to prevent Fidel Castro from taking aggressive action in the Western Hemisphere.

It is patent that Cuba could be the front-line of a nuclear rocket threat against the United States. But why should the Russians want to locate such bases close to us when they could get at us from longer and safer range?

Castro is trying his best to excite us into any movement that looks like agression against Cuba.

At the moment we are trying our best to better solidify the whole Latin-American front against any kind of aggression, and strengthen it economically. An attempt at Cuba, no matter how provoked except by direct aggression from there, could wreck our whole hemisphere program.

Yet this is exactly what Castro is trying to bring about with his agitation.

On the other hand, his actions, if we parry them deftly, can be directed to work our way.

The Latins are increasing in their apprehension over plans of Castro. Our standby plans to stop any oversea efforts from Cuba; our calmness in the face of the Latins' own uprising, palace coups, and junta pressures continues to revive their people's faith in a nation whose policy toward them at one time was strictly military.

A sudden move on our part would be playing into the hands of those very men who would defy the Monroe Doctrine by infiltrating and subverting the continent we are trying to keep free.

The other two, which appeared in the September 8 issue, follow:

PROGRESS, ANYHOW

Perhaps Geneva is the only place in the world where "no progress" can mean progress these days—like the old saying of lynching days: "No noose is good news."

There may be other places as time goes on.

The 17-nation Disarmament Conference recessed for 2 months Friday after adopting a "no progress" report on its deliberations. The report will go to the United Nations General Assembly, due to meet in New York September 18.

While no agreements in any area appear to have been made, at least the talks have kept nations discussing the subject. They have provided both the national officials involved, and the people of the world, a medium through which to know the feelings and intentions of these countries.

Failure to agree on anything but further talks actually could be an advantage.

An agreement involving Russia could well be merely another curtain for it to drop in front of secret activities while the rest of the world went ahead on a basis of good faith.

Possibility of this, of course, was demonstrated conclusively in Russia's last breach of the nuclear testing ban agreement with the United States.

At least the "no progress" status reflects more accurately the actual situation and will serve to keep alert the West and its people.

CALLUP VERSUS BUILDUP

How does President Kennedy's request of Congress for power to call up Reserves square with his urging the other day to keep calm in the face of the current Cuban buildup?

At that time the President expressed the belief the buildup was not capable of aggressive action.

And observers expressed belief he wanted to avoid any action that would give Fidel Castro an excuse to accuse us of threatened aggression against Cuba.

The President meanwhile promised Latin American nations that we would do our utmost to resist any aggressive action by Castro.

By asking authority to call up Reserves, Mr. Kennedy can accomplish several things:

1. He can serve notice on Castro that this country will be much better prepared to meet any campaign Cuba may start.

2. He can bolster the faith South American friends of the United States, whom we have promised to defend, that we will be ready.

3. Perhaps even more important, the President can place himself in position to have this callup power, and, by not using it, undermine Castro's repeated charges that we are getting ready for an attack on Cuba.

In answering questions about the callup power requests, White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger said he was referring merely to the general international situation.

All this could have as much reference to the new Berlin "warmup" as to the Cuban problem.

If Castro wants to charge it's aimed at him, that's his privilege.

The President has plenty of other reasons.

The Merry Wood Apartment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a statement I made on August 15, 1962, and letters which I sent on that date to the Secretary of the Army, Cyrus R. Vance; Commissioner Walter Tobriner; and Mr. Charles Horsky, adviser to the President for National Capital Affairs:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE HENRY S. REUSS, OF WISCONSIN, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 15, 1962

The treelined shores of the Potomac Palisades upriver from Washington have remained unspoiled through the years. The green and pleasant vista north of Chain Bridge looks exactly as it did when George Washington and Lord Fairfax walked along the palisades; when Capt. Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., pulled President Abraham Lincoln down out of the range of a southern sharpshooter in the fort near Cabin John.

The Potomac Palisades area is doubly dear to Americans. It is a beautiful and refreshing area created by nature. And it has been the historic location of many of the persons and events that have formed the Nation. It has still the enchanting look of wilderness. And it carries with it sacred memories of those Virginians who so largely and so generously contributed to the making of a new breed on earth: the Americans.

Until now we have been fortunate. The unspoiled character of the Potomac Palisades has been preserved by zoning ordinances of Montgomery County, Md., and Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va., restricting building heights to 35 feet (50 feet in Montgomery County), with single family houses on large lots, and forbidding tall apartment buildings which would destroy the natural line of the green trees along the shore.

The year 2000 plan for the Nation's Capital, promulgated on May 8, 1961, by the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, provides for "open spaces along the Potomac." This is to be accomplished by purchase, tax concessions, and zoning, as part of our national policy (the year 2000 plan, p. 56).

Now suburban developers would replace the historic beauty of the Potomac with a series of high-rise apartments. It is ironic that such an exploitation should take place on the soil of Virginia, because at Monticello, at Manassas, at Williamsburg, and at Jamestown, Va., has shown the world how the past may be preserved to refresh the present and to enlighten the future.

Early this year, developers got hold of the 46-acre Merrywood property, right next to the District of Columbia line along the Potomac in Fairfax County, Va., and announced their plans to erect on it three 17-story apartment buildings, to house 1,000 families. In March, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors voted to change its 35-foot height limitation zoning so as to legalize the Merrywood proposal.

This abandonment of the Fairfax County height limitation, and of the year 2000 plan open space provision, has led to other requests for rezoning to permit high-rise apartments on the Potomac. A 7.3-acre tract adjoining the Merrywood estate has recently been advertised in the Wall Street Journal for sale as "Potomac riverfront apartment land," at a price of more than $635,000. The ad reads in part:

"Adjoining land just purchased and rezoned for $16 million luxury high-rise apartment. No other apartments in area. Land this close to Washington and on Potomac River is practically unavailable."

The National Capital Planning Commission moved speedily to declare its opposition to the Merrywood high-rise apartment proposal. By its letter of April 10, 1962, it unequivocally opposed the proposed tall buildings as violative of the year 2000 plan:

APRIL 10, 1962.

Mr. WILLIAM H. MOSS,
Chairman, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Fairfax Court House, Fairfax, Va.

DEAR MR. MOSS: The National Capital Planning Commission has always been vitally concerned about the protection of the Great Falls and gorge of the Potomac River Valley above Washington, and its first Regional Park Plan of 1926 indicated extensive areas for park acquisition. This plan eventually led to the passing of the Capper-Cramton Act in 1930, which in part provided for "the protection and preservation of the natural scenery of the gorge and the Great Falls of the Potomac."

The year 2000 plan, recently completed, concentrated high density areas in the transit radial corridors and reaffirmed the Commission's former convictions by recommending the preservation of the banks of the Potomac as a significant wedge of open space penetrating the urbanized areas. President Kennedy in his conservation message to Congress reminded us that, "We depend on our natural resources to sustain us—but in turn their continued availability must depend on our using them prudently."

Acquisition of land for the George Washington Memorial Parkway on the Maryland shore, paid for in part by the citizens of Montgomery County, has now been completed but much of the beautiful scenic bluffs on the Virginia side between Chain Bridge and Great Falls remain in private ownership. Also the first section of the parkway on the Maryland side will soon be completed and the skyline of the Virginia Palisades will be exposed and, for many miles, will constitute an essential visual part of the parkway.

The Commission is most concerned that the skyline and palisades be retained as nearly as possible in their natural state. Low density residential development is compatible with this objective. Tall buildings are not.

From time to time development projects such as the present Merrywood-on-the-Potomac will be proposed. We hope that suitable means may be found to achieve our common goal of preserving the Potomac Palisades and the west bank of the Potomac as a continuous natural area.

I am sure your Board is also greatly concerned in the preservation of this fine natural resource which is a vital part of our great American heritage.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JAMES H. ROWE, Jr.,
Chairman.

More recently, I have introduced two bills designed to empower the National Capital Planning Commission to prevent not only Merrywood-type developments but other undesirable building along the Potomac from Great Falls to Mount Vernon which would "materially impair the national historic, scenic, conservation or recreational interest in the Potomac River." The first such bill, H.R. 12137, would empower the National Capital Planning Commission to set aside suburban zoning ordinances violative of this principle. The second bill, H.R. 12536, would authorize the refusal of District of Columbia water and sewer services to projects so stigmatized by the National Capital Planning Commission.

The bills are now before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the House District of Columbia Committee, respectively. Unfortunately, today is August 15. We are near the end of the session. While I still hope for the passage of at least one of these bills prior to the end of the session, the odds are against it. Machinery for safeguarding the entire Potomac valley in the vicinity of Washington needs to be worked out over the next year or two. But meanwhile, unless the Merrywood development is stopped, there will be no Potomac Palisades left to save.

Fortunately, the Merrywood development can be stopped, under existing law and policy, and without any further legislation. As I have said, the year 2000 plan forbids high-rise apartments on the Potomac Palisades. This policy was specifically applied to Merrywood by the National Capital Planning Commission's letter of April 10, 1962.

Secretary of the Interior Udall has properly exercised his powers so as to effectuate the national policy against the Merrywood development, as set forth in the year 2000 plan and the April 10, 1962, letter. Secretary Udall has officially denied to the promoters of Merrywood the right to run a sewage disposal line under the George Washington Memorial Highway, which is controlled by the Department of the Interior.

This is commendable as far as it goes. Unfortunately, however, there is nothing to prevent the Merrywood promoters from erecting their own sewage disposal unit, and dumping the effluent into the Potomac.

Water, however, is a different matter. The only practicable way in which the Merrywood promoters may secure water for their large development is by purchase from the city of Falls Church, which has the water supplying responsibility over the Merrywood area. The city of Falls Church, in turn, obtains its water from the District of Columbia Dalecarlia pumping station.

The statute and contract by which the District of Columbia supplies water to the city of Falls Church is instructive. The District of Columbia provides water to the city of Falls Church pursuant to the Act of June 26, 1947. That act contains the proviso "and provided further, that the Secretary of War, directly or upon the request of the Board of Commissioners, may revoke at any time any permit for the use of said water that may have been granted." (District of Columbia Code, sec. 43–1531 and sec. 43–1531a).

The District of Columbia supplies water to Falls Church under a contract dated November 1, 1961. The contract sets forth the rates and estimated requirements, although it makes it clear that the District is not obliged to deliver, nor Falls Church to receive, any particular amount.

Paragraph 3 of the contract provides:

"The Government, through the Chief of Engineers shall have the right at all times to investigate the distribution systems through which the water is transmitted and if, in his opinion, there is an excessive wastage of water he shall have the right to curtail the supply to be furnished under this agreement to the amount of such wastage."

Paragraph 9 of the contract provides:

"The Government may at any time terminate the services to be furnished under

this contract and may by thirty days' notice to the Purchaser terminate the license for a right-of-way granted hereunder. The Purchaser may terminate this contract by thirty days' written notice to the Government."

In carrying out this contract, the Secretary of the Army and the District of Columbia Commissioners should carry out the mandate of the year 2000 plan, and the National Capital Planning Commission's letter of April 10, 1962, in the same manner as did Secretary Udall. The Secretary of the Army and the District Commissioners have simply to notify the Falls Church authorities that water service will not be available to Merrywood. Since under the contract the District may terminate its services at will, it obviously has a right to ask that the contract be amended to provide for curtailing water not just where "there is an excessive wastage," as under present paragraph 3, but where "there is a proposed use of the water by a building disapproved by the National Capital Planning Commission." Since the National Capital Planning Commission, by its letter of April 10, 1962, has disapproved the Merrywood project, Falls Church would simply be told not to serve it. Indeed, the District of Columbia could itself, if it wished, undertake to see that no Merrywood outlet was built from the Falls Church distribution system.

I would anticipate no difficulty from such action. Falls Church wants its water supply, and is surely not going to penalize its thousands of users by saying: "If we can't serve Merrywood, and thus ruin the Potomac Palisades, we are going to end our water supply for our thousands of citizens and customers altogether." Furthermore, the governing bodies in Arlington County and civic groups in all three counties—Arlington, Fairfax, and Montgomery—would applaud such a determination by the District of Columbia to preserve the Potomac to the extent that it can through it water sales.

The only people displeased would be the promoters of Merrywood and the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors. We should not attempt to please them at the price of ruining the Potomac.

It is unthinkable that the Nation's Capital preside at its own destruction by furnishing water to the Merrywood promoters. If the Secretary of the Army and the District Commissioners will coordinate their actions with those of the Secretary of the Interior, the high-rise Merrywood buildings will not be built. And we can then go on to evolve regional machinery that will protect the Potomac permanently.

AUGUST 15, 1962.

CYRUS R. VANCE,
Secretary of the Army, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I enclose a copy of my statement of today expressing the hope that you, as Secretary of the Army, will coordinate action with Secretary of the Interior Udall to preserve the year 2000 plan of the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council.

You can do this by not providing water service to the proposed 17-story Merrywood project in Fairfax County, Va., pursuant to the District of Columbia Code, section 43–1531 and section 43–1531a and the contract entered into by you in 1961 with the City of Falls Church water authorities.

I would, of course, be glad to meet with you at any time to discuss this problem.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

AUGUST 15, 1962.

Hon. WALTER TOBRINER,
Chairman, Board of Commissioners, District Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TOBRINER: I enclose a copy of my statement of today expressing the hope that the District Commissioners will coordinate action with Secretary of the Interior Udall to preserve the year 2000 plan of the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council.

This can be done by not providing water service to the proposed 17-story Merrywood project in Fairfax County, Va., pursuant to the District of Columbia Code, section 43–1531 and section 43–1531a and the contract entered into in 1961 with the City of Falls Church water authorities.

I would be glad to meet with you at any time to discuss this problem.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

AUGUST 15, 1962.

Mr. CHARLES HORSKY,
Adviser for National Capital Affairs, White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORSKY: I am enclosing copies of my letters of today to Secretary of the Army Vance and Commissioner Tobriner.

I would hope that the White House would encourage the Secretary of the Army and the District of Columbia Commissioners to coordinate their actions with Secretary of the Interior Udall so as to prevent the violation of the year 2000 plan of the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council.

If you wish, I shall at any time be glad to sit down and discuss this matter with you.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

Soviet Space Failures, Trick Photography Shows Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the United States pursues a policy of openly announcing to the world and permitting everyone to see our space flights—failures as well as successes. Our American space shots are on television for all to see in contrast with the Soviets who keep a secret of their alleged flights and propagandize these alleged exploits to the limit.

Two recent editorials from the Nashville Banner indicate a discovery of trick photography and a hoax by the Russians in their twin orbital flight, pointing up that these space successes may be as phony as a $3 bill.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert these two editorials in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorials follow:

WE LEARN BELATEDLY OF SOVIET SPACE FAILURES: WHY THE DELAY?

American intelligence has uncovered evidence that the Soviet Union's space program has been marked by a number of failures. These reports confirm the suspicions of many—including the Banner—who have doubted Russian claims of space superiority, mainly on the grounds that truth is hard to come by from Khrushchev and others in the Kremlin crowd.

Congress has learned—belatedly—from James E. Webb, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), that the Russians have failed in five out of six attempts to send instrumented space packages to Mars and Venus. The sixth shot was described as only a partial success since the radio system failed on that vehicle.

The Soviet Union's policy, in space and any other field, is to operate behind a veil of secrecy. The Kremlin announces to the world and the Soviet people only its successes; failures are buried with the hope they will never be unearthed.

Even the Soviet's much-heralded tandem cosmonaut launching has many questionable aspects. Phony television film was circulated which purported to be in-flight pictures. Actually, the film was either made on the ground or of previous flights. There was never any communication with the twin cosmonauts by foreign stations; all contacts were limited to Soviet tracking points.

Too, it has never been clear just how these Russian spacemen return to earth. It is presumed they bail out of the capsules which are in turn either parachuted down or destroyed on impact.

Contrast the Soviet operation with that of the United States whose manned space flights are filmed at launching and upon return and whose astronauts are in contact with tracking stations around the globe. Our space probes are announced before the shot and the world soon learns whether they are successes or failures.

The entire Soviet program is keyed to propaganda, for this is the only area in which the Kremlin can lay claim to a measure of superiority and unfortunately the present administration is letting them get away with it.

As David Lawrence pointed out in a recent column, "The American propaganda effort is too much influenced nowadays by a cult in Washington which is afraid to speak out forthrightly for fear of increasing tensions."

Rather than questioning some of these Soviet space conquests, it would appear that U.S. officials are too quick with their congratulations.

In this instance, it was Congress which wanted to know the space score. It is not calculated to make us complacent, but is delivered as a strong propaganda counterpunch. It's high time we voiced official doubt.

IVAN'S TRICK PHOTOGRAPHY TIPOFF ON A HOAX

With its wrappings and trappings removed one by one—for a closer analytical look at the contents of that Soviet "twin orbitry" package—the more it looks like a phony. Certainly that observation holds true with regard to what purported to be televised aspects of it originating from Moscow.

It was a hoax in that particular, and the Columbia Broadcasting System, which discovered the fact after televising what it believed to be a valid news film, has issued a corrective statement: "The film we showed here a couple of nights ago purporting to be that of the launch of [Maj. Andrian] Nikolayev, as shown on Moscow television, was something considerably different than that. It was so identified by the foreign news service that supplied it, but we've learned that the film was taken not from Moscow television but from East German television, and it wasn't of Nikolayev but of an earlier launch."

Sifting for facts in other particulars is in order, too, before anyone goes overboard on assumptions of a spectacular Soviet breakthrough. As already has been pointed out, the margin for tricksterism in this propaganda display is wide—and Moscow is adept at that. Hence the necessity of calm, factual appraisal, before jumping to conclusions. Not without cause has the whole Communist constituency been called masters of deceit.

Without necessarily lumping the whole stunt in the category of hoax, but pointing out that possibility, David Lawrence yesterday called attention to an August 14 dispatch from Vienna by Clyde Farnsworth, Chicago Tribune reporter, emphasizing these same grounds of doubt. "If the hypothesis of doubting observers is correct, these pictures were made safely aground—or in previous flights—and two other men, possibly even Yuri Gagarin and Gherman Titov, were actually in orbit this time.

"If the astronauts actually had TV cameras in orbit, it should have been fairly simple to furnish the frequencies and schedules on which pickups would be possible, and let European and American audiences make the most of them. They probably would have * * *. It was not like them (the Soviets) to miss a good bet if they could help it."

If the camera work was a fake—as now appears, beyond question—who is to say that any detail of the claimed operation occurred as Moscow depicted it?

Possibly it did. On the other hand, possibly it didn't.

At least it is clear that what the Communists sent out—whether from Moscow or East Germany, it doesn't matter—for broadcast as a ringside view of space conquest in the making, was as phony as a $3 bill.

Admission of A.T. & T. to U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important column by James A. Weschler which appeared in the New York Post on September 6, 1962. The article is based on the communications satellite hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Weschler strikes at the heart of the matter when he states that:

What was involved here, among other things, was the abdication of sovereignty, not to an international body but to private interests, in one of the first great national decisions of the space age.

He suggests that:

The whole thing might have been simplified by admitting A.T. & T. to the United Nations.

The column follows:

[From the New York Post, Sept. 6, 1962]

SATELLITE, INC.

(By James A. Wechsler)

President Kennedy recently signed a document that may haunt his administration for many months and years. There was a tone of defensiveness in the statement accompanying his action; the satellite bill, he declared contained "many safeguards to protect the public interest." He expressed confidence that the Government, the public, and private industry, would all have a true voice in the affairs of the new corporation created under the act.

His reassurances must have sounded earnest enough to millions of Americans who have never read the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. One wonders whether Mr. Kennedy himself took time out for such study.

This 456-page volume fell into my hands during vacation and I couldn't lay it down. I had many misgivings about the bill before reading the tome. But I had not adequately glimpsed the real dimensions of the story Messrs. KEFAUVER, MORSE, RYAN, and a handful of others were trying to get across to the country in their lonely fight.

It is regarded as old fashioned to intimate that corporate power can still dictate terms to Government and Congress, and especially that a Democratic administration might be vulnerable to such a coup. But the record of the hearing is devastating. It explains more clearly than anything else why the opponents of the measure fought so hard for time, and why its advocates so tenaciously resisted delay. For what was involved here, among other things, was the abdication of sovereignty, not to an international body, but to private interests, in one of the first great national decisions of the space age.

No summary of the hearings can adequately translate the cumulative revelation of the testimony and interrogation. One can only lament the degree to which much of the disclosure came out piecemeal, or not at all, in most areas. There were a few reporters, like Milton Viorst of the Post, who early detected the scope and meaning of the battle. But the bulk of the coverage was perfunctory, and in most media, when the story finally achieved any prominence, it was the spectacle of "the liberal filibuster" rather than the substance of the argument that drew the largest notice.

The country probably knows in a vague way that, for the first time in our history, the U.S. Government is now officially sponsoring a corporate entity explicity dedicated to private profit. Six of its directors will represent the carriers (with A.T. & T. technically limited to three members); six will eventually represent "the stockholders" and three will be named by the President.

Ostensibly this structure would seem to limit A.T. & T.'s domination of the enterprise. But even proponents of the measure conceded under questioning that A.T. & T., by the very nature of its own resources and the character of the corporate setup, could acquire 50 percent of the voting stock as well as an unlimited amount of nonvoting stock, bonds, and debentures. That its influence would be pervasive is not seriously denied by most sponsors of the bill. They basically contend that, in the long run, what will be good for A.T. & T. will promote the national welfare.

That axiom is sharply challenged by much of the testimony.

USIA Director Ed Murrow formally testified in support of the bill. Yet the heart of his recital was a warning that it contains no provision for a preferential rate for Government agencies and that the cost of using the satellite system may be prohibitive for USIA.

Under the act the directors of the corporation are specifically obliged to serve the commercial interests of the corporation. What happens when the concern for profit collides with national needs—specifically with respect to the use of the satellite program in impoverished areas where the "take" may be small?

The underlying conflict was most pointedly exposed in the discussion on a drastic amendment to the initial draft of the bill. As first written it embodied this clear statement:

"The corporation shall not enter into negotiations with any international agency, foreign government, or entity without prior notification to the Department of State, which will conduct or supervise such negotiations. All agreements and arrangements with any such agency, government, or entity shall be subject to the approval of the Department of State."

This clause was stricken, and in its stead there was adopted this formula of abdication:

"Whenever the corporation shall enter into business negotiations with respect to facilities, corporations, or services authorized by this act with any international or foreign entity, it shall notify the Department of State of the negotiations. The Department of State shall advise the corporation of relevant foreign policy considerations. Throughout such negotiations the corporation shall keep the Department of State informed with respect to such considerations."

As someone remarked, the whole thing might have been simplified by admitting A.T. & T. to the United Nations.

Birmingham Chamber of Commerce Takes Lead in Getting Civic Jobs Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in every community there is one organization which takes the lead in getting civic work done. In a large city such as my hometown of Birmingham, Ala., there are many civic organizations helping to meet the many of the needs of the community. Taking the lead in most civic enterprises in the city of Birmingham is our chamber of commerce, which over the years has been singularly successful in bringing basic improvements to the community which has resulted in Birmingham emerging in the forefront of American cities.

I believe that all of the Members would be interested in reading of the accomplishments of the Birmingham chamber. Their fine work has often been done in cooperation with many groups and many individual citizens working together.

I insert an article from the magazine Birmingham herewith:

WOULD WE HAVE HAD THESE THINGS IF WE HAD NOT HAD THE BIRMINGHAM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE?

The Birmingham water system, Vulcan, junior chamber of commerce, municipal auditorium, Legion Field, U.S. Highway 78, eight paved highways leading into the city, veterans' hospital, a civic symphony orchestra, Federal Housing Administration program, U.S. Department of Internal Revenue, a $6 million industrial water supply (in 1936), the 4-year University of Alabama Medical College, Fair Park, Howard College, the revived Birmingham Symphony Orchestra, Warrior Tombigbee Association, better business bureau, jet flights and increased air service, transit system, 4th Corps Headquarters, U.S. 3d Army, new Bank for Savings & Trusts Building, $31,250,000 in public improvements (including such improvements as the new municipal airport, Legion Field enlargement, etc.), the University of Alabama School of Engineering (soon to be under construction), 75 million additional gallons of industrial water.

It is possible, but the job of obtaining these things for Birmingham would have been much more difficult, and would have taken much longer had it not been that the organized effort of the business leaders of the community were devoted to getting these goals for Birmingham.

In other words, the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce acted as the catalytic agent to put its members (through specified committees) to work in accomplishing these goals for Birmingham. To elaborate on just a few: in 1921 the Birmingham Chamber saw the need for an organization of the younger men of the community who would devote their efforts to improving Birmingham. And so, the Birmingham Chamber formed the junior chamber of commerce.

In that same year, a chamber committee promoted the building of Municipal Auditorium and Municipal Stadium.

In 1931–32, the chamber's good roads committee listed as a major accomplishment letting of the contract on U.S. Highway 78 from Birmingham to Atlanta.

The next couple of years saw the chamber waging a campaign to get an industrial water supply. (In 1936 the Birmingham chamber held a victory dinner celebrating their successful effort in getting a $6-million industrial water supply.

In 1935 the chamber prepared briefs, surveys, and a list of available sites, and sent a representative to Washington, D.C., to have the proposed veterans' hospital established in the Birmingham district.

Also during this year, the chamber sponsored the Federal Housing Administration program.

The U.S. Department of Internal Revenue was established here due to the chamber's work in preparing briefs, statistics, etc., which was the piece of salesmanship necessary to get the department located in Birmingham.

In 1944 the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce and the Jefferson County Medical Association prepared the briefs, surveys, etc., which sold the University of Alabama on establishing a 4-year medical college here.

Several years later, the chamber's coliseum committee recommended that the city commission purchase Fair Park and set up an operating board. These facilities enable Birmingham to get many large exhibits, conventions, etc.

The Birmingham chamber got in the fight to keep Howard College in Birmingham. The chamber pledged their wholehearted support of the $2,500,000 joint drive for Howard College and Birmingham-Southern College.

A chamber president in 1946–47 urged that Legion Field be enlarged to at least 40,000 seats.

In 1948 the chamber's education committee moved to revive the Birmingham Symphony Orchestra.

In 1951 the chamber led in bringing to life the Warrior Tombigbee Association.

A few years later, a chamber president assisted in establishing the Better Business Bureau of Birmingham.

In 1956 the chamber began providing representation before the Civil Aeronautics Board in the attempt to get better air service for Birmingham. Air service has improved—jet service is now available out of Birmingham, as well as several new routes.

In 1958 the chamber worked to save the transit system. They were successful in obtaining 4th Corps Headquarters, U.S. 3d Army for Birmingham.

In 1959 the chamber's efforts paved the way for obtaining the necessary land for the bank for savings and trusts building.

In 1960 the city commission was deadlocked on the amount of money that could be issued for public improvements, and how this should be spent. The city commission asked the Birmingham Chamber to appoint committees to make recommendations on both these matters. Both committees' recommendations were accepted, and the chamber then became a wheelhorse in getting active support for the $19 million bond issue, which was overwhelmingly approved by voters May 3, 1960.

The University of Alabama Engineering School (a new building housing it will soon be under construction) was secured through the efforts of a chamber study committee.

Birmingham's industrial water supply will be increased 75 million gallons this fall. A chamber study committee established the city's industrial water board. It should be reemphasized that this lists only a few of Birmingham's milestones which dedicated men working in an organized effort through the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce have accomplished.

This articl attempts in no way to take credit from the many who have assisted in accomplishing major goals for Birmingham.

It does seek to point out how the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce has organized the ability and power of business leaders to promote the growth and development of this community.

Or, you might say, these are some concrete answers to that old query: "What has the chamber of commerce done for Birmingham?"

The question which should be a twin to this one is: "What have I done for Birmingham?

Today there is still much more the chamber can do for Birmingham. There is much that we have not been successful in accomplishing. There is much we have accomplished.

Even now, the Birmingham Chamber is studying recommendations for its reorganization. A study has been made of the chamber, at the chamber's request, to make the organization an even more valuable servant of the community.

As Dwight Havens, manager of the local service department of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, said: "It is a tribute to the leadership of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce that they see the necessity for a constant evaluation and revaluation in order to utilize to the fullest the resources at their command.

A New Approach to Equity for Our Gold Miners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, for 4 years now I have been studying and working upon the problem of how to save gold mining under the American flag from extinction, in connection with which I have introduced four separate bills. The first three have been repudiated by the Department of the Treasury upon the contention that if enacted they would upset international monetary arrangements. During the period in question I have been joined in this cause by several of our colleagues from Western States, and we have devised what I consider to be a new approach. This is reflected in bills most recently introduced by several of us calling for establishment of a gold procurement and sales agency which would receive all newly mined gold as a commodity rather than a monetary metal at a fair price to our gold miners, and resell same for artistic, professional, and industrial uses. To emphasize the urgency of this matter, the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held a hearing on September 6, at which time it was made amply clear in the record that Treasury and other interested executive departments are requested to considerately study and evaluate the new approach with an affirmative instead of a negative attitude during the forthcoming adjournment period, and be ready to present constructive testimony early in the next session on similar bills, and perhaps improved bills, which will be introduced next year.

My testimony submitted at the hearing on September 6 concisely portrays the situation as I see it. Because this subject is undoubtedly a matter of national concern, I include in these remarks the text of said testimony, which reads as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE AT LARGE FROM ALASKA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 12929 AND LIKE LEGISLATION, ON SEPTEMBER 6, 1962

Mr. Chairman, I wish to first convey my thanks for the scheduling of this hearing in regard to a new approach on the subject of providing an incentive to our gold miners for the production of newly mined gold.

My interest in gold mining stems from the years when I was a young man living in Alaska. I saw gold mining prosper after the increase in the Treasury price of gold from $20.67 to $35 per ounce in 1934, and in recent years I have seen costs rise to such prohibitive heights as to force hundreds of gold mines out of business, leaving behind deteriorating plants, ghost towns, and unemployment, for lack of any increase in price to offset the doubling of the cost of production.

From the highest annual production of gold in the United States in the amount of $170,205,000 in 1940, gold output has dropped to $53 million in 1961, of which 37 percent was derived as a byproduct of base-metal ores. From a production of about $25 million per year in Alaska in the late 1930's, the gold production in my State was down to about $4 million in 1961, and our dredges and other diggings will have to close down in the near future unless relief is soon forthcoming. From a high in the U. S. gold reserves of $24 billion in 1948, we now find our reserves down to about $16.1 billion. Of this decline about $6.7 billion has occurred in the last 5 years. Although this has been caused principally by the outflow of gold to foreign countries, of which we have recently heard so much, the situation has been aggravated by the decline of gold production in our country.

Another contributing factor has been the sharp increase in recent years of the use of gold for artistic, professional, and industrial purposes. The nonmonetary uses of gold have gone up from a value of $91,087,920 in 1958 to $129,500,000 in 1960. This latter figure is over twice the amount of new gold produced in the United States in 1960, and it is estimated that the demand for gold for nonmonetary uses will continue to increase in the years ahead. Of course, some gold is salvaged each year and reissued by private refiners and dealers. In 1960 the amount was $53,495,015. The amount issued by the Treasury in 1960 for nonmonetary uses was $76,004,985, being $23 million above domestic production in 1960.

As against the $16.1 billion presently in our declining gold reserves, we hold about $12 billion as backing for our ever increasing amount of paper currency, and about $4 billion is all that remains as backing for out-

standing foreign dollar credits redeemable in gold on short term demand, which credits amount to about $18 billion. Thus, while the Russians have been increasing their gold supply against the day when they decide to back their trade rubles with gold, our gold reserves have dwindled below the danger point, which presents us with another hazard in the cold war. The need in the United States for more gold is clear. The question—what to do about it?

President Kennedy and the Treasury say that an increase in the Treasury price of gold would seriously disrupt our international monetary arrangements with the countries of the free world. Accordingly, I am willing to accept the President's statement that there shall be no increase in the Treasury price of gold under his administration. Therefore, the only approach which remains open to help the gold miners and stimulate gold production is legislation authorizing and directing incentive payments for newly mined gold. Along this line I speak in favor of my bill H.R. 12929 and like bills introduced by Hon. HAROLD (BIZZ) JOHNSON, of California, and several other of my colleagues. Since Mr. JOHNSON in his testimony has ably explained the provisions of these bills—and I commend him for the fine work he has done in this field—I will not go into the details again other than to say that the proposed gold procurement and sales agency within the Department of the Interior would divorce the Treasury from the field of selling gold for nonmonetary uses and channel all our newly produced gold as an industrial commodity through the new agency for resale at an advanced price for artistic, professional, and industrial uses. This divorcement of the Treasury and its official monetary price of gold form the operations of the proposed new agency, so far as newly mined gold is concerned, should enable the new agency to pay a fair price to our miners without disturbing international monetary arrangements. I believe, however, that the language of the legislation now before the committee should be amended to clarify the commodity status contemplated for our newly mined gold and that the mode and manner of providing a sufficient supply to meet industrial needs which are in excess of our own domestic production should be clearly spelled out.

To conclude, let me express my opinion—held by many others—that with gold production going down, industrial uses for gold going up, the amount of gold on hand becoming disproportionately small as compared to our ever increasing volume of outstanding foreign dollar credits redeemable in gold, it is just a matter of a few years until our gold reserve will have reached the vanishing point. Before this happens, something has got to give.

Mr. Chairman, I extend my sincere thanks to you and the members of this committee for the kind attention and consideration accorded to me.

Comments on Stockpiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include for the attention of my colleagues a letter which I have received from Mr. L. W. Merritt of the Tahoe Timber Co. of Nevada, Reno, Nev. Mr. Merritt's comments on stockpiling are very timely and will be of interest to the distinguished Members of Congress.

Mr. Merritt's letter follows:

TAHOE TIMBER CO. OF NEVADA,
Reno, Nev., August 30, 1962.

Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
Congressman From Ohio,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KIRWAN: Several years ago, while employed as auditor for Nevada-Massachusetts Co., Tungsten, Nev., I had correspondence with you concerning the lack of necessity of continuing the stockpiling of tungsten concentrates under the then tungsten gravy train. At that time you were very instrumental in cutting off further appropriations for this gravy train, and shortly thereafter all the tungsten mines in the country ceased operations. When this program was stopped, I estimated that the Government had a supply of tungsten concentrates on hand to last for 23 years. I noted recently in the newspaper that it was stated the Government had a supply for 16 years on hand, so thus my calculations 5 years ago were not exaggerated but fairly accurate.

Please note the attached clipping from this morning's issue of Nevada State Journal. It all turned out exactly as I predicted—the tungsten mining industry in the United States was completely ruined by this 100 percent needless waste of the taxpayers' money for this stockpiling program. This mine at Tungsten, Nev., had a life of at least 40 more years with a means for a living for at least a thousand people during that period. In a few days now it will be just another Nevada hillside.

When do you think the people in this country will wake up to the fact that Government boondoggling always winds up with the people paying through the nose not only currently but for many years to come?

Incidentally, the owners of this mine made quite a few millions out of this stockpiling program, and now they are picking up some more gravy selling off the equipment and the townsite which have been completely depreciated long ago. The mine at Getchell, Nev., shipped about $13 million worth of gold in 20 years, but when the tungsten gravy train got rolling they shipped 22 million in tungsten concentrates in just a few years.

Sincerely yours,

L. W. MERRITT.

PUBLIC AUCTION SALE: MINE AND MILL MACHINERY—600-TON MILLING PLANT, CRUSHING PLANT EQUIPMENT, CONSTRUCTION MACHINERY, CAMP AND MILL, BUILDINGS AND HOUSES, FORMERLY OWNED BY NEVADA-MASSACHUSETTS CO., ONE OF THE LARGEST TUNGSTEN OPERATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

Auction on premises, Tungster, Nev., 28 miles south of Winnemucca, Monday and Tuesday, September 17 and 18, starting 10 a.m. each day.

Mining equipment: 33 mine battery locomotives, 185 mine cars, 3 surface locomotives, 16 surface cars—600-ton rail to 100 pounds—20 muckers, 54 slushers and tuggers, 20 mine blowers, 75 mine pumps, 11 mine hoists to 225 horsepower, lamphouse and mine safety equipment, 100,000 feet mine timber and lumber, 20 air compressors to 160 horsepower.

Drilling equipment: 138 track drills, rock drills, jackhammers, drifters, stopers; 1,000's, new Swede drill steel carbide bits.

Construction equipment: Shovels, tractors, loaders, graders, dump trucks, etc.

Crushing plant equipment: Symons and jaw crushers, feeders, screens and vibrators, magnets, weightometer, hoists, conveyors, conveyor belting.

Chemical and pilot plant: Assay equipment.

New supplies and parts: 130,000 pound new steel, electrical supplies, truck and auto parts, pump and compressor parts, conveyor parts, plumbing supplies, new tools, etc.

Six-hundred-ton milling plant: Marcy ball mills 64½ and 66, flotation cells, jig, feeders and mixers, sizers, concentrate tables and bins, filters, precipitator, classifiers, thickeners, conditioners, steel tanks, mill belt and chain bucket elevators, 75 mill pumps, conveyors, dryers, kilns, blowers, magnetic separators, laboratory, etc.

Power and electrical equipment: Diesel generator sets to 312½ kv.-a., light plants to 7,500 watts, oil-type transformers, capacitors, electric power and switch gear, power transmission equipment, copper power cable, and so forth, 300 standby a.c. electric motors to 150 horsepower.

Water and pipeline: 75 water pumps, 5 deep well pumps, 51 motor and booster pumps, steel water tanks, 40,000 feet pipe, underground firefighting system.

Maintenance equipment: Machine shop, welding equipment, wood shop, pipe and plumbing shop, hand tools, garage and automotive repair equipment, etc.

Forty trucks, office machines and equipment.

Townsite houses and buildings: Frame construction with hardwood floors, plumbing, electricity, 15 3-bedroom houses 32 by 24 feet, 53 2-bedroom houses 24 by 24 feet, recreation building 75 by 50 feet, store building 100 by 30 feet, 9 guesthouses, 2, 3, 4-bedroom, 33 single-room cabins, 3 bunkhouses 50 by 25 feet.

Tanks: 15 fuel storage tanks to 10,000 gallons, 15 redwood storage tanks to 100,000 gallons.

Camp and bunkhouse furnishings: 70 electric refrigerators, 50 ranges, and so forth. Commissary and kitchen equipment.

Plant and warehouse buildings: Some metal or corrugated covered, some all steel.

Call, write, wire for auction brochure, David Weisz Co. auctioneers, 840 San Julian Street, Los Angeles, Calif., MA 4–8005, offices in San Francisco, New York, and Los Angeles. Northern California representative: Harvey Berk, 112 Locksley Avenue, San Francisco, Calif., LO 4–1515.

American Civil Liberties Union Asks Letter in Reply Be Published

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call your attention to the following letter received by me from the American Civil Liberties Union dated June 12, 1962:

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
Washington, D.C., June 12, 1962

The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: On May 31 you placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a feature article written by Mr. H. V. Witty, which appeared in the Bell Gardens Post-Star, containing a number of statements about the American Civil Liberties Union, which we feel misrepresent its history and function. Mr. Witty uses as his source a book entitled

"Does the American Civil Liberties Union Serve the Communist Cause." Neither the author nor the publisher of the book is identified. Mr. Witty quotes from a number of archaic and discredited charges against the American Civil Liberties Union. Knowing of your reputation for fairness, I am, therefore, writing to you so that our refutation of these charges may be presented to other Congressmen.

First of all, Mr. Witty states, "The American Civil Liberties Union, through its Emergency Civil Liberties Committee organized in 1951, is now spearheading the drive to do away with the House Committee on Un-American Activities." As I am sure you are well aware, there is absolutely no connection between the American Civil Libties Union and the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

Secondly, Mr. Witty states: "A congressional committee to investigate communism (Fish committee), stated: 'The ACLU is closely affiliated with the Communist movement in the United States and fully 90 percent of its efforts are on behalf of Communists who have come into conflict with the law. It claims to stand for free speech, free press, and free assembly, but it is quite apparent that the main function of the ACLU is to attempt to protect the Communists in their advocacy of force and violence to overthrow the Government.'"

It is to be noted that Mr. Witty fails to indicate that this Fish committee report is over 30 years old, and that Mr. Martin Dies, first chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, stated in 1939 that "This committee found last year, in its report, that there was not any evidence that the American Civil Liberties Union was a Communist organization", or that on March 22, 1961, Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities stated: "The American Civil Liberties Union has not been investigated by the Committee on Un-American Activities, nor has there been any hearings held in connection with the organization. It has not been cited as a subversive organization by this committee or any other Federal agency."

Thirdly, Mr. Witty states: "The California Committee on Un-American Activities had this to say about the organization: 'The ACLU may be definitely classed as a Communist front or transmission belt organization.'"

Here again Mr. Witty conveniently leaves out any reference to the date—that this statement was made in 1943, and that since then the 1959 Report of the California Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities states, "We do not believe that the American Civil Liberties Union nationally is in any sense subversive." or that R. E. Combs, chief counsel of this committee on March 28, 1961, stated: "Having served as a consultant to a Presidential Commission on Government Security in Washington in 1956–57, I had an opportunity to study the techniques of experts in the business of evaluating personnel records for security purposes. I assure you from personal knowledge that none of the experts I knew would come even remotely close to considering membership in the ACLU as evidence of the slightest disloyalty."

I shall not burden you in setting out here in detail lengthy quotations from statements made by many other people in public life as well as newspaper editorials which have lauded the work of the American Civil Liberties Union.

We would very much appreciate having this letter placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE SPEISER,
Director, Washington Office.

Clara Barton Memorial Dedicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Sunday, September 9, the first monument erected to the memory of Clara Barton was dedicated by Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, chairman of the American National Red Cross on Antietam Battlefield as a part of the Civil War Centennial Commemoration. In speaking of Clara Barton's life of service General Gruenther noted that it exemplified the American ideal of individual responsibility. "Participation in voluntary service is the personification of individual responsibility" said the general in congratulating the Washington County chapter of the American Red Cross on its service to the community and its efforts in erecting the Clara Barton Memorial.

The ceremonies were opened by Mrs. Nathan Raskin, chapter chairman. The Honorable William Preston Lane, Jr., former Governor of the State of Maryland, presided and introduced General Gruenther and Axel Steele, of Rohresville, the quarrymaster who originally cut the marble block from which the Clara Barton Memorial was hewn. Mr. Jackson E. Price, Assistant Director of the National Park Service, accepted the memorial on the behalf of the Department of the Interior. I also had the pleasure and privilege of being present.

A thumbnail sketch of Clara Barton was prepared by Mrs. Frank W. Mish, Jr.:

Clara Barton, born in North Oxford, Mass., on Christmas Day 1821, was destined to become in the eyes of her contemporaries the greatest heroine America ever produced.

After serving the wounded and dying on 28 battlefields at home and abroad, she became the founder of the American National Red Cross. In her capacity as president of this organization she was in Cuba in the Spanish-American War. Following this conflict Clara Barton assisted in such national holocausts as floods, famine, epidemics, tornadoes, and forest fires. Our peacetime disaster service and national first aid resulted from her efforts.

Following a lifetime of distinguished service and extraordinary accomplishment, Miss Barton died April 14, 1912, in her Maryland home near Washington, D.C.

The Washington County chapter memorial committee acknowledged with deep appreciation the able help and assistance of Mr. Park W. T. Loy, executive secretary, Maryland Civil War Centennial Commission; Mr. Benjamin Davis, superintendent, Antietam Battlefield; Mr. James H. Ward—donor of the marble block; Mr. J. W. Ramsburg; Mr. Henry A. Bester, Jr.; and Mr. G. Victor Cushwa.

The inscription on the memorial reads:

Clara Barton: During the Battle of Antietam, September 17, 1862, Clara Barton brought supplies and nursing aid to the wounded on this battlefield. This act of love and mercy led to the birth of the present American National Red Cross.

Mrs. Alma Bates, Outstanding Alabama Teacher, Cited for Her Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, reading, writing, and arithmetic are the basics of our education, but the most important of these is reading. The last few years great strides have been made in methods of teaching reading to young people and to people unfamiliar with the language. One of the most successful of these teachers of the new method of teaching reading has been one of my constituents, who has been nationally recognized for her teaching. She is Mrs. Arthur Bates who recently received the McCalls magazine Golden Mike Award as "the Nation's leading woman broadcaster who has performed the greatest service to youth."

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is a bill pending in the U.S. House of Representatives at this time to allocate funds "to provide the necessary instruction for adults who are not proficient in basic educational skills," I think that all of the Members will be particularly interested in this article which appeared in the Birmingham magazine, a publication of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, which I insert herewith.

The article follows:

MEET ALMA BATES

(By Lou Peneguy)

A grandfather's fascinating stories of Dixie lured Mrs. Arthur Bates to move South from her Wisconsin home.

In Birmingham, she has found an opportunity to become a nationally known instructor, television personality, author and homemaker.

Her present national credits stem from her development of a system of teaching phonics. It has created a number of converts, all who endorse it wholeheartedly. As a result of this, her system is being incorporated as a basic communications teaching aid.

Mrs. Bates taught in Alabama public schools after she graduated from college. A World War II service appointment, however, transferred A. G. (as her husband, Arthur, prefers to be called) and the family (daughter, Ann, and son, Paul) to Oklahoma. After being away from Birmingham less than 2 years, A. G. suffered a stroke, which left him unable to speak.

Physicians recommended he be given speech therapy. Alma, having some knowledge of speech phonics, and understanding the therapy would be a matter of understanding and time, decided to attempt the training herself. She has been totally successful.

At the time of the stroke, a family friend in Oklahoma recognized Alma's special gift with words, and recommended her for an inter-American training teaching position where she would be required to instruct Latin American aeronautical students to understand English. Accepting the challenge, Alma soon discovered that her knowledge of phonics was readily acceptable as a practical way to teach these young men who needed to learn quickly.

Based on the belief that a person can live only one day at a time, or be engulfed by

life itself, she realized that in learning to write and read, a student must know sounds and take one syllable at a time, or be overwhelmed by word confusions. Assisting her husband to speak again and working with the Latin Americans led Alma to the development of her system teaching by phonics.

Two years later, the Bates family returned to Birmingham. She accepted a position as English teacher in one of the Birmingham high schools.

At this time, Alma found that, ludicrous as some of the mistakes her foreign-origin students had made, they were similar to the mistakes of her Birmingham pupils.

For years she was concerned about the loss of potential among her pupils of average or above ability. She began listing their words confusions, noting that many recurred in repetitious patterns: that these same pupils were also poor readers seemed significant.

She surmised that many of these childid not hear words accurately. Presuming that if children only half understand what they hear, speech inaccuracies could develop and would be as incorrect in a student's writing. During her 16-year collection of misspellings, Alma found examples such as these: "We went swimming in the creep," "Don't shoot until you see the wipes of their eyes," "The cloud looked like an ice cream comb," and one pupil with a high IQ wrote, "He was policing his suicide shoes" (polishing his suede shoes).

It became obvious to Alma that many students had been attempting to memorize every word they had seen in an attempt to recognize it when they had to spell or define it.

She realized this was more than "an English lesson problem"; these pupils were having trouble in other subjects. As with many other young people nationally, her students, too, quit struggling and left school; others switched to vocational training, although the records of many in each group recorded them with high IQ's. Failing in school, they did not know that their problem was actually an inability to master two basic communication skills—spelling and reading.

Requested to plan a new remedial reading summer school course under the supervision of Sellers Stough (now administrative assistant superintendent, Birmingham public schools), Alma complemented the standard text with her own ideas while continuing to do phonics research. She thoroughly tested her pupils before and after her course in order to accurately determine their progress. One boy achieved an unprecedented improvement of seven grades in the 7-week interval—adequate proof that spelling and reading difficulties are not necessarily evidence of a low or even an average IQ. Alma gives full credit to the boy because she insists that pupils profit from her course in accordance with what they put into it. Since the median improvement for her summer classes was slightly over three grades, it was evident that many pupils were beginning to function more nearly in accordance with their potential. For scores of youngsters, a dislike for school became a like.

Over several summers, word of Alma's success spread throughout the city. Requests for home tutoring came from the parents of other youngsters, from executives, from immigrants, from those with speech defects. Students at nearby out-of-State colleges and universities began making weekend trips to Alma's home for help with their English and reading.

The mother of one of the younger tutored students reported that her child's grades jumped from F's to B's after only 1 month's study with Alma. Another mother credited her child's benefits not only to the simple basic system but also to Alma's dedication to education and to her enthusiasm and warmth of personality.

It soon became evident that Alma could not take all of those who came seeking help, so without pay she began training other teachers. She now refers pupils to these teachers for tutoring. She considers it "a privilege to help other members of the profession who want to spread an easier way to learn basic communications."

During the school year, approximately 20,000 student-viewers compose Alma's teleclassroom tuned to the Alabama educational television network's channels 2, 7, and 10, Tuesdays and Thursdays at 2 p.m.

Her 5-year-old "Improve Your Reading" telecourse is followed by children in kindergartens, elementary grades, and in high schools, as well as by adults. The thousands of letters which arrive at the television studio praise the interest instilled by her instruction.

The success of Alma's televised program won the attention of McCall's magazine, resulting in her presentation of the annual "Golden Mike Award for 'the Nation's leading woman broadcaster who has performed the greatest service to youth.'"

Alma thinks that "the contacts I have made through ETV are richly rewarding. I am so lucky to work with and for so many wonderful people."

During her work, Alma has carefully analyzed and organized the numerous lists of errors made by her pupils and by the pupils of other teachers (both in Alabama and in other sections of the country) who have cooperated in the project. Alma has come to some very important conclusions: She believes that children achieve better when they are given an overall picture of the basic consonant sounds before they start to read; that the good speller is the good reader; that from the beginning, children should be taught to spell words according to sound patterns and that emphasis should be placed upon thinking, rather memorization. Her considered judgment is held in great respect by teachers who are constantly on the alert for a better way to combat one of our Nation's greatest problems.

As a result of repeated requests she has organized her materials into a textbook to accompany her pictorial phonics charts, which are in the process of publication for national distribution.

There is a national need for her type of instruction. The U.S. House of Representatives has now before it a bill to allocate funds "to each State to provide the necessary instruction for adults who are not proficient in basic educational skills."

During 1961, when neighboring Louisiana's census reported 19 percent of the population was weak in basic communications, the State organized classes for them. Already, enrollees incomes have increased 23 percent. As a result, Louisiana suggests that it will gain $4.59 in tax dollars return for each dollar it is spending on the project.

Alma has been seeing rapid benefits of knowing basic communications for years.

Although listed in Who's Who in American Women, a National Council of Family Relations member, and on the National Council of English Teachers' Professional Relations Committee, Alma is not as proud of her titles as she is of her children: Mrs. Ann Congdon, formerly with a New York publishing firm; and her recently Air Force discharged son, Paul, now a manufacturer's representative. Both are graduates of Norwood School (where Mrs. Bates is a former PTA president) and of Phillips High.

Alma credits the success of her role as an Alabama educator and her genuine interest in folks to "the helpful, friendly Birmingham people who have encouraged" her.

Those who knew her feel better because of that privilege.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N.C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn* 4501 Conn. Ave.
Anderson, John B., *Ill.*
Andrews, George W., *Ala* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N.Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N.J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N.Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N.H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Battin, James F., *Mont.* 217 Slade Run Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Becker, Frank J., *N.Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Beermann, Ralph F., *Nebr.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Bromwell, James E., *Iowa*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* Alban Towers
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Bruce, Donald C., *Ind.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N.Y.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N.J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio* 5540 Colfax Ave., Alexandria, Va.
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Corman, James C., *Calif.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Davis, John W., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N.Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio* 800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dole, Robert, *Kans.* 2816 N. Jefferson, Arlington, Va.
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N.Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y.* 1719 New House Office Building
Durno, Edwin R., *Oreg.*
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Findley, Paul, *Ill.*
Finnegan, Edward R., *Ill.*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I.* 1235 New House Office Building
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* The Congressional
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N.J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garland, Peter A., *Maine*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N.J.* Capitol Park Apts., 800 4th St. SW.
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex.* 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y.* 3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa.*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George, *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y.*
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Harding, Ralph R., *Idaho*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*
Harsha, William H., Jr., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich.*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N.Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S.C.*
Henderson, David N., *N.C.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.*
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa* 2120 16th St.
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J.*
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.* 5906 Harwick Rd.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N.Y.*
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4807 Newport
King, Carleton J., *N.Y.*
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N.C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa.*
Kyl, John, *Iowa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

On the Firing Line for Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, May 9, 1962, I had the opportunity to address the Health Insurance Association of America's annual meeting in Denver, Colo. As I told the insurance people at that time, their industry is on the firing line for free enterprise, defending the system which has made America great against those who would substitute for it and its decisions through the market mechanism a procedure of decision by governmental bureau and control by governmental agency. This battle continues, not only in the field of the health sciences and services to which my reamarks were principally directed, but as well in a number of other areas in which the free enterprise system is called upon to defend itself. I am placing this speech in the RECORD at this point to call attention to the fight that is being waged for the free enterprise system:

I want first to thank you for that kind introduction and then I want to thank all of you here who represent a very distinguished industry for the outstanding job that you have been doing in our society.

There is no question that in your area of endeavor the United States leads the world. In fact, so much so that it is not even possible to compare other systems with yours.

I am happy to have the opportunity of talking with this group because we have before us today in Washington some very pressing problems. In fact, as I analyze them, we are at the crossroads of whether this Nation is going to go forward on the basis of the fundamental principles upon which it was founded and upon which it has reached its present successes, or whether we are going to abandon it and adopt other theories of government and other theories of economic endeavor. It just so happens that your industry and that of others in the health field are on the firing line of one of the bitter battles, but I do want to suggest to you that it is only one of the battles, because as a Congressman I see many oher battles that are being fought at this present time on a wide front for these two fundamental principles, representative government and private enterprise economics.

The points that I am going to make here are the same points that I make to the doctors, drug people, hospital groups, social works, nurses, to any group of people in the health field.

I remember about 2 or 3 years ago I was invited to speak before the Missouri Medical Association in St. Louis, and 2 weeks later, before the Insurance Agents Group of Missouri. I prepared one speech which I delivered to both, because I felt the same issues were involved.

Let me, before I get into the field of health, try to relate why I say this is only one battle. Let me talk very briefly about the issues involved in the steel price increase and the issues involved in the movement of labor unions to increase the wages for their union members, or the appeals that the Federal employees are making to have their wages increased.

The President of the United States has moved his great powers into line and directed them against the steel industry that sought to raise prices. The President made a speech just yesterday, urging the labor unions to hold the line. In doing this, he has wrapped around himself the garment of deep concern for the welfare of our society, and indeed he is. I am satisfied of that, but in both of his appeals nowhere does he mention the factors that lie at the base of why steel leaders would raise prices, why labor leaders would seek to increase wages for their people.

What are these forces that are at play in our society that bring these things about? Has it come about that our leaders in industry are not interested in the welfare of our society and are selfish men and only those of us who happen to be in politics, of all things, are the ones who are unselfish; or is it that the labor leaders are not concerned about the overall welfare of our society? Of course not. The forces at play, I submit, are the forces that have been created by the fiscal irresponsibility on the part of the President himself and the administration in Washington. At least that is a fair issue for the people to consider when in times of prosperity we continue operating under unbalanced budgets; and I, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, have the job of trying to figure out where we get the money to pay for these bills, knowing that when we don't get it through ordinary taxes, we have to sell more Federal bonds, we have to print more money, and indeed that is what we are doing.

There is only one thing, one powerful economic force, that is holding the line against these inflationary forces that have been set loose, forces which underlie these pressures that cause our steel people to seek to alleviate them by raising prices and our labor leaders by increasing the wage scales of our people; and this force is sinister. It is foreign competition. However, in many respects, already we have been pricing ourselves out of the market. The point that I am trying to relate is this. The President talks about problems that face our society through inflation and increased cost of living, and does not relate these problems to the economic forces that cause them. He relates them only to further Governmental activity, as if the Government can solve these problems by doing something more. He does not relate them to the Government doing less because its very level of action, or expenditures if you will, have been contributing greatly to the power of these pressures.

So this is not necessarily a question of whether the Federal Government should be doing more in these areas. It may be a question of whether the Federal Government should not stop doing some of the things that it presently is doing.

And so, in this very important social problem of health care for the aged, we have a similar one-sided presentation where the activity in the private sector is largely ignored in the national debate as it has been presented by the executive department. No question is raised as to what the Federal Government is doing that it might stop doing that would alleviate this situation. The only suggestion follows one very tired theme; to solve this social economic problem, spend more Federal money, have the Federal Government take care of it.

Now, there are places that the Federal Government can help, but I think this should be approached from the standpoint of, "Let's see where and how to help by first analyzing what the problem is," not putting on this old record, "Just go to the Federal Government, and some wise people in Washington, not even elected by the people, but appointed by those who are elected, can solve these problems."

In the health field we have three major divisions that I like to point out in discussing it. We have first the vendors of health services, the doctors, the hospitals, the drug people, the nurses, the people who sell hospital equipment and so forth. We have the financers—your industry—which seeks to establish techniques and devices whereby income can be spread forward or backward to take care of the needs that occur before one gets into the work force or needs that occur after one has left the work force, the great field of insurance; a field not only of spreading income from earning years forward or backward to nonearning years but of equalizing risks to which all of us are subject and bringing them down to a cost that is bearable by each; and third, the field of facilities, and by that I mean hospitals themselves, and nursing homes, the physical plants.

In all three of these fields such amazing progress has been made that we have created new problems. Many people whom I run into at the Washington level say, "But, TOM, you are against this program of health care for the aged through the social security system. What are you for? You can't beat something with nothing." My answer is a very simple one: Since when is the great health care system in our society nothing?

We have the greatest system that has ever come about in the history of the world. Now, does that mean, and the answer usually is when I make that remark, "Well, then, you are complacent." Of course I am not complacent, and none of you are complacent. We don't want to stand still because the only way a system that is tops remains tops is by continuing to improve and move forward, but it does put the discussion on an entirely different basis. If someone seeks to present a program, one asks, Is this going to improve the system or is it going to radically change it? When we come to that question, I don't think there is any doubt that a compulsory—and note the word "compulsory"—a compulsory Federal health care system will radically change our present system.

And that is the issue, whether the problems that the success of our system has created can be solved under this system. That is a fair question. I don't think it should be just automatically answered, "Well, of course the system that has produced success can solve the problems that the success has created." It is a fair question to examine.

What do I mean, the success of the system has created the problem? Why do we have the problem of health care for the aged? Be-

cause of the failure of our health care system—not at all; we have it because people are living 10 to 15 years longer. That is the result of the success. Indeed it has created cost problems, and if you went to a hospital 20 or 30 years ago, the odds were that you might come out in a couple of days—come out in a box. You have no cost problems to worry about, sure. Now you might stay 4 or 5 days, but you come out on your own hind legs and you have a cost problem. That is one of the things to think about. The success of the system has created this problem, and this problem, I might say, is divided into two, as I see it. One is the problem that our present age group over 65 have, and the other is the problem that those who are not yet 65 have—and that is most of us who are going to become 65. The two are separate, and must be kept separate in order to analyze the problems that we have. The group over 65 today reached that age when there was not very much health insurance available to our society, just as there are 4 million of our 17 million older people who reached 65 before social security insurance was made available to them, who remain untouched and unhelped by either the Forand or the King bill.

This group over 65 who did not have health insurance will fade out as the new groups coming in and becoming 65 increasingly do have health insurance that covers them. That is why we must separate these two problems. If we are talking about what to do for people over 65 now who reached that age before there was such a thing as prepaid health insurance or health insurance that was available to them, their problem is different and must be treated as a separate problem from those who can have health insurance plans to cover them during old-age retirement.

That is, indeed, what we tried to do with the Kerr-Mills Act, to direct attention to whatever their problem might be. Incidentally, I felt that the evidence was lacking and that there was needed such a thing, even, as the Kerr-Mills Act, but I was completely relaxed about voting for it because I said, "Lest I be in error, and if there is a real need, let's set up the machinery for it." The Kerr-Mills Act, I might say, did do one good thing, I think, among others. It created a new approach that the States could take in regard to classifying the older people who might be in need; just the reverse, I might say, of the false propaganda which has been disseminated that the Kerr-Mills Act requires a pauper's oath. The Kerr-Mills Act liberalizes, or permits the States to liberalize, the means test. The Kerr-Mills Act prohibits a State that accepts Federal money under the Kerr-Mills Act from imposing a lien against older people's property. It in effect says this to the States, "You can tell your older people this, that if they have their modest home (and most of them—about 75 percent of them do, with an average equity around $9,000), and they have their pension on which they are getting along all right, and they are hit with a medical cost that is beyond their ability to handle, they do not have to go on relief. They can come in and show the bill and the State can take care of that bill. They can remain in their home that they own and they don't have to cash in their pension."

What an entirely different picture that is from the vicious dirty propaganda that has been disseminated around this country by people in high office in Washington today. To me it is one of the most disgraceful things that I have witnessed. It is untrue. This is what is degrading.

Some people have asked me, particularly here, "Well, what can the private health institutions do about all this politically? What political action can be taken?"

Well, first I do want to say this to any group of citizens. All of our citizens should be active politically. Walter Reuther, in testifying before the Ways and Means Committee, castigated the American Medical Association for being organized to be politically active. When it came my turn to interrogate Mr. Reuther, I said, "That is a very strange thing to hear you say, because I have always commended you and the labor union people for being politically active."

It seems to me that we should want to encourage as many of our people and groups as possible to be politically active. The only danger to representative government is when only one group or a few groups are politically active. Then you get an imbalance. It does behoove all of our citizens to make meaningful the term, "Government by the people." Under our system of representative government the people spend their time, of course, in the communities pursuing their livelihood, doing church work, community work, family work, raising children, and so forth. There is just a limited amount of time that anyone can spend on government. So we send representatives to city halls, State capitols, and Washington, D.C., to do the detailed work that must be done to have intelligent government action. I suggest that that is the way representative government is set up to work, and that was part of the dispute I got in with Mr. Reuther.

He said that we on the Ways and Means Committee should vote out the King bill because the Gallup poll said the "overwhelming majority of the people" favored health insurance through social security. I said, "Well, Mr. Reuther, if we are going to be down here just to have public opinion polls decide these issues, what do you think the purpose of a congressional hearing is?"

Let me suggest what I think representative government is all about; that the people send me to Washington, not to vote on the basis of ignorance on an issue, but to spend some time digging into the facts, listening to the arguments pro and con, and then after having gathered the facts and having listened to the argument, cast my ballot.

The people come in because after having done that, the Representative hopes that he will have cast his ballot as his people would wish him to were they armed with the information, the same information, and had they heard the same arguments.

That is the danger of the President of the United States going directly to the people on a complicated issue like this, as apparently he plans to do in this circus that is scheduled in Madison Square Garden.

The governmental witnesses testified before Ways and Means. What wisdom there is in our society to apply it to this problem that faces us. Yet the printed record of this public hearing was unprinted and unavailable to the public for 4 months, under orders apparently from the White House to the Public Printer. Not until December 15 were these hearings available, well over a month after the White House Regional Conferences set up supposedly to inform the people on the same issues. I can well understand why the proponents of the King bill didn't want these printed volumes available to the people of the communities because many of the statements made by these high government officals were challenged and rebutted very effectively in the hearings.

One of the things Secretary Ribicoff would have been asked—and this needs to be known—"Why does the King bill limit itself to less than 25 percent of the average health costs of people over 65?" I asked, "Mr. Ribicoff, is it because you didn't want the political opposition of the doctors or you felt that you could get rid of that or minimize that by leaving them out as they were in the Forand bill?" "Oh, no," he said, "no, it wasn't a political thing at all. It was a financial problem. We cannot increase the social security tax beyond 10 percent of payroll." So I said, "Then in the future you can't be coming in to increase these benefits, although many of the people who advocate this bill, including Mr. Forand and Mr. Reuther have openly said, 'This is just the beginning.'"

It would have been interesting to have Mr. Ribicoff answer that question in the communities throughout the country, as well as some of the other questions that were posed in these hearings.

And so, getting back to the process of representative government, these public hearings, at which this information was gathered, becomes the basis upon which the people's representatives try to make up their minds. You can see that kind of process where the individual citizens, with a limited amount of time to devote to government, can make that time effective through good representatives.

I, as a Congressman, use my representative on the City Council of Webster Groves. I haven't got the time nor the facilities to dig into the problems that confront our little community, but I help elect a councilman to whom I say in effect, along with my fellow citizens, "You go down to the city hall. You dig into these problems. You study them and then, based upon what you find out, not upon ignorance and prejudice or any preconceived notions, but upon what you find out, then vote on it. I will be there to criticize you if I disagree with what you have done based upon what you found out." I use the same process in regard to things that go on in Jefferson City, the capital of Missouri, with regard to State matters. I don't have the time to find out what is going on and the details that affect State legislation, and so I utilize the State senators and State legislators. That is representative government.

And, when I have some information on one of these subjects, I try to pass it on to my representative. That again is part of government by the people. So that is one thing that this group or any group can do when it comes to becoming politically active.

In fact, that is a responsibility that all citizens have. But there are two particular things that I want to suggest that this group can do. The first one ought to be very obvious. In this very difficult problem of health care for the aged, one of the key problems is financing, as you know. What is the economic condition of our older people? What are the statistics? What are the lack of statistics? It is almost as important to know that. You should be informed of that, but I wouldn't even ask you necessarily to get into that until you have gotten into something even more basic, and that is to know what is being offered and is available in the field of health insurance today for our people. I think one of the most shocking things—and I am not going to mention him by name—occurred when one of my colleagues who has been an insurance salesman took the floor of the House this January to say that it was impossible for private insurance to handle this problem of health care for the aged. They just couldn't finance it and so forth and so on. I approached him afterward, and my criticism of him was primarily that he hadn't done his homework, and the fact that the man who is in that profession hadn't done his homework, made what he said even more dangerous because the people had a right to presume that he knew what he was talking about. He had no knowledge of what was available in the field of health insurance. He was 5 years out of date.

Indeed, as I talk to you here—this field is so dynamic and I should be telling you people—it is so dynamic that you turn around for 1 month and you are out of date. This field moves so fast—the figures I used for example, $1 billion was paid out in

health benefits in 1950, and I think if we interpolate, I haven't seen the exact figures and I am interpolating, that that figure is around $7 billion, for 1961.

Look at the increases. What is the total amount in health costs for our society? Around $19 billion for 1961. Those things need to be known because one of the arguments used is that these health insurance policies don't cover very much and they have these fine lines and clauses in there.

Of course there is an easy answer. It is the bald figures. Most of the policies must have meant a lot because otherwise $7 billion would not have been paid out in benefits. This is something that should be known by all your salesmen—how many are there in the field of selling insurance, life insurance people? I understand there are probably 320,000 to 400,000 people whose business it is to go from person to person and group to group to inform them of what is available in this field. Now, getting back to politics, nothing could be more effective on this issue today than having all of our insurance people know what is available in the health field, life insurance people, too, and to be kept up to date on it and so keep the public informed.

Massachusetts has just passed an enabling act so that the Connecticut 65 plan can be implemented in Massachusetts. New York passed it just a couple of weeks ago, or a similar one. Many people don't even know what the Connecticut 65 plan is; in fact the bulk of America doesn't know. Yet here is the very program that gives noncancelable health insurance without physical examination at reasonable cost to anyone over 65.

How many people know that prepaid health insurance is now available through a number of companies, that a person can take it out at the age of 20, 30, 40, 50, and have it prepaid, noncancelable at age 65. Indeed it is one of the areas that needs to be developed the most, other than this area which your industry has been moving forward in in a very fine fashion, the people over 65.

Let me say something else about this coverage from a political angle. The political appeal has been in behalf of these people over 65. That is the social problem that is always presented, but, believe me, that is not what these people who are promoting it have got their eyes on. You can tell it by the fact that their program leaves out 4 million older people, in fact the ones who need it the most. It also is demonstrated by the fact that the benefits will cover less than 25 percent of the average health cost. It is brought out by the fact that those are the two areas, coverage, and benefits, that the promoters of this plan will always compromise on.

Let me say this: the King bill promoters will let benefits go down to only 10 percent of the average health costs to get this bill through. They will kick the age limit up to 70. But there is one thing they will not compromise on. It was in the Forand bill. It is in the King-Anderson bill. That one thing is "compulsion." Once that is in, then these other things can be broadened out. That is the one matter that they will not compromise, compulsion.

Where comes the political motivation and the forces lined up behind this measure. I can tell from the letters I receive. It isn't from older people. It isn't from older people at all.

I have issued the statement many times in my community, if anybody knows an older person who isn't getting adequate health care, please let me know, because something has gone wrong with our system and we can correct it. I have not received any bona fide replies. No, this is a very subtle appeal to the sons and daughters and the relatives of the older people. It is also an appeal to the humanitarianism of people who do not know that there are not old people who are not getting adequate health care. It is an appeal to that ignorance, but it is also a selfish appeal as I say to the sons and daughters and relatives. One of the most important things to do in selling health insurance, I think, is to point out to a son or daughter why, aside from humanitarian reasons, they should be interested in their fathers and the mothers. It is to their own economic advantage to take out health insurance for their elderly parents.

Again, I refer to the $9,000 average equity of the older people 75 percent of whom own their homes. Sons and daughters stand to inherit this and the other accumulated assets of their parents. There always is this modest estate. It is worth $120 to $250 a year in health insurance premiums to protect it. So from an economic standpoint I think the message can and needs to be told and your group is the one group whose business it is to tell it.

The second thing, and this is most important, politically, don't downgrade those in collateral health fields. One of the great jobs that health insurance is performing is to ride herd on the cost of hospitalization and the cost of drugs and the cost of doctor's fees. That is a good healthy marketplace operation that is going on. But don't downgrade and repeat the smears that are current in our society against the doctors, against the drug companies, against hospitals, unless you can be specific. Sure, there are abuses, but believe me, if you were a doctor and looked through their eyes at their problems, or you were a drug company, or whatever, you would see that they are not made up of calloused people or social robbers any more than you in your profession. Uninformed people say that insurance companies write policies in fine print so that they never pay out any benefits. This is the same unwarranted smear of the private enterprise system.

Sure, there are some people that are on the shady end of the business in any profession, in my own as a lawyer, and in politics. I dare say that there are even those in civil service. But the point is this, this kind of denigration of our institutions is the very thing that these neofederalists feed upon in trying to eliminate the private enterprise system and in its stead put in "big government." So, please, from a political standpoint, join hands on one thing, on this issue of the importance of the private enterprise system, and what it stands for. Criticize it in context and in detail, but don't join the smear artists.

And now I would like to conclude, although this conclusion will take a little more time than the usual conclusion, by reading a speech that I have been writing and intend to deliver on the floor of the House tomorrow. It bears on what I have just been talking about, and it becomes pertinent, I think, and necessary to say it at this time. I have just received a message from Washington that makes me believe that maybe I should stay and read this.

This speech is entitled, "King Canute's Courtiers." One of the stories contained in the third-grade primer, apparently abandoned by our educators because it sought to teach a lesson as it taught youngsters to read, concerned the Danish-English King Canute. King Canute sat by the seashore, surrounded by his courtiers, and as the tide kept creeping up toward the legs of his chair one courtier said, "Oh, great and powerful King, order these tides to cease." King Canute was wise, however, and moved his chair.

Now, some rulers have not been this wise. King Xerxes attempted to transport his army across the Hellespont in order to fight a battle and it turned into a disaster. So he ordered the unruly sea whipped. In World War II a Navy wing commander proclaimed that he was tired of all the accidents from pilots failing to put their wheels down on landing and issued an order commanding that these accidents cease. Of course, these accidents did not cease. Such accidents were diminished, however, by the wisdom of another commander who had installed a howler system which would warn the pilots that their wheels were still up.

I guess all of us at one time or another have kicked the chair or punished an inanimate object which crossed our will or our path. We realize our stupidity when our anger passes and reason returns. However, let this contrary object be animate, particularly human, and reason frequently does not return and passions continue to burn.

President Kennedy's courtiers have been lashing out against the doctors, the health insurance people, and other corporations in the health field, such as the drug companies, for refusing to swallow their nostrums on health care for the aged. One courtier testifying before our committee referred to the doctors as selfish, the health insurance people, yourselves, as crazy—he called you schizophrenic, and the other groups as just plain ignorant.

I think this is like kicking a chair against which one has stumbled. If everybody disagreed with the reasons advanced by the doctors, the health insurance people, and others in the health field, or I thought that they were devoid of humanitarianism, which I do not, I still think it is important to diagnose their behavior rather than to kick at it.

Now, recently some doctors in New Jersey announced that they would not work under the system of health care set forth in the King-Anderson bill if it became law. This has been construed by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff as amounting to blackmail, to prevent the congressional passage of the King-Anderson bill. Congressman KING yesterday—he didn't say it, he put it in the RECORD—construed this announcement as breaking the Hippocratic oath. Now, I am more interested in the phenomenon that produced this emotional outburst of these doctors than I am about the outburst itself. What does this symptom indicate, that a handful of doctors in New Jersey think that they can blackmail the President of the United States and the U.S. Congress? I think this is ridiculous.

If this is a violation of the Hippocratic oath, what would possess these men, well above the average in intelligence and humanitarian motives, because they once took this oath, to abjure it? One thing this outburst indicates is that the theme advanced by the advocates of the King-Anderson bill that the American Medical Association is out of step with the thinking of its own members, is obviously in error. If there is this kind of feeling at the grassroots level among the doctors of America, it would be woe betide the leaders of the American Medical Association if they did not move vigorously as they have to oppose the King-Anderson bill.

The New Jersey outburst is not an isolated symptom. In Saskatchewan the doctors as a group refused to cooperate with the Government-run medical program, and just a few days ago a news item was that the same had occurred in Quebec.

It was reported that in Great Britain about 1,000 British doctors, one-third the annual output of all the medical schools in the country have been leaving Britain annually for the past 5 years. British hospitals in the nationalized health service now depend to a great degree for the continuation of their work on some 4,000 foreign-born doctors, the majority hailing from Pakistan and India, because so many of their native-born doctors are emigrating.

Americans should be the last of peoples to be surprised that men will leave their homes, their birthplaces, their friends and relatives,

and go to a strange land because of a desire to be free, even if the desire remains unfulfilled or the emotion was created by unreality and false information. Our country was founded and developed by many men and women who were so motivated.

More importantly, perhaps, many of our outstanding leaders were so motivated or took inspiration from those whom they came to know who had this motivation.

Our mediums today are filled with stories about how people in Asia, Africa and around the world are stirring to be free. Regrettably, and I say this from personal experience, much of this is fiction, inspired by people in our own country who find that this is a helpful argument to further their plans which are far removed from the freeing up of peoples, either abroad or at home.

However, an emotion to be free is a strong one and an innate one, not confined as the Athenians stated to the Persians, to those who have experienced freedom. The question is as old as mankind. Is freedom important enough to men and women in America today to make sacrifices? We are being told that Government can meet needs which traditionally were met by individuals, by the family, by the neighbors and by our free churches, and that freedom is no longer a factor to be considered in deciding what the Federal Government does or does not do in a particular field.

Ladies and gentlemen, in our debates in Congress, whether the bill is a farm bill which is depriving freedom of the farmers, whether it is in the field of transportation, whether it is in the field of foreign trade, whether it is in the field of education, whether it is in the field of health care for the aged, this value factor of freedom is not being weighed.

I believe that our society is at the crossroads, and unfortunately your industry is on the firing line.

Senator Goldwater Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Edgefield Advertiser, of Edgefield, S.C., has recently reprinted on its editorial page excerpts from an excellent address by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] which was given before the American Bar Association on August 8. I, myself, have been impressed with these comments by the Senator from Arizona, and I ask unanimous consent that these comments be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR GOLDWATER SPEAKS

(From an address on August 8 by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, before the assembly session of the American Bar Association.)

In my understanding of the Constitution, the intent written into it by our Founding Fathers was the prohibition against the gathering of power in any one branch of our tripartite system of government or any segment of our society.

We are witnessing in our National Government today, and we have been for nearly 3 decades, the movement of more and more power away from the people and the States into the hands of the bureaucrats in Washington. And we have witnessed how this power can be used to benefit one segment of the economy, giving it monopolistic power.

I refer specifically to the concentration of power in the hands of labor leaders of today. This power came about as the result of Federal legislation. Its correction can only come through congressional action which would remove those portions of the Labor-Management Act which confer a privileged status on labor unions. This exempt position is not related to the unions' bargaining power in legitimate labor-management disputes.

I would suggest the tremendous concentration of potential power in the hands of labor is contrary to the public interest, and in "the public" I include the working union members.

Labor unions enjoy many special privileges and immunities under Federal law which are creative of power. By far the most important of these is the exclusive right to represent all the employees in the unit for purposes of collective bargaining, even if the union has been selected as bargaining agent by only a narrow majority, which in many circumstances under our existing law, in fact, constitutes only a minority.

There is an unconscious tendency on the part of many to regard labor-management relations as the exclusive concern of the parties directly involved—i.e., of the union and employer.

Where a settlement is reached as the result of collective bargaining and without the intervention of a work stoppage resulting from either a strike or a lockout, it is safe to say, almost without exception, that in reaching the settlement none of the negotiating parties paid the slightest attention to its future impact on the economy of the Nation or its effect on the public interest.

The public is the overlooked body in most of the legislation written in the Congress of late, particularly in the field of labor-management relations. There are protections written into the labor-management law, and while they are not adequate, they exist; but the tendency today is to ignore them and by this action to further ignore the important role the public plays in any labor-management dispute.

It behooves us to examine the nature of the continually recurring labor crises in the United States. Even a cursory examination will reveal one obvious truth: that labor unions have access to far too much power for the good of the economy or the health of the Nation.

Now it surprises no one to realize the immense size and the great economic strength possessed by American unions today. It is worth noting, however, that big labor did not gain its present vital position in our society wholly, or even primarily, through its own efforts.

The Federal Government, that ever-present arbiter, policeman, and entrepreneur of American life, has made organized labor what it is today.

Just to give you an idea of the preferred position held by today's union in the economic scheme of things, I have compiled a list of special privilege, immunities and rights and powers enjoyed by labor unions under the Federal law. And let me emphasize at the outset that most of these special considerations may have been justified when they were initially given to the labor movement because of their weakness and lack of size. However, possible justification from a historical standpoint certainly doesn't justify their continued existence to today's era of monopolistic union power.

The list I refer to is as follows:

1. Almost total immunity under the antitrust laws.
2. Immunity from taxation.
3. Immunity from injunctions by Federal courts.
4. Authority to use union funds for purposes not related to collective bargaining even where union membership is compulsory.
5. Power to compel workers to join the union as a condition of continued employment.
6. The right of a union selected by a majority of the workers to bargain for all employees. This includes the right to bargain for those who were compelled to join the union as well as those who can be arbitrarily denied membership.
7. Power to compel the employer to bargain exclusively with the majority union.
8. Absolute authority to deny union membership to workers employed in the bargaining unit, on any grounds or for no reason at all.
9. The right, in some situations, to invade the privacy of workers, even against their wishes. This deprives them of a legal right enjoyed by all other members of society.
10. The right, in some situations, to compel employers to make available for union use the private property of the employer.
11. The right to compel the employer to provide protection against any physical violence on the part of workers who resist invasion of their privacy.
12. Unions are immune from the payment of damages for personal and property injuries inflicted on employers or others by union members engaged in activities, such as strikes or picketing. And this stands even in situations where such activities have been officially authorized and directed by the union.
13. The right to strike for objectives wholly unrelated to any proper subject of collective bargaining. This is in contrast to the severely limited right of an employer to engage in a lockout.
14. The right in some situations, to examine an employer's books and records—including those containing such confidential data as costs, profits, and prices.
15. And finally, the almost complete immunity of unions from any liability, penalty, or restriction under State law under the doctrine of Federal preemption.

Now, I'm sure you realize that no other private organization, institution, or individual in the United States is the beneficiary of such a powerful combination of immunities, benefits, privileges, rights and powers—under either State or Federal law.

And in presenting this list I am not suggesting that all of these special grants, without exception, should be removed. I do it merely to suggest that the entire question of unlimited power for labor unions should be reviewed carefully by the Congress.

House Resolution 211: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House

who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizents are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively, all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following response of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SUNLAND, CALIF.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am very pleased with your resolution (H. Res. 211) and hopes the House will pass it and soon.

Thank you.

MRS. MARY KENYON.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
July 2, 1962.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DANIEL J. FLOOD: We support the resolution (H. Res. 211) which would establish a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives and I am writing this to Representative WALTER JUDD and to the chairman, HOWARD W. SMITH.

I have read the book "I Was A Slave in Soviet Russia," by John Noble. Surely Christians in America are obligated to do more than we have done to rescue the Christians being persecuted by communism.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. CLARENCE ZWACK.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I support your measure, House Resolution 211. It is definitely the most effective way at the present time to combat the Soviet Russian uniperio-colonialists.

Sincerely yours,

MYROSLAV SYRYSKY.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 12, 1962.*

JACKSON MILLS,
Freehold, N.J., July 5, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As an American citizen of Cossack descent, I would like to ask you to expedite House Resolution 211 introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

I am very glad to see that the resolution included the Cossack Nation and my old homeland, Cossackia.

With best wishes for your work.

Very truly yours,

MARIA MOROZOFF.

AMERICAN STANDARD PUBLISHERS,
Buena Park, Calif., June 24, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As publisher of American Standard, I wish to congratulate you for your work concerning the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations (H.R. 211).

If freedom is ultimately to triumph throughout the world, it is of vital importance that we keep our attention ever focused upon the plight of those already under the cruel heel of their Communist oppressors.

As you well know, there are those misguided persons in our Government today whose warped philosophy of social progress would have this Nation accept the status quo as imposed by the Communist global conquest. This status quo, they feel, is something we must now live with. It is tantamount to believing that we must accept cancer, heart disease, crime, and poverty.

After all, these too are facts of life, yet we spend millions of dollars in research and development in the struggle to eliminate them as far as will be humanly possible.

To accept the status quo in regard to Communist enslavement of humanity, moreover to accept every new Red gain as another unavoidable extension of this same status quo, has presented every American of conscience with a problem of the greatest magnitude.

This foolish and destructive acceptance philosophy can lead to but one final conclusion: the ultimate acceptance of Red control of the United States, and I believe that many of the people in our Government today are capable of just that type of acceptance.

With all best wishes, and prayers for majority congressional action on much-needed House Resolution 211.

Yours sincerely,

AMERICAN STANDARD PUBLISHERS,
WILLIAM D. GRAFF, *Publisher.*

The Russian Computer Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a speech delivered on August 10 by J. Presper Eckert, vice president, Univac Division, Sperry Rand Corp., New York City, at the Northwest Computing Association Conference in Seattle, Wash. Mr. Eckert makes an interesting evaluation of the role of computers in Soviet scientific activity, and has prepared a comparison of where our country stands in relation to the Soviet.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMRADE COMPUTER: THE RUSSIAN COMPUTER TODAY—SOVIET PLANS FOR FUTURE APPLICATIONS—THE OUTLOOK—AMERICA VERSUS RUSSIA

(By J. Presper Eckert, vice president, Univac Division, Sperry Rand Corp., New York City)

Russia's start in the field of electronic data processing has been slow. One reason is that the computer is an American invention. And, although the Russians were very much interested in it from the start—they tried to order an Eniac immediately after it was announced in 1946—the United States was wise enough not to hand computer blueprints to the Russians on a silver platter. But, on the other hand, since we regard the computer as an economic tool, the United States follows an almost completely open policy on publication of computer art in this country. As a result, the U.S.S.R. has made better progress with their computers in recent years.

In my opinion, looking at the overall picture, Russia is at least 3 years behind the United States at this time in the area of electronic computers. Two years ago they were about 5 years behind. In the data-processing field their lag is greater than these figures would indicate.

At present there are between 600 and 800 electronic computers in the Soviet Union compared to 8,000 or 10,000 at work in the United States, depending on just how you define a computer. It should be noted, however, that nearly half of our computers are capable of the big, the complex jobs, while the majority of the 600 to 800 Russian systems can only deal with more restricted and generally simpler problems. Practically all of these Russian systems still rely on vacuum tubes instead of solid-state devices; their peripherals—tape and printing devices, for example—would be considered inadequate and obsolete by American standards.

And now, by a simple comparison, I can indicate to you the magnitude of the data processing problem the Russians are failing to handle.

Let's examine an area in which the electronic computer has made a significant contribution in the United States. Then let's look at a similar problem now developing in the U.S.S.R.

Even in the United States the electronic computer has only been able to stem the tide of paperwork. But it has taken more than 10 years. Back in 1950, 40 percent of our labor force was engaged in clerical work. By 1960, this figure had increased by 11 percent to 51 percent. Last year, the computer was able to hold this increase to 11 percent. It was the first time in more than a decade that no increase was seen in the percentage of people required to keep track of what other people are doing in this country. With our continued population growth—and the fact that more people generate more paperwork—and the ever-growing complexity of government, trade unionism, and business today, just to be able to stem this tide is a major achievement. It means that more people are free to do the meaningful work of the future. This is the result of having superior computers and using them in a sophisticated way. This is the result of being Americans who as part of the free world can think freely and adapt to vital change quickly.

Things are lagging in Russia. The amount of paperwork there still is on the rise. As a matter of fact, the computer center at the Ukrainian Academy of Science in Kiev recently simulated the problem of administrative planning for the U.S.S.R. The conclusion reached was that, unless administrative procedures are changed before 1981, 100 percent of the adults in Russia will be required to perform the administrative function. Actually, between 1954 and 1961 the number of people in Russia required to handle accounting and statistical work along increased by 30 percent, according to Sazonov, Deputy Chief of the General Statistical Administration. This is not surprising, for less than 10 percent of Russia's clerical work is mechanized at this time even to the point of using simple desk adding machines. They are short of typewriters, drafting equipment, and copying machines. The dictaphone is almost unheard of there. There is even a shortage of office furniture. Obviously it is not enough

to say that the Russians will have to get better electronic data processing systems and improve their ability to use them.

Russia does have factors on its side in attempting to gain the most for its economy with this new tool of science.

Science, and particularly computing science in the Soviet Union, is the prestige field. The scientist in Russia has the prestige of the movie star here. Their pay is at the top of the scale. Their living accommodations are the finest The top box office attraction in Russia is the academician. Keltish, for example, current president of the Academy of Science, the most coveted scientific position in all the U.S.S.R., is a hero to the people. His work is closely allied with the computer field.

I cannot help but think, when I learn these things, what it was like in my early years. Interested in science, it was not always easy for me as a child; for my contemporaries scorned those who were interested in such a dry and dull subject. In high school I was called the "Prof." Needless to say, this nickname was not particularly meant to flatter me.

The people of the past generation hardly realized there were such things as scientific professions, and my parents were not exceptions. They urged me to study business administration at the University of Pennsylvania.

Unfortunately, even with the publicity given scientific achievements today, the situation has not greatly improved. Last year there was another decrease in the enrollment of American students for engineering courses.

I think that having an extremely favorable attitude toward science and scientists is a decided plus for the Russians.

In the United States we have tried to develop the technology as rapidly as possible to meet our needs and then apply our ideas as widely as possible. Wonderfully, the electronic computer is much more suited to the needs of the United States at this time than it is to the needs of the U.S.S.R. We have economic problems which are manageable with available techniques. Their problems are not manageable by any known techniques. By continued wise use of our computers we should make advances by analyzing where we are going and selecting the best alternatives open to us. When we have reached the point in analysis and planning where we can handle many of our objectives with a reasonable degree of certainty, happily our governmental system is one with enough flexibility to allow us to take advantage of such progress.

I believe the following eight points are worth remembering when we consider Russia's standing in this field:

Russia's start in electronic data processing was slow and they are at least 3 years behind us in the area of electronic computers.

There are 10 times as many electronic computers at work in the United States as there are in the U.S.S.R.

Russian electronic computing equipment is inadequate and obsolete by American standards.

Russia's successes in space, while spectacular, have not required many computers or really fast computers. On the other hand, Russia's economic planning does require fast computers and fast computers are unavailable there.

The Russian Communist, actually an extreme conservative, resists the very changes which he must make if he wants to improve his data processing performance. His actions must rest on the unshakeable basis of Marxist-Leninist economic theory. Because of this and other encumberances, until a few years ago even mathematical logic was out.

The fact that science is the prestige field in Russia is the one advantage they have over the United States in the computer area.

The Russians still find it difficult to bring about transition from handmade computers to units suitable for mass production.

The electronic computer is much more suited to helping solve America's economic problems than the problems of the Soviet's centrally controlled economy.

The marvelous virtue of the capitalistic system is that, after living with it, one recognizes that it is not necessary to control everything in the world in order to survive. The communistic system, epitomized in their ambitions for a planned economy, displays their feeling that they must control everything in order to survive. When and if the Communists see the folly of trying to plan a total economy, can we help them to the realization that it is not necessary to control the world to survive?

The Hanford Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ANSWERS TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ON THE HANFORD PROJECT RAISED BY REPRESENTATIVE HOWARD SMITH, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, DURING DEBATE BEFORE THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON AUGUST 29, 1962

Question. Does the Government assume any obligation?

Answer. Yes. Despite claims by proponents of the contract between the Bonneville Power Administration and the Washington Public Power Supply System that the Government assumes no obligation, any reasonable examination of the proposed contract clearly reveals that the Government, through the Bonneville Power Administration, takes upon itself serious and lasting obligations. For example, Bonneville Power Administration assumes the obligation to supply participants in this project an amount of firm kilowatts of power at prevailing Bonneville rates equal to the amount of the annual financial contribution of such participants to cover amortization and interest charges on the outstanding bonds, full operation and maintenance charges, replacements and repairs on all parts, and such other expenses as become necessary as a result of this arrangement. Bonneville's obligation to supply firm kilowatts of power is not contingent upon the supply of power forthcoming from the Hanford generating plant, but rather upon the annual financial contribution of the participants. This would be true even if at any time and for any reason absolutely no power was produced at the Hanford generating plant for any extended period of time.

Furthermore, various clauses in the contract clearly indicate that Bonneville Power Administration would be the real party at interest and basically would suffer any losses that might accrue. The contract gives Bonneville Power Administration the right to disapprove the rate of interest on Washington Public Power Supply System's revenue bonds issued to finance the project. In addition, all plans and specifications for the generating plant must be approved by Bonneville Power Administration. Likewise, the annual operating budget would be subject to Bonneville Power Administration's approval. The level of maintenance at the project would be under its control, the scheduling of shut downs for repairs and maintenance operations would have to be approved by Bonneville Power Administration. Power from the project could be dispatched only pursuant to Bonneville Power Administration's instructions.

On the basis of these facts, it is fallacious to argue that the Federal Government, through the Bonneville Power Administration, does not assume any obligations for this proposal.

Question. Who pays for the plant? Who pays for the thing that has to be constructed?

Answer. Again, it must be said that any reasonable individual upon careful examination and evaluation of all the facts must conclude that the Federal Government will in the last analysis pay for this project. Bonneville will pay for the project with a guaranteed supply of firm kilowatts of power which have a ready market at a fixed price rather than actual dollars, but it pays for the project nevertheless. As it was brought out in the hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, July 11, 1962 (p. 82), that all the cost of whtasoever nature that the participants incur is paid by the receipt of electricity which is converted into cash by the sale of the electricity. The participants assume no risk with respect to their operation and maintenance or debt service and are sure of being able to pay all the costs because they are going to receive electricity from the Bonneville Power Administration that they can sell to make the payments. During that same hearing, Mr. Charles Luce, Bonneville Power Administrator (p. 91), said the exchange contract assures Washington Public Power Supply System participants of a market for the Hanford power so they can float these bonds. Thus, this contract is a form of security for underwriting the bonds. Mr. Luce also said Bonneville Power Administration was taking a rather large part of the risk in this project.

At another point during the hearings (p. 87), Mr. Luce testified that if a nuclear incident should occur at the Hanford reactor and the insurance did not cover it, "then the Bonneville Administration, under these exchange contracts, would have to deliver, continue to deliver, that amount of power that would be necessary to amortize the bonds as they became due."

Therefore, the net result is that Bonneville Power Administration provides the cash required for the repayment of the revenue bonds issued by Washington Public Power Supply System and all operation and maintenance charges, improvements, replacements, repairs, or any other charges whatsoever. It does this by selling its own power and permitting the purchasers to discharge their obligations for paying off the bonds. Since Bonneville Power Administration's obligation to deliver power to participants is not related to the actual production of power at Hanford, the Federal Government, through the agency of the Bonneville Power Administration, becomes the guarantor to the bondholders of the continued operation of the project for the entire term of the bonds.

Question. Then, does the Government agency; namely, the Bonneville Power Administration, pay for the plant?

Answer. When this question was asked on the floor of the House of Representatives, the answer was given, "No. They do not have to pay 1 penny. The State public power bodies pay for the plant." From the foregoing discussion of the previous question, obviously the answer given is not true. The so-called State public power bodies may be considered merely as the messengers to take the dollars they receive from the sale of the guaranteed supply of power and pay them over to the holders of the bonds. There should be no question, however, but that

it is Bonneville Power Administration itself which has supplied these dollars in the first place in the form of firm kilowatts of marketable power.

Proponents of the proposed contract between Bonneville Power Administration and Washington Public Power Supply System have consistently maintained that it is not the Nation's taxpayers but rather the customers of Bonneville Power Administration who will be required to pay for any possible losses from this arrangement through increased rates for Bonneville power. Mr. Charles Luce, Bonneville Power Administrator, consistently told the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the hearings on these arrangements that should any loss occur it would be covered by an increase in the basic wholesale rates of the Bonneville Power Administration. This may sound good to some people, but, let's look at the record.

It has been obvious since World War II that new sources of hydroelectric power in the Pacific Northwest coming into the Bonneville Power Administration grid were relatively higher cost facilities that were the original Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. It was also obvious that at a date in the not too distant future Bonneville should increase its rates in accordance with sound business principles. Since 1947, Bonneville Power Administrators have been assuring members of the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations that such increases in rates were imminent. Since that time, rate review periods came due in 1949, 1954, and 1959. But Bonneville rates have never been increased. In fact, since fiscal 1958 Bonneville Power Administration has been operating at a net deficit annually, and it is estimated that for fiscal 1963 this annual loss may run as high as $16 to $20 million. Even though Administrators have consistently assured members of the Appropriations Committee that rates would be increased to meet anticipated losses, such increases have never been put into effect. Therefore, despite assurances of Charles Luce that any potential losses from Hanford would be covered by a rate increase, it must be said that if the past has taught us anything at all it has taught us it is easier to promise rate increases than to actually deliver.

In order to keep the record straight, the following direct quotations are taken from hearings before the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations over the past several years:

YEAR 1947

"I have taken this position about that matter, Congressman, that we are required by law to cover the cost of power development. We are doing it, as near as I can determine at the present time, and we will continue to do it for some time in the future.

"It may be that the additional costs under the higher price level that we have now of the new dams when they are built will indicate that those rates should be raised."—Dr. Paul Raver, Bonneville Power Administration Administrator.

YEAR 1948

"I do not think there are any of these operators, either private or public, represented in this group, who have any thought whatever that they are expecting the Federal Government to give them a handout. They are expecting to pay for this under whatever the rules are that the Congress sets up for paying for it. They will have to pass on to their own consumers, then, those costs, whatever they may be."—Dr. Paul Raver, Bonneville Power Administration Administrator.

"If current high-cost levels prevail throughout construction of additional dams and transmission facilities relating thereto, it is possible that some increase in the wholesale rate will be required in order to maintain payout requirements."—Dr. Paul Raver, Bonneville Power Administration Administrator.

YEAR 1950

"In 1954 we think we have to make a rate increase * * *. The rates that we are charging now cover costs, in accordance with the requirements of law. And they will continue to do so in our opinion until 1954. They may continue to do so beyond that, but we are at least reserving, and on the basis of our estimates, notifying all of our customers, that there is a possibility of a rate increase in 1954, although we have notified all of them that in our opinion such an increase will in no event be more than $5 per kilowatt-year."—Dr. Paul Raver, Bonneville Power Administration Administrator.

YEAR 1951

"We have notified all our customers that there will probably be a rate increase in 1954 on our wholesale power. In no event will it be more than $5 per kilowatt-year * * * we do feel that by 1954, in order to continue showing a net income over and above all expenses, including interest, we will have to raise that wholesale rate."—Dr. Paul Raver, Bonneville Power Administration Administrator.

YEAR 1953

"Representative BEN JENSEN, Republican, of Iowa. In order to comply with the law and pay back the investment, that part which the Congress appropriates for those things that must be paid back, the present rates will not be sufficient because of the increased cost of construction and operation. Is that a fair statement?"

Dr. RAVER. That is correct * * * and 1954 is the year when we think we will have to begin raising these rates * * *. We run into a difficult period here for about 5 years, at least, to cover our total costs, and we are planning to make these rate changes do it in 1954."

YEAR 1954

"And we presently have under study the problem as to how much the rates are going to have to be increased and when. We have stated in our annual reports for the last 2 years that as the new dams come in, we will have to have increased rates, so the public has been told that. We have not kept it from them. And we are studying the matter right now to determine how much the increase will have to be and when it will have to be put into effect."—Mr. E. D. Ostrander, Bonneville Power Administration Controller.

YEAR 1956

"To really answer your question, briefly I would say there will probably be some change in our rate structure."—Dr. William A. Pearl, Bonneville Power Administration Administrator.

YEAR 1957

"About 2 weeks ago we announeed there would not be an increase in rates for the year beginning December 1957. That is to say, there will not be an increase before December 1958."—Dr. William A. Pearl, Bonneville Power Administration Administrator.

YEAR 1962

"If our revenues are insufficient to do that, because of deliveries that we have to make under the conditions that you have assumed, Mr. Bates, then we would simply have to raise our rates."—Mr. Charles Luce, Bonneville Power Administration Administrator, hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 87th Congress, 2d session, page 88.

U.S. Policy in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there have been a number of editorial comments on the critical situation confronting us in Cuba and U.S. policy on Cuba. I have been impressed by editorials in the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., of September 5, the Augusta Chronicle of September 4, the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., of September 8, and the Dallas Morning News of September 7. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Sept. 5, 1962]

TROUBLE BREWING IN CUBA

A technician is an expert in some specialized field, such as a science; military science, for example. In modern warfare, all soldiers are experts. So whether our Government's identification of the Russians in Cuba as technicians, or the private and semiofficial designation of them as fighting men, is correct may be just a question of semantics which boils down to the same answer.

In straight talk, they are troops from the Soviet bloc and they are there as part of a continuing Communist buildup.

They may be there because Castro fears rebellion and seeks protection against revolt of his own people and military forces. The people are restless and hungry, their crops are poor, the land that Castro seized for them is being taken back by the government, food is scarce, prices are rising, wages are frozen, machinery is being idled by breakdowns, black markets are flourishing.

Castro, who stole the Cuban nation and committed its people to Soviet captivity, admits the desperation of his position and tries to shift the blame to his industrial victims.

"They left us chaos and anarchy, which are the essence of the capitalist means of production," he ranted to a student congress. "They left us their waste. Not 100,000 tractors, but just a few thousand tractors and 300,000 cars. With them you cannot produce. With them you only spend tires, spare parts, gasoline. With that we cannot have more milk, more meat, no new clothes and shoes.

"At present, poverty, the one they left us; underdevelopment, lack of industries, hostility, blockade, aggression, saboteurs, criminals paid by Yankee millionaires." In attempting to shift the blame for his country's woes, he paints a sordid picture of its distress.

Yes, he may need those technicians to bring order out of "chaos and anarchy" and protect him from the wrath of the Cubans he betrayed. Or he may need them for some military sortie against another Latin American country to give him the aura of heroism he so sorely needs to regain.

"Where are the students in Venezuela?" he asked, as he dreamed across the sea to other triumphs. "In the street combating

the reactionary and submissive government. Where are the students in Guatemala? In the street, fighting and dying against the puppet, Ydigoras. Where are the students in Colombia? On strike, fighting against reactionary power and unpopular measures. Where are the students in Peru? In the street, fighting against the military junta. Where are the Argentine students? In the street, fighting against the guerrillas." He saw them all as members of his team in a Communist revolution.

The Soviet technicians may be in Cuba to consummate the communism of the unhappy island and make it a fully integrated satellite. Or they may be there to defend it from disenchanted Cubans who plan to retake their homeland with assistance from the United States.

Soviet bloc shipments are arriving at Havana in unusually large numbers and under suspicious circumstances. A hotel in the capital, where the technicians were quartered, was shelled by small boats manned by Miami-based exile Cuban students. Cuban naval craft fired at a U.S. plane over international waters. Castro denied the shooting and rebutted the allegation with an array of charges of American military violations.

Whatever is happening in Cuba, it appears to portend even more startling and dramatic developments in the early future.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Sept. 4, 1962]

OUR PUZZLING CUBAN POLICY

The new Democratic administration will also affirm our historic policy of opposition to the establishment anywhere in the Americas of governments dominated by foreign powers, a policy now being undermined by Soviet threats to the freedom and independence of Cuba * * * the United States under a Democratic administration will not be deterred from fulfilling its obligations and solemn responsibilities under its treaties and agreements with the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Nor will the United States * * * permit the establishment of a regime dominated by international, atheistic communism in the Western Hemisphere.—From the Democratic platform adopted July 12, 1960.

In light of the President's prompt dispatch of troops to Thailand when our interests in Laos were threatened, and the strengthening of our garrison in West Berlin in the face of warlike gestures by the Soviets, his dilatory tactics toward Cuba are puzzling.

In this instance we are not dealing with an isolated, little understood area of Asia, nor with a problem centered in Europe. Cuba is 90 miles from the coast of the United States, a stark and growing peril to this country. In fact, to quote the office wag, it's only about 550 missile miles from Broad Street.

We are not unaware that any overt act on our part to topple Castro could end by some American boys being killed or wounded. But we think it would be the height of naivete to continue to live in a fool's paradise and expect the menace of Castroism and Cuban communism to disappear of their accord.

Certainly, as Senator STROM THURMOND pointed out last week, the danger that the situation holds for the United States was recognized 2 years ago. "If the circumstances in 1960 and early 1961 justified decisions by two administrations that a U.S.-sponsored invasion of Cuba was essential, how can the far worse circumstances of today require less?" he asked.

Obviously, the Chronicle is in no position to know what steps the Kremlin might take to strengthen Cuban resistance to an invasion. In fact, there is no certainty that even the CIA is in possession of any firm knowledge of Soviet intent. Yet, if past performances may be utilized as parallels, the danger of open Russian warfare appears inappreciable.

Since the Korean war we have moved forces into sensitive areas on several fronts without provoking the Soviets into combat. Information now, in fact, discloses that had the United States acted forcefully a year ago, the "wall of shame" separating East and West Berlin would never have been constructed.

It doesn't follow, of course, that nothing we do will continue to go uncontested, but we will make no gain if we take no risk.

This line of reasoning doesn't prompt us to hold, necessarily, with the young Cuban who led the hit-and-run sea raid on Havana that the United States should provide the Cuban exiles with military aid because Castro is receiving help from the Soviet Union. But it seems the height of folly to continue to do nothing and watch Castro's arsenal bulge with Communist arms and aircraft and his troops become combatwise under Soviet technical training.

The reluctance of President Kennedy to commit American men to the hazards of battle and the Nation to the dangers of war is understandable and appreciated. The eager young sea raider, however, may have a point. We encouraged the Cuban exiles in April of 1961—then let them down by less than an honest, cooperative effort on our part.

It seems logical, therefore, to believe that success would attend another try, provided we equip these eager beavers with proper materiel and furnish them with topflight leadership and American naval and aviation support.

No less an effort was promised in the Democratic platform—and the United States may not have to many more chances to eliminate this festering cancer on our southern shore.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Sept. 7, 1962]

REALITIES IN CUBA

From every indication, it seems that President Kennedy is about the only American citizen unwilling to face the realities of the situation in Cuba today. Unfortunately, he is the one American who must face reality. He is the only one with sufficient authority to deal with this situation.

On Tuesday the President warned Russia and Cuba that the United States would take "whatever means may be necessary" to prevent expansion of communism in the Western Hemisphere. The News commented that it was a welcome stiffening of our backbone—but was it a reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine?

The Monroe Doctrine pledges that this Nation will prevent extension of alien systems into the hemisphere. Can it be denied that the mere presence of Castro's regime in Cuba is a violation of the doctrine?

Khrushchev boasted recently that the doctrine is dead. In fact it has been dead for nearly 4 years—ever since we permitted Castro to set up a Soviet beachhead 90 miles from our shores.

Even the State Department reluctantly admitted, in a statement issued last December—long before there was evidence of a significant number of Soviet troops and weapons in Cuba—that "Cuba under the Castro regime represents a serious threat to the collective security of the American Republics."

This the President denies. He is still insisting that those Soviet troops are merely "technicians"—in spite of powerful and reliable evidence to the contrary, including boasts from Havana and the Kremlin. Moreover, Mr. Kennedy clings to the fiction that the Soviet weapons (which he admits are there) are purely defensive.

There is no such thing as a strictly "defensive" weapon—or at least there hasn't been anything of the kind since the body shield went out of fashion. Whether or not these weapons were designed for defensive purposes, they can be used with great effect in the hands of an aggressor. They can be used, for example, to protect the Castro regime at home from internal revolt, while the aggressor forces now used for that purpose are released to undermine neighboring countries.

In spite of these facts, the President pursues a timid course, promising only that we will try to "isolate" communism in the hemisphere to Cuba; that when Castro starts to drop bombs on the United States, or its neighbors to the south, we may call out the militia. Meanwhile, we are doing nothing to prevent subversion in the hemisphere.

What happens when the next Communist beachhead is established—in Brazil or British Guinea, for example? Will we then merely try to "isolate" these Red outposts, too?

When are we going to stop isolating communism and began to run it out of the hemisphere?

When are we going to get off the defensive? When, in short, are we going to take a few positive actions?

Thanks to Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, we now know that our faithful NATO allies—Britain, Germany, Norway, and Greece—have been partially responsible for the Soviet buildup in Cuba. Ships from these countries have transported most of the weapons Castro has received recently from Russia and the East European satellites.

Months ago we tried to boycott Cuba so that this kind of thing would not happen. But typically we refused to do anything more than "request" our allies to assist in the boycott. Phil Newsome, foreign news analyst for the United Press International, stated yesterday that such a boycott "never can become truly effective without military measures."

The hour is late. It has become obvious that "military measures" have become a necessity to deal with the Cuban threat. This doesn't mean, necessarily, that we have to invade Cuba—though that may soon become essential. But at least we need a military blockade—a naval patrol—to surround the Red island outpost in the Caribbean.

This would have the dual effect of preventing a further arms buildup of Cuba by cutting off its supply line with the Soviets and also would truly isolate Castro from exporting his revolution elsewhere in the hemisphere.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Sept. 8, 1962]

A TIME FOR DECISION

Wallowing in indecision over what to do about Red Cuba, the United States presents a sorry spectacle before the world. Here is this country, greatest power on earth—defender of liberty and guardian of free nations around the globe—incapable of removing a small thorn from its own side.

After spending hundreds of billions of dollars on national defense, Senator HOMER CAPEHART warns that the United States may have to call up Army Reserves by the end of winter to deal with communism in Cuba, a nation of 6 million population.

What kind of Government is it that embarks on major wars 10,000 miles from its shores in southeast Asia, yet sinks into hesitant confusion over dealing with a military threat 90 miles from our mainland? How real this threat is may be gaged from Senator STROM THURMOND'S citation of "substantial evidence taht there are now at least four intermediate-range ballistic missile bases in Cuba."

This climate of weakness reminds an older generation of the late 1930's, when Great Britain and France could not make up their

minds over Hitler's aggression in Europe. David Lawrence, in a syndicated column published in the Charleston Evening Post, has pointed out that "the situation strangely parallels the 1930's, which Winston Churchill describes in his book 'The Gathering Storm' published in 1948."

Churchill wrote of the "milestones of disaster" and of the series of appeasements in Hitler's aggressions in the Rhineland, in Austria and in Czechoslovakia, until finally the climax came in Poland.

The United States acquiesced in Cuba. It did more than that, for it helped Fidel Castro rise to power. While Russian arms pour into Cuba, President Kennedy, like Neville Chamberlain—the umbrella man in the days of Nazi invasion—finds the threat insufficiently grave for decisive action.

Under the British parliamentary system, it was possible for Chamberlain the appeaser to be replaced with the resolute Churchill. But the constitutional system of the United States affords no similar opportunity for changing leaders. The only way to halt the disaster in Cuba and to bolster the entire foreign policy is for public opinion to force the President into doing what must be done for the security—indeed for the survival—of the United States of America.

If the President feels that he needs a legal charter for decisive action against a threat to our territory, he can find it in the Monroe Doctrine. This is an American document that must be interpreted by Americans. Nikita Khrushchev has usurped the role of defining it, and he has defined the doctrine as out-of-date and meaningless. It is up to President Kennedy, as Commander in Chief, to scotch the peril facing the Nation in Cuba. He must make plain that the destiny of this hemisphere will be shaped by Americans, not Russians. These are the responsibilities that face our President in this time of decision.

Rocking Chair Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Economic Committee followed the Ways and Means Committee in holding hearings on the economic condition of our country and the arguments pro and con for a tax quickie to stimulate our economy. A byproduct of the Joint Economic Committee hearings was an article by economic columnist Mr. J. A. Livingston, who was one of the witnesses, entitled "Finance Tax Cut at Bureau of Engraving."

I enjoyed the column very much as anyone familiar with my economic views can well understand. However, Mr. Stanley Ruttenberg, director, Department of Research, AFL–CIO, another of our witnesses, did not. This, too, is understandable.

I want to help move the national debate along so I am setting out Mr. Livingston's column, Mr. Ruttenberg's reply to Mr. Livingston, a copy of which he generously sent to me, and my reply to Mr. Ruttenberg:

BUSINESS OUTLOOK: FINANCE TAX CUT AT BUREAU OF ENGRAVING

(By J. A. Livingston)

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, is short, stocky, and stubbornly matter of fact.

"But where are we going to get the money?"

Always politely, always quietly. Never did his voice rise. But oh, so persistently, did he ask that question.

The witness before the Joint Economic Committee was Stanley Ruttenberg, director of research of the AFL–CIO. Ruttenberg favored an immediate tax cut of "approximately $5 billion," to terminate December 31. "The impact on the economy would be the equivalent of almost $20 billion a year," he said.

How would Ruttenberg achieve this 4-for-1 fiscal tour de force?

He'd reduce "witholding taxes by $10 a week for 10 weeks for each taxpayer, and taxpayers whose withholding tax is less than $10 a week would be able to apply immediately for a tax refund that would permit them to have a total tax cut of $100." A $5 billion cut in one quarter would be tantamount to $20 billion a year.

At this point, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, suavely asked if Ruttenberg didn't feel that Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin Jr., could impose a "Russian veto" on the program by making money tight. Wouldn't a rise in interest rates run directly counter to tax-cut stimulation?

"I would hope," responded Ruttenberg adroitly, "that the Reserve Board would maintain a monetary policy consistent with economic expansion."

Then Representative CURTIS got in his licks. He hadn't noticed in Mr. Ruttenberg's prepared statement a plan for raising $5 billion. "Do you think the Treasury could sell $5 billion of E-bonds to the public?"

Ruttenberg allowed that might be difficult.

"Well, then," repeated CURTIS, "where do we get the money? I'm a member of the House Ways and Means Committee. It's our responsibility to see that the Treasury has the funds necessary to conduct the Government's business.

"You, and other witnesses have appeared before this committee and the House Ways and Means Committee and suggested, 'cut taxes,' but you don't submit a plan of financing. One must be the counterpart of the other."

Ruttenberg promised to submit a proposal. But the committee wasn't through with him.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, had misgivings about the 4-for-1 assumption. Did Mr. Ruttenberg feel certain that people would spend this money or would they save it? He, himself, suspected that a temporary tax cut wouldn't have the same impact as a permanent tax reduction that people could count on—year in and out.

Well, answered Ruttenberg, if you knew workers, and he thought he did, they'd spend the money, and fast.

But, countered Senator PROXMIRE, people couldn't employ a shortrun tax cut on longrun purchases. They wouldn't contact new installment debt on $100.

"Maybe they'd use the money to pay off old debt," the Senator suggested.

"That would be fine," responded Ruttenberg, "then they could start all over again." [Laughter.]

Senator PROXMIRE, unconvinced, turned to a new subject.

"Do you think that once the Congress granted a 3-month tax reduction it could withdraw it? I'm thinking of the political realities. Wouldn't people expect us to continue it?"

Said Ruttenberg: "I think the Congress could review the situation on January 5, 6, or 7, when it reconvenes."

All through Ruttenberg's testimony, through sheer force of character, I managed silence. As a witness, I was bursting with desire to help him out.

Why, he could have handled CURTIS and PROXMIRE in one fell razzle-dazzle. Why not just hand every taxpayer, whether he pays $100 in taxes a year or not (for Ruttenberg didn't cover this point) a brandnew, fresh $100 bill?

That would help employment at the U.S. Bureau of Printing and Engraving which would have to print 50 million new $100 bills.

It would help to popularize the portrait of Benjamin Franklin, who graces the C note. And it would answer Representative CURTIS' question: "Where's the money coming from?"

Answer: From the printing press.

AUGUST 20, 1962.

Mr. J. S. LIVINGSTON,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIVINGSTON: Your August 15 column, "Finance Tax Cut at Bureau of Engraving," prompts the old saying, "It's a shame to spoil a good story with the truth." But you owe your readers at least an accurate report of events you witnessed. The column falsifies facts.

No one could guess what happened at the August 10 Joint Economic Committee hearings. The transcript shows:

1. When Congressman CURTIS asked me to explain how to finance a deficit resulting from a tax cut, I described several technical methods for financing it. I did not, as you reported, promise to "submit a proposal." I did present sound, acceptable economic methods for financing the prospective deficit. A copy of my response is attached.

2. You attended and participated in the hearings and asked for a tax cut of a different kind. Your fictional account of how you "through sheer force of character" managed to contain your desire to "help" me "out" by indicating that the printing press could print money is, therefore, very funny, but it is not true. You merely advocated a different kind of tax cut from the kind I was advocating. You may find to your horror that the American people think that all tax cut advocates think money grows on trees if you make fun of any tax cut, just because labor supports it. Economists of every political hue are concerned right now about the need for tax cuts.

You have the right to disagree with me, to ridicule my views. However, you have no right to falsify the facts. It is too bad, it seems to me, not only that you should feel that you must result to falsehood to argue against the kind of tax cut I was advocating, but also that you fail to allow your readers to understand that what I described as a means of financing was technically sound. This is true not only for the tax cut I suggested, but also for the tax cut you suggested. Any tax cut requires financing. Tax cuts of various kinds have been proposed to stimulate the economy. Until the stimulus results in additional revenue, deficit financing is necessary. The public should know that.

It should also know that the President of the United States, the Council of Economic Advisers, Members of Congress from both political parties, the chamber of commerce and various business groups have all considered tax cuts as necessary means of spur-

ring the economy. Their suggestions have differed, but all would have required deficit financing until the necessary stimulus had been provided.

It seems too bad, therefore, for you to try to ridicule as nonexistent a very real economic problem which all of these groups do recognize. It seems very odd and strange for you to ignore the fact that all these other groups have asked for tax cuts and that you also have advocated them. Do you think the funny joke you make about printing press money applies to the thinking of the President of the United States, to the Council of Economic Advisers, to the Members of Congress, to the chamber of commerce, and to J. A. Livingston when they consider and sometimes advocate the necessity for a tax cut to spur the economy? Or is it only for labor spokesmen whose views you don't have the courtesy to report, whose colloquies with Congressmen you deliberately distort, that such ridicule is appropriate? And is this because you have decided, as you told the Joint Economic Committee that day, that you think the National Association of Manufacturers is now correct?

Sincerely,

STANLEY H. RUTTENBERG,
Director,
Department of Research.

CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 4, 1962.

Mr. STANLEY H. RUTTENBERG,
Director, Department of Research, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RUTTENBERG: Thank you for sending me a copy of your letter to Mr. J. A. Livingston commenting upon his column of August 15, 1962.

I enjoyed the humor of the column, but perhaps that was because I was on the same side of his economic philosophy.

I think your reply misses the basic point in the national debate over the proposed tax quickie. The point is that those who advance the theory that deficit financing per se stimulates an economy must assume the burden of proof, just as anyone who advances a novel theory should assume this burden.

To date, the professed followers of Lord Keynes' economic theory that deficit financing will stimulate an economy by increasing consumer purchasing power have been begging the question, and insulting those who refuse to adopt this theory by accusing them of being neolithic in their thinking.

I think it is time that this school of economic thinking started proving its point, if it can. You were one of a long line of witnesses appearing before both the Ways and Means Committee and the Joint Economic Committee, as I pointed out when I interrogated you, who advocated a tax cut to stimulate the economy but who did not come in with prepared remarks to discuss the vital issue—how would the deficit that this created be financed? What would the economic effect of marketing that additional amount of Government bonds have on our present economy, struggling as it is with a large deficit and with a balance-of-foreign-payment problem, and yet breaking new economic records as measured in gross national product and innovation of new products and services?

I appreciated your willingness to discuss the questions on this point I posed after you had made your prepared remarks, just as those who preceded you had proved willing. But in your instance, as in the others, it was obvious that the remarks were the result of improvisation rather than deep study.

You, along with your predecessors, fell back essentially to the supposition that the deficit would be financed by the increased economic growth that the deficit would produce. As I pointed out, this begged the question. The question is, Will Federal deficits stimulate an economy, under any circumstances and, in particular, under the present circumstances. If so, how? Answering this, of course, requires full discussion of the economic problems involved in debt management. No witness for a tax cut quickie had one word to say in his prepared remarks about the problems of debt management.

Isn't it about time the theory of deficit financing be supported by straightforward argument and reference to economic history instead of the appeal to "authorities," as does your letter? This is the 20th century, not the Middle Ages. Facts and arguments, not "authorities," decide the points at issue.

There are many economists who do not scoff at a balanced Federal budget; there are many who do not believe that deficit financing stimulates an economy. President Kennedy asked for a national debate on the subject but, instead of a debate, we get a name-calling contest.

I think Mr. Livingston was on entirely sound grounds in spoofing the deficit financiers by pointing out that devoid of its sophistication the theory is no more than giving printing-press money to the potential consumers in the society. This theory has never worked in the past and there seems to be less logic to suggest that it might work in modern America. In fact, if anything, it would take us backward to the frontier days of the 1800's which seem to so fascinate our currently ruling politicians in the White House.

I can't understand why it is so difficult for people to realize that our society has advanced economically to a point no society has ever reached before. Our economy is so dynamic that it is creating serious growing pains. Yet the New Frontier seeks to treat growing pains as if they were symptoms of a tired and rundown condition requiring rocking chair treatment. This kind of medication can stop the growing pains all right—by stopping growth. We will surely get stagnation and ultimate economic death through this kind of backward and forward motion, going nowhere.

However, I enjoyed your response to Mr. Livingston. Usually I am the one who complains that news commentators miss my points.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Promotion of Sale and Use of Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, much is being written about our wheat surplus, but seldom do we get information regarding some of the outstanding work that is being done to promote the sale and use of wheat and wheat products.

In 1957, our State established the Kansas Wheat Commission. Its assignment was to find and develop new markets for wheat, and it has been most successful.

Recently Don Kendall, of the Hutchinson News, wrote an article in which he discussed the outstanding work of this group. I was unanimous consent that the article be made a part of these remarks and printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS WHEAT COMMISSION AND GREAT PLAINS WHEAT, INC., ARE DOING THE JOBS THEY SET OUT TO DO

(By Don Kendall)

HUTCHINSON, KANS.—In the spring of 1957 a new State agency set up office in Hutchinson. Its name: Kansas Wheat Commission. Its job: Find and develop new markets for wheat.

In January 1959 what is now a five-State organization was formed at Garden City. Its name: Great Plains Wheat, Inc. Its job: Develop markets abroad as a foreign arm of the Kansas Wheat Commission.

The Kansas Wheat Commission was created by the 1957 legislature's Kansas Wheat Act which provided that farmers would pay a penny tax on each 5 bushels of wheat sold. This money would be used by the new agency to promote a crop which rapidly was developing into the Nation's No. 1 farm problem.

Today the wheat officials point with pride at what has happened:

1. Three out of five bushels of wheat produced in Kansas this year eventually will be sold in foreign countries.

2. Transportation rates have been reduced to some coastal points to enable more competitive movement of inland grain for export.

3. New food uses have been found and more are coming.

4. An international network of wheat offices has been established in Europe, Africa, South America and Asia to help acquaint buyers with Kansas wheat.

5. Hundreds of foreign grain men, flour millers and backers have been brought to the Great Plains to see for themselves the supply and quality of the area's chief crop.

6. The United States has emerged as the leading wheat exporter in the world and its reputation for quality, sagging a few years ago, is being bolstered.

The organizations don't claim their efforts alone have brought about these developments. But they have occurred, primarily since farmers organized to help promote their wares.

Walt Graber, 55-year-old Reno County farmer, who was hired as Kansas Wheat Commission administrator 5 years ago, comments:

"I think we can point to areas of progress that no one can argue with. It has been uphill all the way—don't mistake that—but I think our exports, as an example, speak for themselves."

In 1957 U.S. wheat exports reached a peak for the previous decade, around 525 million bushels, or about half an average U.S. crop. Then exports began to slide.

The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 has had tremendous impact on U.S. wheat exports. Basically, the law provides foreign aid to needy countries in form of surplus U.S. farm commodities, including wheat.

Under this law last year, more than 400 million of the 662 million bushels moved abroad. This, some critics say, is "dumping" on the world market and cannot be attributed to the work of any promotional group.

The facts remain that since 1958 U.S. wheat exports have increased from a low of 400 million bushels to an estimated 730 million bushels this year.

Cash markets—wheat sold for hard dollars—also have developed in this period. Last year cash sales of U.S. wheat rose by nearly 30 million bushels.

While domestic per capita consumption of wheat indicates a continuing decline, new wheat foods appear taking up some of the slack. Sale abroad of ready-to-eat wheat

products also is a valuable outlet for the Kansas farmer.

The Kansas Wheat Commission collects approximately $450,000 a year from the special tax. Twenty percent is turned over to the State general fund. The remainder is used by the commission as it sees fit.

Foreign market development is handled by Great Plains Wheat, which is headquartered in Garden City. The Kansas Wheat Commission pays about $180,000 annually out of wheat tax receipts for support of Great Plains Wheat. Through Great Plains Wheat, the Kansas Wheat Commission reaches into four continents.

Great Plains Wheat was supported, after its establishment in 1959, by State wheat agencies in Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado. Since then North Dakota and South Dakota have become Great Plains Wheat members.

Great Plains Wheat maintains an office in Washington and others in Europe, Africa, South America, and Asia to help develop markets.

Clifford Hope, of Garden City, former Kansas Congressman, is Great Plains Wheat president.

Hope's assistant and executive secretary of Great Plains Wheat is Bill Crotinger, a large-scale wheat farmer in Greeley County.

Starting several months ago, Great Plains Wheat concentrated on bringing young West German technicians and tradesmen to work 6 months each in U.S. wheat industry. One of the requirements, Crotinger said, is that the trainees agree to return to West Germany and work for their home firms—and presumably they will spread the word about U.S. wheat.

"We feel West Germany is the key to the European Common Market as far as we're concerned," he said.

Another country is proving to be more than a future possibility. Japan, prior to Great Plains Wheat, was importing none from this area, only a little white wheat raised in the Pacific Northwest.

This year Japan will buy almost 14 million bushels from the United States, Crotinger said.

A rail freight rate reduction went into effect this year from the Great Plains breadbasket to west coast ports, applying only to wheat moving into Asian markets.

"Now we are competitive on the west coast with Canada as far as wheat is concerned," he said.

Before the reduction, he explained, it cost the United States $6 to $9 more than Canada to put a ton of wheat in position for export. Consequently, Japan could get wheat cheaper from Canada.

The rail rate reduction was worked out mainly at instigation of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers and its national brotherhood. Kansas Association of Wheat Growers is a private organization distinct from the Kansas Wheat Commission, which is prohibited by law from negotiating freight rates.

Physical Fitness in the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the schools in Westchester, N.Y., County are regarded as successful pioneers in correlating physical fitness with academic discipline. This is achieved under the State department of education's physical education, health, recreation and safety syllabus.

In keeping with the theme for increased physical fitness standards among our Nation's youth, as emphasized by President Eisenhower and reiterated by President Kennedy, the public and private schools in Westchester County, the municipal recreation organizations in the villages, towns, and cities, and many industrial and civic groups have received, through the courtesy of the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, a printed folder of a speech made recently to honor schoolboy athletes.

Written by Col. Frank J. Kobes, professor and director of athletics at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y., the talk entitled "Physical Fitness in the Space Age," is one which should be shared by every school and every community in the Nation. I suggest that my colleagues make the speech available to their State commissioners of education with a notation that Colonel Kobes' comments serve as a basis for a memorandum to all schools within their respective States.

My colleagues who have nominated many young men to the service Academies, know that physical fitness is a prime preentry yardstick, and that physical education instruction at the Academies is designed to aid in developing the whole person so necessary for military effectiveness.

Colonel Kobes' timely speech follows:

PHYSICAL FITNESS IN THE SPACE AGE

(By Col. Frank J. Kobes)

This has been called the space age.

It has also been called the age of anxiety or the aspirin age—whatever its name, it is a protective age.

Parents protect their children from the jolts which they themselves absorbed.

The state protects its citizens against unemployment, sickness, profit or loss.

Schools, more and more, protect their pupils from the reliable old corrective of trial and error.

The final result of this overprotection is stultification—a cocoon which strangles the butterfly.

This is an age of leisure and abundance. We have so much food that it is collected and hoarded in storage bins throughout the country. The 4-day workweek for the same wages as the old 6-day week is already upon us.

Today also, we have 16 million men and women past the age of 65 who are classified as aged. These 16 million, in just 15 short years from now will become 20 million. Many of these elderly people are not really living but merely existing, being kept alive by drugs and medicines, not able to lead active lives.

The space age student is one who is overfed, overweight, and underactive. This generation of the tallest, heaviest and most nearly disease-free youth in all history is being victimized by prosperity—to be specific, by an age of mechanization, specialization, and materialism. More than likely, he finds recreation in sitting or watching, or listening or riding.

The space age curriculum is loaded with abstract intellectualism. Priority is given to the development of a select group of minds that are supposed to solve the mysteries of space. We pile more and more academic work on our children during school hours and send them home with more to do at night. There's nothing wrong with hard work but there is something wrong with overemphasis on academic training at the expense of good health and physical fitness. Should this trend continue, our children will certainly become a race of "egg-heads walking around on birdlegs."

I get the feeling that we are riding off in all directions at once and forgetting that the foundation stones of any successful community, State, or country, are not machines, but people.

Perhaps you have heard of the Army officer whose radar equipment announced the arrival of unknown squadrons hurrying toward him at a supersonic speed. As a responsible chief, he had the power and perhaps the obligation to give an immediate order for nuclear counterattack. He did not give this order. It was discovered later that the alarm was due to an error in the detectors.

Can you imagine what went on in that man's conscience during those few minutes? To deliberate? To hesitate? A decision had to be made—quickly.

Thank God, in the chain of automation there was still a man, and this man had the responsibility of making a decision contrary to the orders given to him by automation. He was the last link in the chain, and he knew how to break it.

Arnold Toynbee, the eminent historian, stated recently that, of the 21 great civilizations in the history of mankind, 19 of them were destroyed, not by the armed strength of attacking enemies, but by moral and physical decay from within. Let's not forget that it is our job to bring up our young men and women to be human beings, not mechanized robots.

We tell our cadets over and over again that mental strength and intelligence are essential for any Army officer. It is vital that they know well their military tactics and strategy. But the greatest tactician in the world is of no use to his men if he doesn't have the physical strength and moral fiber to lead them on the battlefield.

And the same is true of every citizen in these United States of ours. If we do not possess the physical fitness and moral courage to meet the challenges which face us, we are losers before we get started.

We often refer to the golden age of the Greeks. They believed in educating the whole man physically, mentally, and morally. The Spartans, in particular, were great believers in the fact that health and physical fitness were the very foundations for building good citizens. When a child was born, he would be examined by his father and if there was evidence of physical weakness or ill health, the child was abandoned on a mountainside to perish.

Thank goodness that our respect for human life today considers such a screening method unthinkable for developing a high quality of people. However, the pendulum appears to have swung too far in the opposite direction. Too many of our school administrators are of the same opinion as one of our supposedly outstanding college presidents who stated not too many years ago, that when he feels the urge to exercise, he lies down until the feeling goes away.

Any really informed person knows that man develops a total entity, that growth and development of any part is related to the growth and development of the whole. And, that if active cells are wanted in the brain or any other part of the body, activity of the total organism is a necessity.

No wonder President Kennedy is concerned about physical fitness.

Even though we can earn a living without perspiring, and enjoy life without moving much more than an elbow, from the standpoint of physiology, the body needs physical activity. This is a basic requirement for successful and productive living, and it will always remain a requirement. If our job does not require us to be physically active

then we must seek activity elsewhere, or eventually atrophy as a people and as a Nation. It is just that simple.

Physical fitness is not only the key to a healthy body, but it is the basis of creative intellectual activity and adjustment to our ever changing environment. We don't understand all the aspects of this—the molding of a sound body with an energetic mind is complicated. Nevertheless, it is there. We have made several studies at the Academy which have convinced us that this is true.

We must be constantly aware of the fact that in 20 years, few men will have to work with their hands. Also, we must realize that all those young men here tonight, and their associates, have a life expectancy of about 22 years more than their grandparents.

We must do something to prepare them to live these additional years with dignity and vigor. We must educate them to realize the need for the habit of physical activity. They must understand that in their leisure time they may seek release from the fast pace of today's world and tomorrow's world through physical activities which are relaxing and which counterbalance their otherwise physically inactive routines of daily living.

The capstone of any physical fitness program is competitive athletics. This is the incentive or the frosting on the cake. It is this program that has unlimited potential for educating young people—especially developing in them what I like to call moral fiber. By moral fiber, I mean such attributes of character as courage, the will to win, daring, perseverance, sportsmanship.

It is a recognized fact that the worth of any activity for character development depends upon the nature and intensity of the emotions it arouses, and the standards which control the expression of these emotions. Because physical and athletic activities involve the deepest and most powerful of human emotions, they are of exceptional value from the character development standpoint. In addition, they appeal strongly to young men, and elicit their energetic, enthusiastic participation.

Of all the experiences which they undergo, none possesses more opportunities for the building of these desirable moral qualities. Since many of the activities are contests in which the participants are brought into close contact with one another, and in which personal courage and daring play very decided roles—manliness, aggressiveness, confidence, determination, and the ability to think and act quickly and efficiently under pressure are developed to a degree unattainable by other means.

Hundreds of young men in whom these attributes might have never been awakened are, for the first time, given a chance to find themselves. This laboratory of the sports field simulates the conditions of life where leadership, self-discipline, and teamwork are experienced over and over again.

Athletics are an integral part of a boy's educational experience, not just a diversion or safety valve for excess animal energy.

Athletics offer the boy the chance to meet the challenge of his own inadequacy face to face, and do something about it as no other activity does. They give him the spirit of adventure, the opportunity to dare.

An end in football may wear a protective face mask, but he still must tackle a hard running back. If he flinches or fails, he knows. Negotiations will not pin another wrestler's shoulders to the mat. Promises will not put a soccer ball into the goal. Guidance conseling will not raise a batting average or give a pitcher control. Only the athlete can accomplish these feats and he does so, primarily alone. It is the athletic program's function to see to it that he faces the task squarely and does not hide from it. The help it gives is to help the boy gain satisfaction and confidence from continuous self-improvement.

Vigorous spirit and tough minds are usually found in strong bodies. I, for one, am convinced that our present day society and its educational system provides no means for toughening or tempering the bodies and minds of our youth other than through the medium of competitive sports.

Rather than deemphasizing athletics, we should reemphasize them on a sound educational basis. We must set up and adhere to high standards across the board—physical, mental, moral; and we, as parents and teachers and coaches and spectators, must show the way by our teaching and our example.

We are the ones who have let the kids down. In our haste to enjoy the luxuries provided by our high standard of living, we are denying our children the opportunity to fully grow.

This, of course, is not true of these young men whom we are honoring this evening. But you young men are among the small 5 percent who have the chance to be an athlete. What about the other 95 percent who can't make the school team? Every single boy and girl is entitled to be on an athletic team in some sport. They must be given the opportunity—the leadership, the facilities, and the time in school—to grow up in an atmosphere of vigor and physical activity.

Proper facilities for intramural athletics and physical education are not cheap. A gymnasium may cost more than a mathematics classroom; three or four soccer fields may require as much space as an auditorium. But when compared with the amount of learning and growing up that takes place in that gym and on those fields, what a bargain we can get for our money. Our Nation, and we as parents, can enjoy dividends whose value exceeds the initial investment many times over.

We have a tremendous job at hand of mentally conditioning the youth of today to their responsibilities. I emphasize the word "mentally" because our high sschool graduate, today, doesn't have the slightest conception of the inexhaustible resources of the human body and mind.

These boys, although larger, healthier, and better educated than their predecessors, have never experienced a depression, never had firsthand knowledge of a war, have ridden to and from school on buses, taken their exercise and their adventure vicariously through the medium of television, have been able to go to the refrigerator when they were hungry, to bed when they were tired, and always have had a vast variety of drugs to keep any physical pain away from them.

We have a motto in our boxing room that reads, "When the going gets tough, the tough get going." I, for one, feel it is time that we started getting tough.

One of our former Presidents had this to say: "We cannot afford to turn out men who shrink from physical effort or from a little physical pain. In any republic, courage is a prime necessity for the average citizen if he is to be a good citizen, and he needs physical courage no less than moral courage, the courage that dares as well as the courage that endures, the courage that will fight valiantly against the foes of the soul and the foes of the body.

"Athletics are good, especially in their rougher forms, because they tend to develop such courage. They are good, also, because they encourage a true democratic spirit; for, on the athletic field the man must be judged, not with reference to outside and accidental attributes, but to that combination of bodily vigor and moral quality which go to make up prowess."—Theodore Roosevelt.

If given serious consideration, sports can revitalize our education and our culture. By their very nature, sports become an outlet for the competitive instinct, and under proper guidance, become a way of learning about life. On a football field, a baseball diamond, a basketball court, in track, and in swimming, in all the wide range of modern sports a youngster learns without knowing that he is learning.

Respect for the rights of others is firmly implanted by adherence to rules that he must obey as well as his opponents. He must get along with his teammates, but he must also protect the rights of the other team as he would want them to protect his.

Physical activity serves to release his tensions and aggressive instincts; team spirit gives him the recognition and sense of importance which every person must have.

The rules of social conduct grow into his whole personality and makeup, and spill over naturally into that very real world outside of the athletic field—the world of which he will be a part.

In athletics, a boy learns the significance of individual effort and success, and he absorbs the knowledge that fairplay is a two-way street. Racial discrimination and intolerance are crowded out of the athletic field.

Group opinion, the opinion of teammates as well as opponents, emphasizes sportsmanship as well as good athletic performance. There is no better training ground for democracy.

A well-organized and full athletic program contains several areas of potential danger. One is the tendency to put too much emphasis on winning. This, of course, can be overcome by leadership which reflects good judgment and sound guidance on the part of parents and, most important of all, giving the game back to the boys.

I must emphasize that good sportsmanship can easily be nullified by questionable practices condoned by spectators, parents and coaches. We cannot be too happy about today's tendency to resort to anything in order to win, or the habit of booing the referee before he even blows the whistle to start the game, or worse yet, booing the little 10-year-old who strikes out in a Little League ball game.

We can't be too proud of the coach who says: "What they don't know won't hurt them; if we don't get caught, it's all right." Surely, we don't want our sons to grow up with such a false philosophy.

In programs of athletics, we have a tremendous opportunity to teach these young men to choose the harder right instead of the easier wrong, to help them along the road toward growing into men of high morals and strong character.

Recently, General MacArthur was asked if he had changed his mind about the value of competitive athletics. He replied: "The opinions I expressed at West Point on the infinite value of athletic competition have but intensified with the passage of time. It is a vital character builder. It molds the youth of our country for their future roles as custodians of the Republic.

"It teaches them to be strong enough to know they are weak, and brave enough to face themselves when they are afraid. It teaches them to be proud and unbending in honest defeat, but humble and gentle in victory. It teaches them humility so that they may always remember the simplicity of true greatness, the open mind of true wisdom, the meekness of true strength.

"It gives them a temper of the will, a quality of the imagination, a vigor of the emotions. It gives them a predominance of courage over timidity, of an appetite for adventure over love of ease.

"Fathers and mothers who would make their sons into men should have them play the game."

Formulation and Administration of Foreign Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, radio station WTYC of Rock Hill, S.C., broadcasted on September 6, 1962, an excellent editorial on the U.S. State Department and its formulation and administration of our foreign policies. This editorial calls for a strong and vigorous stand against communism every time the Soviets move on an aggressive course of action and it questions sharply our past and present policies in dealing with communism. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT

Russia's latest scorching rebuke against the United States involving another U–2 flight, which they allege violates Russian air zones, is being met with dismay in the minds of many Americans—and for these reasons. Again the Russians have put us in a position of trying to justify ourselves and our actions in the eyes of the world—making us look like warmongers and aggressors. The average American citizen, we believe, is tired of these verbal attacks and threats by the Russian Government. What's wrong in our State Department when we sit idly by while Russia does what she wants to do and continually indulges in acts of aggression against the United States? While at the same time, the President reports to our people, as in the Cuban situation, that, at the present time, there doesn't seem to be too much cause for alarm concerning Russian technical and military help to Cuba. The United Press International reported that Soviet citizens reacted with "shock and dismay" at the disclosure of another U–2 flight. The American people have long been shocked and dismayed at Russian aggression against the free world. But we continue to wage a "no win" cold war while Russia piles up propaganda victories. We ask ourselves, "Is this Russian aid to Cuba an act of friendship on Russia's part?" "No," we say. It is an act of aggression of the worst kind, making our U–2 flights look like child's play in comparison. President Kennedy reported to the American people, "There is no evidence of Communist-bloc combat troops or other significant offensive capability." The Russian note to the United States with reference to the U–2 flight stated that the incident was a "deliberate provocation." They warned of possible retaliatory attacks on foreign bases where U–2's are stationed and demanded "immediate measures to prevent future violations of Soviet air space."

The recent incident at the Berlin "wall of shame" found us sadly lacking also, and to our Berlin allies we lost face. Russian fishing boats just off our coastline recently—and we could go on listing Russian acts of aggression. Are we so dumb that we cannot fight a propaganda war also? Can we not also blister, and we mean blister, the Russians verbally for these acts of aggression and play them up to their full significance and make our rebukes ring throughout the world? Where is our backbone? The Cuban situation should have never risen to today's proportions. We should have taken a stand at the Berlin "wall of shame." We should have ordered the Russian boats off our coastline. Let's not play games, we know those so-called fishing boats were fishing for bigger game and so does our State Department. All of these "should haves." Must we always seem to cower at the growl of the Russian bear? Will we sit by and let the Russians literally camp on our doorstep while the State Department and President Kennedy say they are no threat?

We're proud to be Americans and most of us had not rather be "Red than dead." So to the State Department and President Kennedy we plead—let's let the Russians know in no uncertain terms that we're proud of what we have and that we plan to keep it that way. Let's fight propaganda with propaganda. Khrushchev is not afraid to call us "American warmongers" and "despised capitalists" while our State Department trembles that we may offend the Russians in some way by what we say.

There are bills being introduced in Congress for a full-scale investigation of the State Department. We sincerely hope we don't wait too late.

King-Anderson Health Proposal Simplified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much misunderstanding regarding the President's health care program under social security, identified as the King-Anderson bill, which I deemed a privilege to sponsor in the House of Representatives at the request of the President, that I wish to clarify the true purpose of the bill which will be reintroduced next January.

Health is the business of a democratic country, for the fulfillment of the individual—impossible without health—is one of its highest goals. The health of every individual is very much a concern of our Nation, yet many elderly citizens cannot afford and do not obtain the health care they need.

The principal aim of the King-Anderson bill is to provide our older citizens with protection against the excessive costs of hospital care for prolonged illness which can wipe out the lifetime savings of an aged couple of moderate means, and often results in a major financial drain on their families, or forces them from independence to dependency.

The need is widely acknowledged, and the fact is beyond dispute that the greatest single threat to the economic security of older people is the unpredictable cost of illness. The King-Anderson proposal would make it possible for our people to build insurance protection in their working years against the high cost of illness in their later year—just as they now build protection under social security for themselves and their families against the loss of earnings because of old age, disability, or death.

Hospitalization represents the heaviest financial health care burden imposed on aged persons. The average hospital care cost per day in 1946 was $9.39; in 1950 it rose to $15.26; in 1955 to $23.12; in 1960 to $32.28; in 1961 to $34.98, and in California, exceeding the national average, the cost has risen to $44.81.

Therefore, insurance against the cost of hospital care was deemed the proper area of coverage under a health insurance program, with a contribution rate within the means of our country's working force of approximately $1 per month. It is a very modest proposal designed to meet the most essential need, with sufficient deductible requirements to discourage unnecessary utilization.

People 65 and over have health care costs twice as high as those of younger people. They are more likely to have serious and long-lasting illnesses, yet their annual income, on the average, is only half as large. The majority have little or no money beyond what they need to meet their day-to-day expenses for housing, food and clothing. Most younger persons readily recover from serious illnesses and regain both their health and economic well-being, whereas such an opportunity is rarely afforded those of advanced years.

In our social security system we have the instrument which can spread the cost of health services in old age over the working years effectively, and in a manner consistent with the dignity of the individual. For over 26 years the efficient administrative machinery of the social security system has been operating successfully, and extension of health care insurance can be logically added at a minimum cost for the benefit of those over age 65.

By using this proved system to provide health insurance protection, it will be possible for our older people to get the vital hospital services they need, not as a gift, but as a right earned and established during productive years, without exhausting their resources, mortgaging their homes, burdening their families, or being obliged to resort to public assistance. Paying for hospital costs under the social security system is the conservative and practical answer to the problem.

Only about half of our people 65 and over have hospitalization insurance, and many of the policies offered to older people provide but limited benefits under restrictive conditions. It is well recognized that a policy that will provide even an approach to adequate care is beyond the financial ability of the great majority of retired persons.

The Kerr-Mills law, adopted by the Congress in 1960, provided medical assistance for those who could prove poverty through a means test. But now we must meet the needs of those millions of taxpayers who are staggered by the drain on their savings—or those of their children—caused by an extended hospital stay. The King-Anderson bill seeks to prevent ever-rising health care costs from bringing about indigency, rather than to extend care only after indigency occurs.

It is obvious the proposed health care program has no resemblance to social-

ized medicine. It is simply a national program to help older people prepay hospital and related health care bills, not a means of providing these services. Nothing in the bill would in any way change existing practices of hospitals which require that patients be admitted only on the order of a physician.

There would be no interference in the doctor-patient relationship. Every patient would have free choice—of doctor, hospital, or nursing home. Hospitals and other services would be paid in much the same way that Blue Cross and other insurers now pay. The proposal states specifically that the Government would in no way control, regulate, or interfere with the practice of medicine or the administration of hospitals.

The aim and ideals embodied in the health insurance program will help social security do the job it was designed to do—provide a measure of independence with dignity for America's senior citizens during their golden years with an added measure of health and happiness. What greater bulwark against communism could there be than the contentment of a citizenry assured of a feeling of security they have earned.

Texan Among Winners of Retail Clerks International Association Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Retail Clerks International Association has a special scholarship program where the winners are all A students in high school and where each winner receives a scholarship of $500 a year for 4 years and is free to choose any college or university. There are 7 of these scholarships each year, so 28 of these brilliant students will be in colleges of their choice each year under this union scholarship plan.

These scholarships are financed by an endowed trust fund, made up of contributors from the local unions of the Retail Clerks International Association.

This is trade unionism at one of its highest and most idealistic levels. It picks the most brilliant minds from among the clerks and children of clerks and sends them to college for 4 years each. Each year a new group is sent to college. This is helping strengthen the Nation in a time of educational crisis.

This is the first year a Texan has been chosen. He is George Moore IV of Irving, Dallas County, Tex., an outstanding student who plans to attend the University of Texas.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Seven Excellent Students Receive Fourth Annual RCIA Scholarships Awards" from the September 1962, issue of Retail Clerks Advocate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVEN EXCELLENT STUDENTS RECEIVE FOURTH ANNUAL RETAIL CLERKS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION SCHOLARSHIPS AWARDS

Southwestern division: Jeanne M. Sandell graduated from the Albany High School, with emphasis in the field of music. She was valedictorian of her class. She plans to attend the University of California, majoring in music, teaching, or psychology.

Northwestern division: Dennis L. Weaver graduated at the head of his class from Evergreen High School. Active in a four-piece band, he also worked. He will attend Washington State University where he will major in business administration.

Southeastern division: Gerald Schall graduated from the Jessup W. Scott High School. He was a member of the National Honor Society and a number of clubs. He is one of 25 students selected for a special medical program at Northwestern University.

Southern division: George Moore worked part time as a checker while compiling a straight A average. He was also active in school clubs. He will attend the University of Texas and plans to continue on to law school after graduation from college.

Metropolitan New York division: Lana Segan graduated from Bergenfield High School where she was the top student of her class. She won an award at this year's science fair. Planning to become a teacher, she will enter Fairleigh Dickinson University.

Central division: Randall Oloizia graduated from Custer High School. He was a member of the student council, the Math and German clubs, the wrestling and track teams. He has been accepted as a member of the freshman class at the University of Wisconsin.

Eastern division: Tobi Holtzman graduated from Pennsauken High School. She served as editor of the school paper throughout high school and was associate editor of the yearbook. She plans to attend the University of Wisconsin and to major in psychology.

Four outstanding young men and three exceptional young women have been chosen as winners of the Fourth Annual James A. Suffridge-Retail Clerks International Association scholarship awards. This brings the total number of college students who have received grants from the permanent fund established through contributions of local unions in the United States and Canada to 22.

More than 500 high school seniors who are members of the Retail Clerks International Association or children of members competed for the awards this year. The selection of the winners was a difficult job for the board of trustees because of the high caliber of the applicants. The finalists who won the coveted awards were all straight A students.

A $2,000, 4-year scholarship was awarded in each of the seven organizing divisions of the Retail Clerks International Association. The grant is payable in four yearly installments of $500. The last three are contingent on the maintenance of a satisfactory scholastic performance.

The money is provided from the interest of the James A. Suffridge-Retail Clerks International Association Scholarship Fund, which is held in perpetual trust, guaranteeing that the principal fund will never be touched. This will make scholarships available on a permanent basis for hundreds of years.

Recipients of the scholarships are:

Northwestern division: Dennis Leroy Weaver, of Seattle, Wash. The winner is a member of Retail Clerks International Association Local 1105.

Southwestern division: Jeanne Mary Sandell of Berkeley, Calif., whose mother is a member of local 1179 of Richmond, Calif.

Central division: Randall Leroy Oloizia, of Milwaukee, Wis., whose mother is a member of local 444.

Southern division: George Clifford Moore IV, of Irving, Tex., who is a member of local 368 of Dallas.

Southeastern division: Gerald Lynn Schall of Toledo, Ohio, whose father is a member of local 954.

Eastern division: Tobi Deborah Holtzman of Pennsauken, N.J., whose father is a member of local 1360 of Camden.

Metropolitan New York division: Lana Segan of Bergenfield, N.J., who is a member of local 1262 of Newark.

Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote a most perceptive editorial from the September 5, 1962, issue of the Wall Street Journal, which commends the statement of the President that the Soviet satellite government in Cuba will not be allowed to extend its influence further in the Western Hemisphere.

The editorial follows:

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

The year was 1823. Imperialist Russia, filled with ambitions to extend its domain, was pushing its power along the northwest coast of North America. In an alliance with Austria and Prussia, whose territories included parts of what is now East Germany, the Russians were threatening to intervene in revolutions in Central and South America.

In that situation the U.S. Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, proposed and the President of the United States, Mr. Monroe, issued a statement addressed to the European powers.

"We owe it therefore to candor," said the President of the United States, "and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portions of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety."

The United States, in those days, was a weak country. It comprised less than half its present continental expanse; it numbered barely 9 million people; it had only a small Navy and less Army. It was certainly no such power in the world as Austria, Prussia, France or Imperial Russia. And as a matter of fact, in most of the chancelleries of the world there was contemptuous amusement at President Monroe's bold pretensions.

For they were bold. It took considerable courage for the President to act alone instead of waiting for Great Britain, which had suggested a joint statement but somehow never got around to acting on it. Neither Mr. Adams nor Mr. Monroe were quite sure how they would implement their policy if it were challenged by the great powers. But believing the step necessary to this country's peace and safety, they did not let uncertainty paralyze their decision.

Those quiet words, shorn of all bombast, served their purpose for 140 years, through many tests, because the world came to believe we meant what we said. The Monroe

Doctrine did not keep the United States out of wars. It did assure that no foreign power would come to threaten us upon our own doorstep.

Or at least, the Monroe Doctrine did so until our own day.

It can hardly be a secret to anyone that a new imperialist Russia is extending its system to this hemisphere. The system of the present government of Cuba is the Communist system. And this week the Castro regime signed a military pact with the Soviet Union in which it is frankly and publicly acknowledged that the Soviet Union will help train and provide arms to the Cuban army.

But a difference between the centuries is that today Secretaries of State and Presidents of the United States have reacted differently. Both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have asserted that the Monroe Doctrine is not dead. But up to yesterday neither had chosen to implement it; both have relied instead upon the so-called machinery of the inter-American security system.

That is, the U.S. Government has put its trust in the hope that others will act rather than in acting itself. Where once a weak nation was bold enough to put its shield over the other nations of the hemisphere, a strong nation has hoped that its weak neighbors will somehow rise and shield it from a danger on its own doorstep.

So matters stood until yesterday. Now President Kennedy has issued a statement saying that the Castro government of Cuba will not be permitted to extend its influence further in the Western Hemisphere and strongly implied that the United States will stand by its doctrine of 140 years ago.

Just 2 years ago—in July 1960—Mr. Khrushchev said the Monroe Doctrine was dead. The President of the United States says it is still alive. Now the problem today, as it was in the days of Imperial Russia, is for the United States to convince the world that it means exactly what it says.

California's Mother Lode Can Help Restore Our Gold Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, committees of the Senate and the House are giving attention to our gold supply problem with the dual objective of adding to the Treasury's gold reserves and of helping our troubled gold mining industry. I have a bill, Senate Joint Resolution 44, to provide incentive payments for domestic gold production.

Congressman HAROLD T. "BIZZ" JOHNSON, who represents the mother lode district of California, has introduced a bill, H.R. 12874, to create a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency. He explained this proposal in convincing terms at a hearing last week before the Mining Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have Representative JOHNSON's statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON BEFORE MINES AND MINING SUBCOMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 12874

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this year has seen more interest in doing something about the critical situation of our domestic gold mining industry than in any recent year and I am extremely gratified at this. The visit which your fine committee made to California's historic gold-producing areas last year and earlier the formal hearings held in Washington on various gold measures were valuable contributions in seeking a solution to the problem. Later, I was pleased to have been able to arrange a meeting with the Secretary of the Treasury and many of us were able to join gold industry spokesmen for a further discussion of this extremely serious problem. Much has been learned during this legislative review and as a result of these meetings, hearings, and studies, I have drafted H.R. 12874, a bill to establish in the Department of the Interior a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency. It is on this legislation that we are holding hearings today and I certainly appreciate the opportunity to meet with you, and, in effect, sum up our efforts to resolve this situation.

First, may I be permitted to indulge in a little historical background for the record. As we know, the United States once was the world's leading producer of gold. This was about the close of the 19th century. Today we rank a relatively ineffectual fourth place behind such unstable giants as Russia and South Africa. Only a couple of decades ago, the United States still maintained a strong world position in the production of gold as its output continued to grow during the first 40 years of this century reaching an all-time high of approximately 5 million ounces immediately before our entry into World War II.

During the war, American gold mines were closed by Government Order L–208 and rapid deterioration of their productive facilities followed. Since the war, the domestic price of gold has remained frozen at artificial 1934 levels, despite the fact that production costs have risen between 300 and 400 percent since the 1939–40 period.

During the first 15 years after the end of World War II, more than $200 million worth of gold has been sold by the Treasury Department of the United States for domestic industrial uses than our domestic mines have produced. This means that today our annual domestic production approximates 1.5 million ounces while about 3 million ounces are being consumed in the domestic commodity market. The 2-million-ounce deficit was sold from our monetary gold stock and represents a net domestic loss of our monetary gold reserves. In other words today we are filling teeth, adorning jewelry and shielding spacecraft with some 2 million ounces of gold which has to be drawn each year from the gold reserves which are backing the U.S. dollar.

I might emphasize further the requirements for gold in the space and missile age. Substantial quantities of gold are used in space vehicles to shield them from radiation. Gold is used in production of communications equipment and nuclear power facilities. Gold, always a commodity in the production of jewelry and the filling of teeth, now has become an essential, expendable material for the prosecution of our national defense in the cold war of today which will continue into the foreseeable future. This is further borne out by the guarded secrecy of Russian gold statistics and her aggressive gold-production programs.

Since similar conditions exist throughout the world, both the free world and the Soviet colonial empire, it is only logical that the production of gold throughout the world has increased steadily, year by year, until today nearly 50 million ounces of gold are being produced.

The exact reverse is true in the United States. We are producing no more gold today than we were in 1946 and the situation would be even more critical if it were not for the fact that gold can be produced as a by-product of base metal ores which accounts for 70 percent of our total gold production. Unless we act now, the situation will get worse and the remaining operators still struggling to survive as primary producers of gold will follow the downfall of the Cripple Creek Mine which closed last year and the U.S. Smelting, Refining & Mining, which will close its Nome, Alaska, operation this year. The last of our great mining operations are highgrading to keep alive but time is running out on them, too.

Added to this drain on our dollars from the inability to produce enough gold for our own use has been an exceedingly heavy withdrawal of our monetary gold reserves.

Confronted with these trying difficulties and the inescapable predicament of being burdened with an international gold liability to support the major currencies of the free world, the United States is in dire need of gold—at a time when 97 percent of her gold mines remain closed on the controversial assumption that if an economical price were paid for gold production, the international position of the dollar would be weakened. As you will recall at our meeting with Secretary Dillon, this was the primary reason why he opposed earlier legislation to provide an incentive payment to place our gold mining industry back on its feet. One sure way to get more gold is to produce more, but we agree it must be done without interfering with the monetary policy.

This problem has thrown an obligation on the Congress of the United States to consider a means of accomplishing this most difficult task. The 87th is meeting this obligation because of the actions of this responsible committee. Since gold is essential to the welfare of the Nation, this problem can be resolved by setting up a gold procurement agency to purchase newly mined gold directly from domestic mines. Such an agency, which could operate under the Interior Department, must be completely divorced from the Treasury Department and the monetary picture. Its purpose would be to contract directly with the domestic mines for gold at whatever price—within reasonable limits—is necessary to reopen the mines and bring the volume of production back to immediate pre-war and pre-L–208 levels.

Besides supplying the defense and space programs with necessary gold requirements, it should be the responsibility of such an agency to sell gold at cost to the domestic industrial, professional and artistic users and to supply the Treasury Department with all surplus purchases of gold at the monetary price of $35 per ounce. This would in no way interfere with monetary or fiscal policy operations of the Government. It would add gold to the official reserves through increased gold production and industrial activity rather than draw down official gold reserves for the domestic industrial and defense requirements of gold. This would demonstrate to the foreigners a determination in protecting the gold value of the dollars that they hold and thus strengthen—not weaken—confidence in the dollar internationally.

H.R. 12874 I believe clearly distinguishes the status of gold as a domestic commodity from its function as an international monetary factor and eliminates the contention that an incentive payment for domestic gold production would result in an international catastrophy for the dollar. Purchase and sale of domestically produced gold as a commodity would be completely separate from the use of gold as a monetary measure and reserve.

Enactment of this bill will bring back and keep domestic gold production at the maxi-

mum, give a just return to the miner, furnish industrial users with gold at a fair price, and add to the monetary reserves rather than deplete them. It prevents the possibility of overpricing gold as a windfall for the producers by eliminating the guess work to a price that is necessary to carry out our common objective—full production from the domestic mines. In comparison to the benefits, the cost would be slight.

The following example will illustrate the practicality of such a program:

If $70 per ounce would return gold production to its prewar volume of 6 million ounces, then $70×6 million=$420 million of gross income to the mine operators at an apparent cost to the Gold Procurement Agency of $420 million.

In assuming that the domestic users (including defense and space) consumed 3 million ounces (amount used in 1960) for which they would be required to pay the cost of $70 per ounce, then $70 times 3 million equals $210 million, which would be returned to the Gold Procurement Agency.

	Millions
Cost to Government	$420
Less	210
Cost for surplus of 3,000,000 ounces of gold	210

In selling the 3 million-ounce surplus to the Treasury Department at the monetary price of $35 per ounce, then $35×3 million=$105 million returned to the Gold Procurement Agency:

	Millions
Cost for surplus	$210
Less	105
Cost of program	105

As a defense measure, this would put the apparent cost of such a program at $105 million, or less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the total defense budget for the fiscal year 1963.

However, in addition to the defense aspects, which should embrace the $105 million contribution to the gold reserves (backing for 420 million paper dollars), consideration must be given to the economic benefits gained from reopening the mines.

In assuming a revival of operations comparable to the prewar level, then the $420 million received by the operators would circulate in the economy by the direct employment of upward to 50,000 people with indirect benefits to an estimated additional 400,000 through the rehabilitation of the mining communities; the purchase of machinery, supplies and equipment, and related services and transportation. This in itself would be of greater value to the Government than the $105 million expenditure—mainly as an aid in offsetting unemployment and welfare payments.

A deeper analysis will show that each time money changes hands, a profitable transaction generally occurs from which the Government collects income and excise taxes. Since the $420 million gross income of the revitalized gold mines would continually circulate via the payment of related expenditures and services, the Government would be continually collecting taxes from a gross turnover of $420 million through an investment of $105 million.

Each 1 percent of taxes that the Government would collect on each turnover of the gross $420 million would net $4.2 million: $105 million divided by $4.2 million equals 25 times. In other words, for each time that this new growth of $420 million of income from the mines changed hands 25 times in the economy, the entire investment of $105 million would be returned to the Government.

Put another way, the Government collected nearly $80 billion of income and excise taxes through the circulation of $32 billion in 1960. Therefore, $80 billion divided by $32 billion equals 2.4 times $420 million equals $1 billion. This means $1 billion of new yearly revenue for the Government (without tax increases) on an investment of only $105 million.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give you a brief section-by-section analysis of the provisions of H.R. 12874:

Section 1 requires that the Secretary of Interior make a survey of the gold mining industry to determine the price which must be paid to domestic producers in order to achieve maximum production of gold from our mines. The results of this survey must be submitted to the Congress for consideration.

Section 2 would establish, as of January 1, 1963, a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency in the Department of Interior. The Director would be appointed by the President and receive a $20,000 salary.

Section 3 outlines the duties of the Gold Procurement and Sales Agency as follows:

(a) The Agency shall be the only agency authorized to purchase gold from domestic producers and to sell it to science, arts, and industry for nonmonetary purposes. It must buy and sell at—up to $105—the price fixed by the Secretary of Interior as a result of the survey mentioned above. And it must conduct annual resurveys to determine what price changes may be required to maintain maximum domestic production of gold. Resurvey results also must be reported to the Congress. Any surplus gold will be transferred to the Treasury Department at a rate of $35 per ounce, or the going monetary value of gold.

Section 4 authorized the appropriation of funds to absorb the difference in cost between the $35 price paid by the Treasury Department for any gold transferred to it and the price paid for the gold to the domestic producer by the Procurement Agency. I might note here that it could well be some time before any such expense is involved because it will take a year or so to triple the production of our domestic gold mines which is what is needed just to meet today's constantly rising domestic consumption.

Section 5 specifically states that this law does not relate to the monetary system nor interference with the rights of the Treasury Department to obtain gold from foreign producers.

Section 6 provides that the term "domestic" includes our 50 States of the Union, our territories and possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I want to say that this is a simple piece of legislation which I believe will solve an extremely complex problem. It meets the objections raised by the Department of the Treasury and it has the support of the gold mining industry as I am sure you will realize from the statements which are to be submitted for the record of these hearings. I would appreciate at this point permission to submit the various industry and community statements which I have received.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to say on behalf of myself and the mining industry of California how much we appreciate the time and consideration which you have given to this problem during the 87th Congress, and I do hope that through our cooperative efforts we will be able to achieve a realistic solution to this very grave problem.

Redesigning the Nation's Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration, Mr. William L. Slayton, made what I believe is an unusually significant speech on the subject of "Design Considerations in Urban Renewal" at a conference of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials at Eugene, Oreg., on July 9.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his speech, somewhat condensed for reasons of space, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What is done in these next several decades will have a tremendous impact upon our cities in terms of their function, their shape, their form, their appearance. What is done in the next several decades will last for a long, long time, and one should not accept lightly the responsibility that has been thrust upon him. One should be sure that what he as administrator creates will be of such status that he and his successors will be proud of it. What is produced under your administration, the policies you adopt, what you do will have an impact far greater, I believe, than any of us have realized. I can't emphasize too strongly the responsibility we all have in this regard, and my concern is that in our frenetic activity to clear areas, to rehabilitate houses, to sell land, to be sure that plans are adopted, and to see that construction gets underway, we may not recognize the enormity of this responsibility. We must never forget the end product of our frenetic activities and not think of activity as an end in itself.

As Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver recently said, "We should give the 'd' for 'design' at least equal standing with the 'd' for 'dollar' in the development of our urban areas."

It seems to me that we have not bragged sufficiently. I feel that in urban renewal we have employed the best architects, have had, by and large, the most enlightened developers, and have created some of the most exciting new urban developments in the country.

Writing in the New York Times recently, Ada Huxtable criticized much of the architecture and design in New York City. She then went on to say, "it is in middle-income housing * * * under urban renewal programs, that improvements are appearing. Here, new structural systems and some conscious attention to design are beginning to temper long-standing cliches."

Many of the top architects in the United States are now represented in both single structures and complete area designs in urban renewal projects—Edward Durrell Stone, Mies Van der Rohe, Harry Weese, Satterlee, and Smith, I. M. Pei, Paul Rudolph, to name only a few. Both Arena Stage and the Capitol Park apartments in Washington, D.C., have won awards for design excellence. The elementary schools designed for urban renewal areas by Stone in the Lin-

coln Square project in New York, and by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill in New Haven are outstanding by any criterion. Such projects as Society Hill in Philadelphia, Constitution Plaza in Hartford, Church Street in New Haven, Embarcadero in San Francisco, Lake Meadows in Chicago, Erieview in Cleveland, and Lincoln Center in New York are the kinds of projects which we would like to see more often, whether built on urban renewal or privately developed sites.

With this as background, let's examine the role the Administrator can play in furthering the cause of good urban design.

I would like to discuss five aspects of the Administrator's role in seeking this objective. They are: (1) design guidance in plan preparation; (2) design emphasis in renewal plans; (3) design oriented disposition; (4) design guidance in redeveloper selection and review of plans; and (5) experimental design approach.

First, design guidance in plan preparation. By and large I feel that we have paid too little attention to urban design in the preparation of renewal plans. We have all too frequently approached the plan from a zoning ordinance concept and created two-dimensional rather than three-dimensional concepts. We have been so concerned with designating particular land uses, being sure that we had the proper width and alinement of streets, and with showing the proper percentage of open space, etc., that we have failed to look at the renewal plan as an overall, three-dimensional design. Here I feel that it is in the interest of the city to obtain the best possible advice and guidance in preparing what I call a design concept.

Of course, one must first establish the framework, the public decisions that determine the basic program for the renewal area, a program of basic land uses and the basic characteristics of the area to be developed. Also there may be certain givens that must be recognized such as major utility lines, major highways, and specific structures that must be retained such as historic churches. This framework or program and these givens, of course, must be determined prior to establishing the design concept. But even at this point in time of early public decisions establishing a program, one can be too adamant in assuming that design guidance cannot be helpful. I think Fritz Gutheim in his paper that I referred to earlier has stated this far better than can I, and I should like to quote him: "Based on the usual practice in architecture (where it is equally false), it is commonly assumed that the urban designer commences with a program in which the utilitarian conditions of the city are set forth, and which it is his business to reflect and resolve in the design. The fallacy of this approach is that design deals with potentialities and no program is based on more than the sum of current experience. To design too close to such a program, therefore, is to condemn the new urban design to repeat the mistakes and limitations of the existing city. Unless we are to foreclose all prospects of forward development in our ideas of the city, and the design of future cities, we must expect a larger contribution of designers; indeed, demand it of them, not simply at the end but at all stages of the urban design process * * * Fresh possibilities, offered by urban designers in the earliest sketches, should be received as inputs to survey and research efforts. If this is not done, the designer commences with a largely sterile analysis, and sets of data that are scarcely related to the problems of design."

The point that Fritz makes is an essential one. The designer can see new potentials, new possibilities, and may well be able to propose some new development concepts that can enrich the initial basic determinants of the city. Here is the opportunity for early client-designer relationship in establishing a program. As client you should feel it is essential to obtain this kind of design guidance at the outset rather than presenting the urban designer with a fait accompli—a plan already prepared—within which framework the urban designer must create. The urban designer is a contributor, he is not one who merely puts the frosting on the cake.

There is no issue on whether this design guidance comes from an urban designer who is an independent practitioner and retained as a consultant or whether he is an urban designer on your staff. Probably with our present shortage of urban designers, it may be difficult for each city to employ its own. But consultant or staff, such design guidance is essential from the beginning of program development.

And this leads to the second point on the role of the administrator as client; namely, emphasis on design in the redevelopment plan itself. I know that this point echoes what you have said many times, but the point needs reiteration. Most of our renewal plans have been created on the false foundation of the zoning approach. Our concern has been too much with precise delineation of land uses, densities, set backs, heights, distance between buildings, and distribution by kinds of dwellings to the point where no room is left for a design concept, and we have nothing but a detailed, zoning plan. Urban renewal starts with a clean slate—with the removal of the restrictive elements of present city structure—and we tend to reintroduce through zoning and other standard restrictions a set of limitations intended for and presuming rebuilding to the same basic standard. The result is a reproduction of the kind of urban development with which we have all become much too accustomed, and the creation of the sameness that is now criticized so vigorously. Our creative urban renewal designs have been successful only through overcoming these standardized restrictions.

The beginnings of a nonzoning approach were adopted in the renewal plan for Bushnell Plaza in Hartford. Hartford freed itself from the standard zoning limitations. For this relatively small area, Hartford has established a program for a certain amount of commercial area, a certin amount of park area, and a certain number of residential units. The developer in his proposal is left to his own devices in arranging these uses on the site. Hartford did not, as part of the plan, determine a priori the organization of these elements.

I have long hoped that we could jettison the zoning type controls that were so exciting in the twenties and which, if not modified, produce sterility for urban renewal. I would like to substitute what I call design objectives. I must admit that I cannot be too specific in defining the controls or approaches that such design objectives would establish. Naturally, they would differ from area to area and from designer to designer. I would hope, however, that these design objectives would establish a certain character such as the relationship between buildings, the organization of the area, and the character of the structures. These would somehow be set forth in the renewal plan. For instance, a design objective might be a street with a particular facade or a common cornice line. Or another design objective could be the sprinkling of a residential area with small, neighborhood convenience shops. The plan need not designate specific uses but could indicate the amount and character of these commercial uses to be intermixed with the residential area.

And this, of course, leads me directly into my third point—namely, design oriented disposition. Although URA policy permits various disposition methods, I feel we should emphasize disposition arrangements that look to the quality of the design rather than to the highest reuse value. Here I am considerably encouraged, for I see increasing evidence of interest in design as the criterion in the selection of redevelopers. It is true that we have had some difficulty where we have combined design and price as criteria in selecting a redeveloper. Although we have resolved this question in several instances to the benefit of design, it has not been without difficulty and sometimes controversy. Where there is an unclear mixture of criteria, the unsuccessful developer sometimes feels he has a basis for complaint—and complain he has.

There are several approaches to bringing design in as the element. One, of course, is to use a negotiated procedure whereby the city selects a developer not only on the basis of his capacity and financial qualifications, but also and perhaps even more important on the basis of the design ability of his architect. This can be done, of course, without requiring the architect to submit designs at all.

Where this procedure is followed, we in the Urban Renewal Administration feel strongly that it is essential that the procedure for selecting a developer be announced some time in advance of actual negotiation so that all potential developers have the opportunity to express their interest.

Another device, of course, is the design competition handled most successfully, I believe, in recent Southwest Washington dispositions. Here an advisory panel was established to review designs submitted by potential developers. The materials to be submitted were specified, the submissions were not identified except by number, and the review panel selected on the basis of the designs submitted. Obviously the local public agency must exercise the final responsibility, and this advisory panel must be advisory only.

A caveat in this kind of a disposition procedure is that it should not result in an undue expenditure by potential developers. Developers, like contractors, are willing to risk relatively modest sums in seeking to obtain a contract; but when a competition in no way limits what the developer is to submit, one ends up with very expensive submissions. I think these can be only self-defeating in the long run, in that the cost will discourage redevelopers from bidding on other redevelopment projects.

Where design competition is going to be used, one should be very specific as to the items to be submitted, such as scale, color, size of drawings, renderings, and models, and if a developer submits more than that specified, the overage should not be submitted to the review board.

A variation of this procedure, one that permits the introduction of land value, is selection of those designs that are acceptable and desirable and requiring from among those selected a sealed bid or auction based on land value.

A further variation is Justin Herman's Red Rock disposition in San Francisco. Here a design competition was held among architects, and four designs were selected as acceptable. Bidders were asked to bid on the basis of land value but were required to accept one of the four designs.

It also follows that in any competitive disposition where design is determinate, the design submitted by the developer must be made a part of the disposition contract, and the developer may not deviate from the design submitted unless he obtains the approval of the local public agency. It goes without saying, it seems to me, that the developer must submit his plans to the local public agency for review and approval.

If, however, the city feels that competition based upon the price of land is essential, it is very important for the city to have the benefit of the advice of an urban designer, and the redevelopment plan must be rather detailed in its design aspects. This is the

only way in which the city can control the design in such disposition.

And this leads me into my fourth point—namely, design guidance in redeveloper selection and plan review. It is important for the city to have a designer as consultant, or on its staff, to assist it in the preparation of design criteria for disposition documents, to assist the redevelopment agency in reviewing plans submitted, and in dealing with the redeveloper's architect.

It is important for the administrator client—the layman—to have the urban designer assist him in reviewing plans and in helping guide in the selection of redevelopers. This is obviously particularly important where a negotiated sale is followed, rather than a design competition. But it is also important, it seems to me, when it comes to working with the architect of the redeveloper. There will inevitably be some changes resulting from further study on the part of the architect of the developer, and it will be necessary for some judgment to be made on the desirability of these proposed changes. Here it is important that the local public agency have as adviser a designer who can comment from a design point of view on the proposed changes.

Where the city has used a design consultant to create a plan with some design guides, it is helpful to have this design consultant work with the architect of the developer to make sure that the design guides are actually carried out by the developer. This does not mean that the design consultant designs the buildings but only that he interpret and help produce the kind of basic design that the city originally intended. Here I think it is wise to quote our good friend, Chloethiel Smith, when she points out that the design concept must be kept basically one concept. It can't be constantly changing. As she puts it: "One can't keep pulling up the carrot every day to see if it is still growing."

My fifth and last point is a plea—a plea for experimentation, a plea for new concepts, a plea for a willingness to try new ideas. President Kennedy has said, "It is the test of every generation to build a road for the next generation." Here again, I should like to quote Fritz Gutheim's paper. He states: "The greatest obstacle to seemly cities has become the low standard of demand and expectation of their present inhabitants, a direct expression of their having become habituated to the present environment and their incapacity to conceive of any better alternative."

Those who insist that we build only that which has been market tested would put us into the position of continuing the present environment and not offering the urban inhabitant any alternative to what he now has. Our great opportunity in urban renewal is to produce a different kind of urban living, a new kind of urban pattern, new kinds of urban associations, new ways of living. My one basic criticism of the design of our urban areas is our unwillingness to experiment. We have, of course, provided the mixture of elevator apartments with low structures and shown that this can be successful, and we have also demonstrated that the townhouse is marketable. I guess the term "townhouse" rather than "row house" has persuaded the urban dweller that it is desirable. But we have done little else to experiment in new ways of living, in new housing types, in new ways of distributing schools, stores, and houses. New ideas and new concepts will, of course, mean greater effort on the part of the client—you, the administrator—to persuade, cajole, and sometime bludgeon the municipal official into changing, adjusting, and reinterpreting the zoning ordinance, and building code. This adds, of course, another task to an already difficult one and can discourage even the most vigorous pushers for new concepts. But we are going to be judged on the kind of design we are willing to tackle, and it is only through urban renewal that we are going to be able to persuade the developer to try out some of these new ideas. And it is you who must backstop him.

And in this connection, let us not overlook what is an essential element of urban design—namely, beauty. Design itself should be beautiful, but we should not ignore the amenities, the art, the street furniture, all of the individual elements of the design, and we should make sure that they are beautiful as well as functional. We should look for graceful light standards or perhaps a new form of fire hydrant, for a pleasingly designed iron fence, for a texture in our walks, for those touches that can bring richness and pleasure to the urban scene. And I would hope that we would seize the opportunity of urban renewal to place our utilities underground.

So let me emphasize once again the responsibility I do not think we have fully realized—the responsibility for creating urban areas not for the next few years but for posterity—and for posterity that will use and inhabit these areas and buildings for some 75 years to come. What we build will last for a long, long time. We should be sure not only that we build it well, but that we create in the process both beauty and function—beauty to raise one's spirit and function to provide a delightful urban environment. As August Heckscher said in his speech, "The Challenge of Ugliness": "A civilization begins to manifest itself when men and women have begun to take thought about what it is they construct, and why, and to what end. It begins to be a living whole when the idea of beauty has found its place alongside the pressure of utility and the spur of need."

Plight of the Cotton Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, people in South Carolina are very concerned about the continuing flood of low-wage textile imports into this country. Last week's tariff decision against the proposed equalization import fee to offset the cotton export subsidy which has caused domestic textile manufacturers to be placed in a very adverse position has caused additional concern in South Carolina, which is noted as the textile State. To give some indication of this concern, Mr. President, I offer for insertion some additional comments from the Columbia Record of September 8, the Greenville News of September 7, and the Spartanburg Herald of September 8. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Sept. 8, 1962]

J.F.K.'s TEXTILE HELP LONG OVERDUE

Why was the U.S. Tariff Commission's decision against an import equalization fee for the textile industry a "bitter disappointment" to Senator JOHNSTON? If he is so closely attuned to the textile situation and to the Kennedys, why couldn't he read the handwriting on the wall?

At no time since August of 1960 has the Record been optimistic about the genuine concern for textile employees by the Kennedys. There was then, and is not now, a certitude of relief. To us, the U.S. Tariff Commission's ruling came as a matter of predictable course.

We expected that the deciding vote, cast by Mr. Kennedy's appointee—Ben Dorfman, the Chairman—would be against textile people. And the thumbs down conclusion is consistent with the previous decisions of the Kennedys.

During this interim, we have wondered why both Senator JOHNSTON and Governor Hollings have beguiled Carolinians with reports on the President's solicitude.

It began on August 30, 1960, when the then Senator Kennedy wrote Governor Hollings: "Imports of textile products, including apparel, should be within limits which will not endanger our own existing textile capacity and employment, and which will permit growth of the industry in reasonable relationship to the expansion of our overall economy."

Please note that nearly 2 years ago, Mr. Kennedy was telling South Carolina's Governor that textile imports should be restricted, should be "within limits which will not endanger our own existing textile capacity and employment."

Would Mr. Kennedy do anything about guaranteeing the 122,000 textile jobs of South Carolinians? In August of 1960, he told the Governor: "The Office of the Presidency carries with it the authority and influence to explore and workout solutions within the framework of our foreign trade policies for the problems peculiar to our textile and apparel industry. Because of the broad ramifications of any action and because of the necessity of approaching a solution in terms of total needs of the textile industry, this is a responsibility which only the President can adequately discharge. I can assure you that the next Democratic administration will regard this as a high priority objective."

In May of 1961, the President's Special Committee on Textiles came up with a seven-point program to help the industry. Several of these points were virtually meaningless. Some were very important.

"Ah, hah," said the President's apologists in South Carolina. "See. He is going to help South Carolina and its textile workers."

We were skeptical. And said so. On May 17, we wrote that there would be no restrictive quotas, which the industry sought and which the President promised in his August 1960 letter to Governor Hollings. We were right.

Then came a conference of 19 textile-producing nations in Geneva, concluding with a short-term agreement of a single year, and a long-term agreement of 5.

Once again, the apologists praised the Geneva agreement as a "great boon" to the State and its $412 million industry. Before, during, and after the Geneva meeting, we were skeptical. We pointed out on June 22, before Geneva, that the President preferred "an international approach" on textiles to "unilateral action by the United States." This, despite his August 30 epistle to Mr. Hollings that a solution to the textile problem "is a responsibility which only the President can adequately discharge."

But the Kennedyites declared to South Carolinians that the President was taking care of the textile workers.

How have the Geneva agreements worked? In the first 6 months of this year (as Republican Candidate Workman has stressed), "We imported more cotton yarn than we had in any entire year in the past. From some countries which were not a part of the 19-nation agreement, imports have increased

as much as 1,000 percent. And as fast as one nation has been persuaded or pressured into cutting down on its shipments into the United States, other nations have stepped up their shipments. Altogether, textile imports for this year promise to be about 30 percent greater than they were last year."

How does this affect South Carolina? Candidate Workman said in a Rock Hill speech that "the J. P. Stevens mills have announced cutbacks on 3 mills in South Carolina already, affecting almost 2,000 workers. And other cutbacks are in the works for some of the Derring-Milliken mills, the Inman mills, and Spartan mills. And still others may be forced to follow suit."

What does the latest ruling of the Tariff Commission mean for the Palmetto State? R. Dave Hall, of Belmont, N.C., president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, said the ruling "casts a shadow on the future of tens of thousands of cotton farmers and domestic textile employees."

It has been 16 months since May of 1961, when the President announced his seven-point program. "These months," says Mr. Hall, "are completely lost. We are back where we started. In the meantime, cotton textile imports are continuing at an alltime high. The loss of jobs, investments, and opportunities mounts."

All the time, Mr. Hall is saying, since Mr. Kennedy became President, has been lost. The industry must start from scratch.

But relief is needed now. The grossly inequitable cotton price system must be corrected. Now. Senatorial Candidate Workman said on August 25, "If the administration intends to help our textile industry, let it do so now—when that help is needed."

The President, after the Tariff Commission decision, announced he would seek legislation to correct the cotton problem next year.

Carolinians have been waiting since August of 1960.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News-Piedmont, Sept. 7, 1962]

TRADE BILL COULD BETRAY TEXTILE WORKERS OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The most important congressional issue affecting South Carolina's textile workers today is the trade bill advocated by President Kennedy.

This bill actually affects every industrial worker in the Nation. It is of particular importance to textile people because of the damage they already have suffered from foreign imports. Many have lost their jobs and all have lost working time and pay because of cheap textile goods flooding this country from low-wage nations.

The proposed trade bill has been passed by the House, awaits action in the Senate. One of its important provisions would give President Kennedy broad authority to regulate tariffs and thus control entry of foreign goods into the United States. The personal powers to be delegated to the President far exceed any a President ever has had in the field of foreign trade.

Under them a President could, if he chose to do so for any reason, throw any segment of American industry into confusion simply by whacking a particular tariff and letting competitive foreign goods flow freely. This is particularly true of textiles because of adverse factors already plaguing the industry, including these:

1. Heavy competition from foreign goods.
2. Pressure of automation.
3. Never-ending problems of overproduction and underpricing.
4. The two-price cotton system which lets foreign mills buy cotton cheaper than American firms.

In the case of textiles, therefore, the proposed trade bill would give a President the power of virtual control over production and thus over employment.

Some months ago the textile industry, through its American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, endorsed the trade bill. The industry acted with some trepidation and with some members in opposition. Its action was an historic break with its traditional position on foreign trade. The industry made the break on statesmanlike grounds—the trade bill would help implement American foreign policy, and the textile industry would willingly bear its share of that burden.

Developments since then have sharpened fears about the possible effects of the trade bill on industries like textiles. To list a few:

1. The President has failed to carry out the major portion of a seven-point program he promised to relieve the troubles of the textile industry.

2. The President demonstrated in the steel price episode a disturbing tendency to use every weapon available to carry his point with private industry.

3. Evidence continues to mount that the Government's foreign policy in many cases gives foreign industrial development priority over American industrial needs. In this connection the State Department appears to exercise considerable hidden control over actions of all other governmental departments.

4. After a meeting with textile State Senators, President Kennedy was represented as thinking in terms of curtailing textile imports for the rest of 1962. No long-range relief or guarantees were mentioned. (This would cover only Mr. Kennedy's immediate objective of wooing Senate votes for his trade bill and popular votes for his congressional candidates in November.)

In short the President, as of this writing, has played the textile industry and its workers for all they are worth in the arenas of national and international politics. He has promised much; he has given little of lasting value.

This record automatically poses the question—would the President use the foreign trade powers he requests as a political weapon should the occasion arise?

In view of the past, it could happen.

Despite the previous endorsement of the trade bill by the textile industry, it is now to be hoped South Carolina's two Senators will vote against the presidential tariff powers. Unhappily, events since that endorsement was given indicate the bill, as proposed, could betray the textile workers of South Carolina by putting them at the mercy of both national and international political considerations.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, Sept. 8, 1962]

TIME FOR ASSURANCES TO BE DEMONSTRATED

President John F. Kennedy has stated it emphatically, sort of.

"A solution must be found in the near future * * * for the inequity of the two-price system of cotton."

Accordingly, the President will propose remedial legislation early in the next session of Congress.

Let's see now. That gets the subject safely beyond the November elections, doesn't it?

You reckon it will get the problem safely beyond textile-State support of the Kennedy free trade bill?

Once upon a time a Senator was in the running for President of the United States. He came to Charlotte in his campaigning, and he outlined several reasons why textile people would be benefited under his administration.

He made two chief points: (1) The President already possessed authority to adjust imports which were damaging an American industry; (2) if it should be that this was not the case, he would immediately ask Congress for such authority.

How long is immediately?

Nearly 2 years after the above statement, the President says he will propose legislation next year.

The Associated Press reported: "Kennedy did not say what he has in mind."

It is not surprising at all to read that "Japanese Ambassador Koichiro told newsmen he is sure his Government will be pleased" at the Tariff Commision's 3-to-2 rejection of a plan to balance the U.S. Government' subsidy of foreign manufacturers.

One has only to scan the report of the Commission to realize the peril to textile jobs was not its primary concern. Instead, the emphasis was on a desire to protect—apparently at all costs—the Government price subsidy for raw cotton.

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, discussing the adverse decision of the Tariff Commission, said: "The President has assured me that he will act to restrict imports for the rest of this year."

Well, the time is reasonably ripe for the President to assure the rest of us on that score.

Lack of Political Morality and Civil Responsibility May Spell Doom for Our Free Way of Life

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln warned us that if this Nation ever falls we ourselves must be the destroyers. The prophetic words of our great President may well be coming to full realization because of the increasing lack of political morality and the failure of large segments of our people to assume civil responsibility. How can a Nation of free men survive if we permit the head of the Government to gamble the lives, the fortunes and the sacred honor of the people on a foreign policy designed for but one purpose, to win Negro votes which will perpetuate the administration in office? Yet, this is exactly what is taking place and we have as the authority one of the chief spokesmen of the Kennedy administration, J. Kenneth Galbraith, U.S. Ambassador to India and close adviser to President Kennedy. According to David Lawrence in the following column from the Washington Evening Star, Ambassador Galbraith, unashamedly told the Indian Parliament that our attitude on foreign policy is being shaped to win Negro votes in America. Congress and the American people should demand that President Kennedy immediately repudiate this statement and remove its author from his responsible position. If he fails to do so, we can only assume that Mr. Galbraith is speaking for the administration and that our national purpose has degenerated to the point where its end is merely to keep the Kennedy family in power.

No less the victims of such naked abuse of political power are the millions of Negro citizens who are led to believe that they may enjoy the full blessings of civil rights without assuming civil re-

sponsibility. Mr. Lawrence's column, which I include as a part of these remarks, demands an answer from the President, from the Negro people of Harlem and from the Negro leaders of the United States. I am sure that none who calls himself an American, white or Negro, is willing to trade freedom and our great heritage of liberty for the votes of any group of any race or any economic level.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 10, 1962]

WHAT ABOUT CIVIL RESPONSIBILITY?—ADAM CLAYTON POWELL ADMONISHED FOR JUNKETING AT CRUCIAL MOMENT

(By David Lawrence)

There's a lot of agitation these days about civil rights, but very little is said about civil responsibilities. All sorts of public demonstrations are being staged in the South to assure Negroes of the right to vote—but there is little concern apparently over what they do with the vote in those sections of the country where they have been exercising that right freely for many years.

For nine consecutive terms now—18 years—in a district in New York City populated predominantly by Negroes and Puerto Ricans, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, a Negro clergyman, has been elected to Congress. By reason of the seniority rule and length of membership, he now is chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. He cannot be displaced unless the Republicans win control of Congress this November, or unless he is himself defeated.

It might be thought that the chairman of the committee of the House of Representatives which deals with such an important subject as labor relations would be attending committee meetings and sessions of the House at this time, as the work of Congress is currently in the most decisive stage of the present session. Strikes and work stoppages in missile plants are causing grave anxiety. The all-important Federal aid-to-education bill is tied up in joint conference, in which his committee plays an influential part. But Mr. POWELL chose this period for a 6-week trip abroad. The New York Times, in an editorial last Thursday under the caption "POWELL's Shameless Junket," said:

"In the midst of the important closing period of the congressional session, when a record of accomplishment versus do-nothingism is in the balance, the chairman of a major committee of the House is traveling about Europe on a frivolous junket. Almost needless to say, this is ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, a Democrat from Harlem who annually vies with BUCKLEY of the Bronx for the dishonor of being among the most absent Members of Congress.

"Representative POWELL sailed for Europe August 8 with Mrs. Tamara J. Wall, associate labor counsel for the committee, and Miss Corrine Huff, receptionist in his office. They are due back about September 21. Mr. POWELL is supposedly conducting an inquiry into equal opportunities for women in Europe, a study that will take him to a Paris nightclub show, a Venice film festival, and possibly on an Aegean cruise. State Department officials have been alerted to arrange hospitality and entertainment, as well as counterpart funds—other countries' reimbursement for our foreign aid—which conveniently need not be accounted for in detail by our traveling Congressmen. Mr. POWELL is not alone in the enjoyment of this and other abuses of the congressional privilege.

"The reckless, irresponsible conduct of Mr. POWELL is a disgrace to the people of his district, to the U.S. Congress and to the Kennedy administration, which to its discredit sent Secretaries Ribicoff and Goldberg to New York last year to attend a Powell glorification dinner.

"We say it is time for the people of Harlem to wake up, quit making a hero out of this man who holds in such contempt his obligations in public office, and retire him from Congress before he has a chance to make good on his repeated promise to retire himself. As for the House of Representatives and the Kennedy administration, have they no discipline for a Member, and especially a committee chairman, who runs away to Europe for 6 weeks on idle whimsy like this 'inquiry' just at a time when Congress is belatedly trying to get down to serious business?"

The next day news dispatches reported that Mr. POWELL had suddenly cut short his tour and flown from Madrid to Puerto Rico, where he maintains a $50,000 home and where his wife spends most of her time, though she is on the congressional payroll at a salary of $12,000 a year as a staff member of the committee of which her husband is chairman. Mr. POWELL says his wife earns her pay because she handles the voluminous mail he receives from Spanish-speaking constitutents in New York City.

Mr. POWELL is up for reelection this autumn, but he isn't worried about the outcome. The Negroes in his district are expected to continue to reelect him. The Kennedy administration is expected to help him get elected. Maybe the explanation for this was given recently by J. Kenneth Galbraith, former Harvard professor, close adviser to President Kennedy, and now U.S Ambassador to India. In a speech on August 8 before the Constitution Club in New Delhi—an assemblage of Members of the India Parliament—Mr. Galbraith told why the Kennedy administration is against "colonialism."

"Perhaps our reasons for this stand are even more pressing than yours. Africa is the continent most intimately identified with modern colonialism. A very large number of Americans are of African origin. The administration which I represent came to power because it enjoyed the overwhelming support of the 19 million Americans—about 10 percent of the population—of African descent. These help form our attitudes toward colonialism. On the basis of a long and close political association with Negro friends and colleagues, I can assure you of the strength of these attitudes and also of their political force."

In other words, American policy in foreign affairs is made nowadays on the basis of what will win the Negro vote in America and not on the principles of what is right for all the people of the United States—such as preserving, for instance, a naval base for our Armed Forces in the Azores which Portugal has granted us but now is reluctant to renew. This is the expediency doctrine of a political-minded administration now fully confessed by one of its principal advisers

Jobs Going Begging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the August 19 issue of the Washington Post contained a very interesting and penetrating analysis of discretionary unemployment, a new phenomenon in our economy. I want to commend reporter Frank Porter for commenting on this for, I believe, the points which he makes are valid. These are the points, I might say, which I have been urging upon the attention of the Congress and the country. For example, he notes that much of today's unemployment may be traced to prosperity, to the dynamism of the economy and not stagnation. He points out the paradox of a large unemployment rate—5.8 percent seasonally adjusted at the last report—while at the same time many, many jobs are open. He notes the particularity of the unemployed in what jobs they will take on one hand and the high skill requirements which block many of the unemployed from the jobs they might want. Here is the point. There are jobs in our society going begging while, at the same time, we have a large body of unemployed. Any program which is based upon an analysis which ignores this fact suffers from a fatal weakness.

In the hope of furthering discussion and understanding of the unemployment situation, I am placing Mr. Porter's article as it appeared in the Washington Post in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 19, 1962]

DISCRETIONARY UNEMPLOYMENT: PRODUCT OF PROSPERITY

(By Frank C. Porter)

Why is it that West Germany, with less than 1 percent unemployment must import workers to ease its acute labor shortage while in the United States, the richest nation on earth, some 4 million (5.3 percent of the labor force) are without jobs?

Asked this question, an American who works for the Bonn Government scratched his head. "I suppose it's because the West Germans want jobs more badly than we do," he replied. "They're not as choosy. Very often they'll take any job just to keep on working."

There are other, more common, explanations of the tight labor supply in West Germany, of course. A war-devastated industrial plant had to be rebuilt. The nation started from a lower economic base and has to run to catch up.

But there is probably at least the germ of truth in the American's observation. West Germany has not yet acquired the luxury of discretionary unemployment.

Much unemployment in the United States involves acute distress. Who can help but be touched, for example, by the numbing despair of a West Virginia coal miner with hungry mouths to feed whose skills have been displaced by a machine?

But much of our unemployment also involves little or no distress. Hundreds of thousands of jobless Americans could be working today if they were willing to settle for second best. But they're not. Their unemployment is discretionary.

The Wall Street Journal reported last week that the Ohio State Employment Service has failed for 6 months to fill 100 openings for waitresses. Of 2,000 unemployed women it has interviewed, only 30 have been willing to take what most considered substandard work.

The Journal survey found "a wide variety of jobs in many cities are going begging" largely because of the "choosy attitudes" among jobless workers (and also among some would-be employers).

We Americans can afford to be choosy today. Hunger or dole faced the wage earner who went without work for so much as a week a generation ago. Now there are all

sorts of buffers: Unemployment compensation, severance pay, savings, a working wife or husband. These cushions generally give a person a few months or even more to pick and choose, to find the most congenial job or one that will best advance his career.

This discretionary unemployment is a comparatively recent development. Economists who see in the present high rate of joblessness some structural defect in the nation's economy might well ponder the following proposition. Much of today's unemployment is the outgrowth of prosperity rather than the harbinger of stagnation.

It is not true that 4 million Americans cannot find a job. It would be more accurate to say that a large proportion of that 4 million, perhaps a majority, has not found the right job. Prosperity has taught them to expect something better than a menial or humdrum task. And prosperity enables most of them to wait for something better, at least for a while.

Meanwhile, there are acute job shortages all over the country. Lack of a sufficient number of qualified engineers and scientists is probably the No. 1 brake on our space program. In one section or another schoolteachers, computer programers, garage mechanics, household help, salesclerks, and office workers are all in short supply. And there are countless other categories.

Perhaps we have been looking too long at long one side of the coin. It could be that unfilled jobs are holding the economy back more than idle workers.

At any rate, the technique of matching idle workers with unfilled jobs is in its infancy. So are the measures being taken to train and educate Americans for the jobs that must be filled in the future if the country is going to meet its full economic potential.

The solution of these two problems may be the key to reducing both discretionary unemployment, which is the outgrowth of prosperity, and hard-core distress unemployment, which is in large part, the product of our advancing technology.

Abuses of the Aid to Dependent Children Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have inserted material in the Appendix of the RECORD relative to the abuses of the aid to dependent children program over the Nation.

For the past 6 months we have been reading a series of articles relative to the abuses that were found here in the District of Columbia.

The Commercial Appeal, an outstanding newspaper of the Nation published in Memphis, Tenn., has for a number of years cited the abuses in the various States relative to the aid to dependent children program. The answer that was given on each occasion when these abuses were exposed was that Federal regulations prohibited the discontinuance of these payments. If the State welfare agency in any State did not abide by these regulations the State would run the risk of losing the entire Federal assistance program to the aged, the blind, and the aid to dependent children.

Morris Cunningham, an outstanding writer and head of the bureau for the Commercial Appeal here in Washington, has just completed a series of articles on these abuses in Washington.

On Friday morning, September 7, there appeared an editorial in the Commercial Appeal which is very timely and I think that the membership of the Congress will be interested in this editorial.

The editorial follows:

WASHINGTON LEARNS—SLOWLY

As we have said so many times, the people are ahead of Washington. Now we have a lag of nearly 10 years.

A series of three articles by Morris Cunningham of the Washington bureau of the Commercial Appeal tells of what the Nation's Capital is just learning about the abuses of the aid to dependent children program.

Washington has found the same thing that Paul Molloy found in Memphis in a series of articles published in July of 1953. Mr. Molloy, then an investigative reporter for this newspaper, is now on the staff of the Chicago Sun-Times.

The Molloy articles were greeted with scoffing and scorn by welfare officials, professional social workers, and some others. But eventually there was a massive enlargement of the welfare staff in Shelby County and a more serious attempt to separate chiseling women from the worthy cases.

During the long years since 1953 other investigators have pried into the flow of tax money down the ADC drains and made their findings known in such publications as Reader's Digest, Saturday Evening Post, Look, and U.S. News & World Report.

But the Washington fountainhead of welfare cash continues to flow freely and now suddenly the city stands back appalled by what General Accounting Office staff members found in the District of Columbia. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, insisted on the GAO probe of things that remained out of sight as long as the welfare organization investigated itself.

The GAO sample of cases turned up more easy riders, cheaters, and false claims for this tax money than there were legitimate cases of mothers and children for whom the ADC program is designed. In the city of Washington alone, new estimates indicate $18 million has been passed out to fake welfare cases in 5 years.

It takes Washington a very long time to catch up with the people, but eventually we hope a way is going to be found to plug up the gaping holes in the welfare apparatus and let the money flow on to the children for whom it is intended.

Centennial of the Land-Grant College Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. A. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to join my colleagues in saluting the centennial of the Land-Grant College Act. All this year the Nation has been observing the 100th anniversary of the Morrill Act—the bill signed by President Abraham Lincoln on July 2, 1862, which established the land-grant colleges.

The history of the land-grant colleges and the many benefits which the Nation has derived from them has already been covered in other speeches. There are now 68 land-grant colleges and universities throughout the 50 States and Puerto Rico, and I would like to talk a little about the University of Puerto Rico and its service to the Nation.

Enrollment at our university at Rio Piedras was 18,554 in 1962. Its schools of medicine, dentistry, nursing and pharmacy are models for Latin America and recently served as a regional center for public health training for our Spanish-speaking neighbors in this hemisphere. The University of Puerto Rico has also played a leading role in training Peace Corps volunteers for service in South America. A group of these volunteers recently completed courses in nutrition prior to assuming posts in Peru. Another group is now preparing to teach and aid in rural development in the Dominican Republic. This land-grant university, together with other educational institutions on the island, is a final indoctrination center for all Peace Corps members bound for Latin America.

This year's commencement exercises at the university were dedicated to the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of our college and the 100th anniversary of the creation of the land-grant institutions.

Higher education has played an important part in the rapid development of Puerto Rico. It gives me great satisfaction to salute the land-grant colleges throughout the United States on their centennial and to look forward to their future achievements.

Hero Scholarship Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity on Friday, September 7, 1962, to attend the Eighth Annual Hero Scholarship Fund Thrill Show at the Philadelphia Stadium which was held to benefit children of Philadelphia police, firemen, and park guards killed or permanently disabled in line of duty.

About 70,000 persons attended the show which included leading TV and radio entertainers Dick Powell, Joey Bishop, Brenda Lee, and Duke Ellington. The master of ceremonies was Bud Collyer—CBS–TV. The fund chairman, Mayor James H. J. Tate, and the fund vice chairman, City Council President Paul D. Ortona welcomed and spoke to the great audience.

The most spectacular presentations were made by representatives of the city

agencies. The park guard men and mounts presented a foot and cavalry thrill; the fire department presented firefighters demonstrations; the police motorcycle drill team presented the thrill riders. The police and firemen's bands presented soloists and music.

This is a great event in which one of the greatest cities in the Nation features its police, firemen, and park guards and invites its citizens to participate in benefiting the children of its killed and permanently disabled heroes.

Small Towns and Small Merchants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, recent years have seen an ever-increasing number of independent merchants in small towns throughout America go out of business. This is a great loss, because the independent merchants of a smaller community are its backbone. In a very real sense, they are the reason for the town's existence. They are the center of an entire trading area.

The hometown independent businessman can provide nearby personalized service of a kind that is not obtainable from large chain organizations or huge supermarkets.

During the last two decades there has been a steadily increasing program designed to aid small business. The Small Business Administration has done much; small business investment companies offer new sources of capital. Set-aside programs have been provided for smaller manufacturing and other similar firms. However, no program has been specifically devised to aid the small independent retailers.

Small retail establishments, because of the diversity of goods and services offered by them, and because of the relatively small size of individual units, and the fact that they do not require large capital or seek to sell goods or services to the Federal Government, do not readily lend themselves to most of the various types of assistance offered by the Small Business Administration or other Federal agencies. The truth of the matter is that the seeds of their own salvation are already present in their own situation. They simply require careful tending.

The independent merchant offers the consumer substantial reasons for trading at home. In addition to being part of the community and knowing the needs of the people he serves, he also can give better, prompter service and is in a position to give more satisfactory attention to his customers' needs than the larger merchants in area trading centers 25 to 50 miles down the superhighway.

One of the best possible ways to inform prospective customers of this kind of advantage is through advertising in local newspapers. One of the best expressions of this fact that I have encountered appeared in the Thursday, September 6, 1962, issue of the Cooper Review, published at Cooper, Tex., by J. T. Toney. I am inserting it at this point in the RECORD:

In every State, in nearly every county, of the United States are small towns in which former business areas have become ghost streets.

The scene is a common one: Store windows boarded over; former banks used for storage; dust gathering on empty benches on the sidewalks. Yet, in many of these towns there are as many or more people than ever before.

The movement of trade came about as a result of better highways, faster automobiles, and poor promotion by the local merchants.

But what about the future? Will superhighways, airplanes, and still faster automobiles continue to sap the commercial activity of the small towns? Not necessarily so.

The local merchant holds many advantages over distant competitors. The local consumer will remain loyal if he thinke he will get a fair price at home. He will remain loyal if he knows he can find the variety he seeks at home. He will remain loyal if he realizes how much he will save in transportation and service costs by trading at home. He will remain loyal if the local merchant demonstrates that the local store is progressive and up to date.

In short, every if concerning the future of the small city merchant depends upon his use of advertising to keep the local consumer interested and informed on the goods and services he has to offer.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of September 8, 1962:

CUBA—PRESENT DANGER

The failure of U.S. foreign policy is moving inexorably to a climax in Cuba. There are other factors and areas which could conceivably mature into crises before Cuba, but probably will not. These include the Berlin wall, Vietnam, Laos, South American subversives, our gold outflow and foreign aid, foreign trade and barriers against the United States, the stultifying taxload on industry and individuals at home and abroad—but none of these are as imminent as Cuba. The Russians, long ago, in 1823, under the czar provoked the United States to establish and announce a policy against invasion of this hemisphere which became known as the Monroe Doctrine. President Monroe said as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that "the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not "be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers. If any European power tries to interfere with the American governments, the United States will consider it an unfriendly act dangerous to our peace and safety."

A series of violations of this doctrine has culminated in these actions as reported by Senator HOMER CAPEHART of Indiana: "Between 3,000 and 5,000 Soviet personnel arrived in Cuba in 5 Soviet passenger ships between July 27 and July 31. Eleven cargo ships arrived in the same period. Soviet personnel unloaded them. Trucks were lowered into the holds of these ships, loaded and covered with tarpaulins. Eyewitnesses reported seeing tanks, communications trucks and large truck-trailers carrying crates 40 feet long. At least 15 more ships from Communist countries are on the way carrying the same kind of cargo and personnel." In the face of these facts and at a time when positive action is long overdue President Kennedy's conduct, his speeches, his inaction and indecision are almost unbelievable. It is as though he, his White House advisers and his State Department and officials have never known what is happening. Yet, we know now that the administration has always known, but did not see fit to report to the American people until forced to do so by members of the press, Congress and individuals, and then his report was reluctantly given.

In analyzing the inept leadership of the administration in this crisis consider these:

1. The expropriation of American property, the threat to American lives climaxing in the firing squads.

2. The President calling off the air support promised by the United States in the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion.

3. The financial support of Cuba by the United Nations and other countries receiving our aid (contrary to U.S. policy).

4. The tractor blackmail deal on Cuban prisoners imprisoned because the President called off promised U.S. support of the invasion.

5. The build up by Russia of Cuba, entrenching communism, developing Castro's military power, and creating a base for Russian Communist operations throughout South America.

6. The continuing attempted subversion of other nations in this hemisphere by Russia, Castro, and the Communists.

7. President Kennedy's statements that military weapons to Castro from Russia are for defensive use by Cuba—not offensive. Worse, the President unilaterally telegraphs U.S. action by stating that we will not invade Cuba now or at any time. Obviously then, no action is planned to blockade the heavy Communist traffic by sea and air. While Cuba is strengthened militarily for what can only cost greater loss of life later. We can, we must blockade Cuba, and then, as Senator CAPEHART says: "From the standpoint of international law the United States has every right to land troops, take possession of Havana, and occupy the country, unless the Cuban Government answers satisfactorily the request of the U.S. Government that all Soviet military personnel be sent home and that no further shipments of military supplies be sanctioned by the Havana authorities." To do less invites other intemperate action against the United States which can precipitate war. There is risk in our action, but much greater risk in continued inaction.

Here's a positive U.S. foreign policy (which I submitted a year ago) to absolve President Kennedy and save the United States:

1. Firm, bold leadership (to match strength and determination), prevent war by miscalculation, and attrition by subversion. Examples: Reinstate Monroe Doctrine—clean communism out of Cuba. Demand German reunification.

2. Declare war on communism—they've declared war on the United States and the free world. The Communists mean to dominate the world by infiltration, subversion, and all-out war when ready. Accept the challenge.

3. Withdraw recognition of Communist governments—brand them outlaws of civilization. No negotiations. No dignifying them. They never honor contracts.

4. Stop supporting and aiding Communists, socialists, and neutrals. Foreign aid only to friends—self-help basis. We should provide know-how—not gifts.

5. Encourage and help satellites to rebel.

6. Increase military superiority. Advanced weaponry, research, massive retaliation, not conventional or limited concept. Gear to win. Know strength breeds respect. That's all we seek or expect.

7. Preserve free economy. It undergirds our military and free form of society.

8. Force showdown in the United Nations. Only Russia violates charter by subversion. Demand withdrawal (or conformance). Maintain strong alliances outside the United Nations.

9. Protect U.S. lives and property everywhere in the world. (Alger resolution, H. Con. Res. 410).

Automation in the U.S.-Flag Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies, of which I have the honor to be chairman, reported the 1963 fiscal year appropriations bill (H.R. 12580) for these agencies on July 17, 1962, with a recommended reduction of $1,950,000 in the amount requested for research and development, Maritime Administration. This unanimous action by my subcommittee was subsequently approved by the full House Committee on Appropriations and later by the House of Representatives. My bill is presently pending in the other body.

The following statement released recently by Joseph Curran, chairman of the AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, tends to substantiate the House action taken with regard to the $1,950,000 for studies of automation in the Maritime Administration.

Mr. Curran's statement reads as follows:

AUTOMATION IN THE UNITED STATES—A FLAG MERCHANT MARINE

Continued reports that maritime labor "is dragging its feet" or "grudgingly giving in" to automation are unfounded.

The question of accepting or rejecting is not the issue. The issue revolves around establishing an overall program in which automation will be considered as only one phase of a program to establish a sound U.S.-flag merchant marine that will carry a substantial portion of our imports and exports.

We cannot ignore the fact that while the frenzy to automate is taking place, our flagships have sunk to the position of carrying less than 10 percent of our imports and exports. The number of active ships has declined to an all time low, and from all indications, will continue to decline. This is a very bleak picture and contrary to what some Government officials apparently think, automation will not in itself solve the problems. The recent rush to build an automated ship before solving the basic problems confronting the industry, and the problems raised by automation is an example of this single-track thinking and has absolutely no merit.

It became apparent sometime ago that automation in the maritime industry, while being engineeringly feasible, raised many problems and questions that were of vital concern to us. We, therefore, set out to develop a program that would solve the many apparent problems and at the same time be beneficial to all concerned.

If automation is to contribute anything beneficial to the present situation, the entire industry must cooperate on an equal basis in all studies, experiments, and programs. Such cooperation must, to begin with, be based upon the following:

Automation should be considered as only a part of an overall program to provide a healthy U.S. merchant marine with more cargoes, more modern operating methods and a sounder Government program;

The social factors inherent in any such program must be recognized by Government and left to labor and management for settlement; and

Collective bargaining on all other phases of automation must be unimpeded and parties must be given a free hand to make arrangements in free collective bargaining with the results arrived at respected by Government.

To date the efforts by Government officials have taken various routes. We cannot see any signs of the much needed effort to promote and foster the U.S.-flag merchant marine. We have, however, arrived at the conclusion that the preconceived ideas of eliminating seamen and subsidies are the primary motivations for automation instead of the well-being of our merchant marine.

Peace Through the Rule of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the noblest objectives of Western civilization is world peace through the rule of law.

The August 1962 issue of the American Bar Association Journal contains an interesting and informative discussion of one means by which this objective could be achieved.

The discussion is in the form of an exchange of correspondence between two fellow Commissioners of the U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO, Adolph W. Schmidt and Prof. Oliver Schroeder, Jr.

Mr. Schmidt, a nonlawyer, asks and Professor Schroeder, a member of the ABA, undertakes to answer these questions:

First. Why do members of the association continue to advocate "world peace through world law" when from Mr. Schmidt's impressions of the meaning of "world law" it is impossible to attain in the foreseeable future and, under present circumstances, the attaining of it is at best undesirable?

Second. Why cannot the important influence of the association be induced to work constructively toward an alternative, the development of the Atlantic community into effective government?

I ask unanimous consent that the exchange of correspondence be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATO CITIZENS' COMMISSIONS: A CORRESPONDENCE

November 15, 1961.

Prof. OLIVER SCHROEDER, Jr.,
The Law-Medicine Center,
Western Reserve University,
Cleveland, Ohio.

DEAR OLIVER: I appreciated your sending me the excerpt from the October 1961 issue of the American Bar Association Journal on the NATO Convention and its comments on "World Peace Through the Rule of Law."

When Grenville Clark was writing his book on this subject, revising the Charter of the United Nations so that it could be changed from a league into government, he would send me drafts for comment and criticism. I began at that time to have the greatest difficulty with what I believe has now become a cliche, "World Peace Through World Law." This has disturbed me because I have great respect for Mr. Clark and great admiration for the zeal and earnestness which Charles Rhyne has devoted to this subject. Law to me has always meant a body of rules formulated by representatives duly elected by secret ballot comprising a legislature or parliament; and having the acceptance of the people who are to live by those rules. Query: "Who will make the law?" I do not wish to accept the United Nations' General Assembly. If we accept existing law, I am sure the Soviets will insist on their brand of Soviet law, but I would insist on the common law, and I am sure we would not get very far. What the Chinese and Indians would want, I do not know, but in neither case would I be anxious to be subject to their particular brand of law.

Equally important with the body of law and the makers of law, is its enforcement. I understand that in the early days of our Western States, each territory had its code of law, but there were no means for its enforcement. Hence, vigilantes, posses, or lawlessness existed when no marshal was around.

What world law actually means to me, therefore, is world government constituted by a world legislature, a world executive and a world court, backed up by a world police force, all acting upon the individual citizen, if it is to be effective. I think this great and admirable goal is impossible for as long a time ahead as can be foreseen, and under present conditions at best, undesirable. I have never been able to see how democracies can be merged with dictatorships, either of the Soviet or Latin American variety, nor how people of high political development can be made compatible with people of primitive political development. The basic issue is freedom versus tyranny and this issue, for me at least, is irreconcilable by compromise, negotiation, or law. The left wing of the British Labor Party has stated that it is willing to surrender on the thesis that "We would rather be Red than dead," but in a recent poll, 81 percent of the U.S. population has rejected this point of view.

Under these circumstances, why do able, intelligent and sincere members of the American Bar Association continue to advocate "world peace through world law"? I hope you can enlighten me and instruct me if I have missed some crucial point.

I am particularly concerned when you and I know that there is an alternative which

has every reasonable prospect of success; namely, the development of the Atlantic Community into effective government, which by the creation of an overwhelming unbalance of power, controlled by democratic processes, could enforce the peace indefinitely. Why cannot the important influence of the American Bar Association be induced to work constructively in this direction?

Sincerely,

ADOLPH.

NOVEMBER 17, 1961.

Mr. ADOLPH W. SCHMIDT,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR ADOLPH: Your November 15 letter was most refreshing. The American Bar Association efforts at "world peace through law" are based on the desire to ignite men everywhere to the basic need for the establishment of the rule of law. The various "rule of law" conferences held on the several continents seek to open men's minds to the opportunities which law rule could provide. We also hope these conferences with their accompanying publicity will stimulate the American people in the same vein.

When the problem becomes one of bringing lofty ideals down to marketplace operations, you have, quite rightly, isolated a very grave problem. Law means different things to different people—the Soviet Union, Red China, Central Africa, Latin America. It is safe to state that in Western Europe the basic ideals of life are similar to our American ideals, yet the constitutional and legal systems bear much less resemblance on the surface than the constitutional and legal systems of our Latin American neighbor states. Many Latin American nations have copied our U.S. Constitution, but from my personal experience the constitutional liberties under law are not present in Latin America, while they are present in Western Europe even though the constitutional and legal systems appear to be so different.

Law is the product of reason and experience. Knowledge and wisdom feed reason; cultures and customs cultivate experience. Our NATO community shares common sources of knowledge and wisdom as well as cultures and customs. Legal structures and legal rules may be different, but the sources and purposes of our laws are similar. These factors explain why it will be a long period before Central Africa, Red China, Soviet Russia, yes, even Latin America can join in a common legal community with Western Europe and North America.

Your observation on law emerging from legislatures composed of elected representatives is only partially true. The Western World has placed the law-creating function also in the judiciary—not only in the common law nations where judges literally make laws to govern people, but also in civil law nations where judges adapt laws to meet society's needs by interpreting the legislation. The International Court of Justice is a prime example of the law-creating function of the judiciary in the manner it has handled the Southwest Africa case and various cases involving the United Nations civil servants.

The editorial in the October, 1961, issue of the American Bar Association Journal emphasizes to me that the struggle to achieve world peace through the replacement of violence with law will receive its greatest advance if we on the U.S. Citizens' Commission, with our NATO colleagues, rise to the occasion. The people of the NATO nations believe in the rule of law; the roots of our legal systems are similar although the surface appearances of our legal systems may differ.

The movement of the American Bar for world peace through world law is a lofty dream. Ours is not to dispel the dream but to tread the path of the Western explorers—da Gama, Columbus, Magellan, Cabot, Leif Ericson, LaSalle (and shall we now add Shepherd and Grissom)—to make the first discoveries in the creation of an international community under law which we may well call Atlantica. Let us still continue to hope that other peoples observing our vision and progress in the decades ahead may also discover the rule of law as a foundation for world peace, freedom and abundance.

We agree on our final goal—the triumph of peace, freedom and abundance under law. The pathways to this goal may differ—both in the geographical areas concerned and the chronological timing of our advances. My pathway is:

First, the creation now in the Atlantic Community of law and legal institutions to meet the economic, political and defense desires of our free peoples who respect the rule of law.

Second, the maintenance of an open door to our Atlantic Community so that the free peoples of like-minded nations may join as the opportune time and proper place develop.

Third, the stimulation of the uncommitted peoples of the emerging nations to the lofty ideal of the rule of law by our example within the Atlantic Community and our guidance through the world peace through world law movement, so that in the years ahead these peoples will choose the way of peace, freedom and abundance under law which dignifies man rather than enslaves him.

Fourth, the expression of a relentless faith that the peoples now under totalitarian rule, when they observe the peaceful and free progress of Western man, will eventually demand and obtain the rule of law in this generation or the next.

Sincerely yours,

OLIVER.

Let the Critics of Agriculture Be Informed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, it is an inescapable conclusion that the majority of the population of large urban areas is convinced that their food prices are too high and the American farmer is responsible. A study of the facts on this matter make it equally apparent that such an assumption is inaccurate. In order that the readers of the RECORD can more fully realize the extent of the benefit that farming has conferred on them and so they can better understand the farmers' present discontent with the prices he is receiving for some commodities, I commend this editorial from the August issue of Successful Farming by its editor, Dick Hanson, to their attention:

LET THE CRITICS OF AGRICULTURE BE INFORMED

I'm sure you become annoyed, as I do, every time you hear agriculturally uninformed people bandying about criticisms aimed at agriculture in general, and farmers in particular. I've heard some of the wildest accusations made against farmers by people who should really know better. These people, and some newspapers and magazines, too, do a real disservice to the American public with their false statements.

I'm sure you have met people of the type referred to here. Their two major complaints against farmers are that farmers are getting rich because food prices are too high, and that farmers are nothing but a drain on the national economy. How they arrived at these conclusions usually remains a mystery, but that doesn't deter these critics in the slightest.

There is only one good way to "fight back" at these distortions of truth—have some good hard facts in mind and stand up and say your piece at every opportunity.

First, is food high priced? In most countries of the world, people spend half or more of their income for food. Those in India spend 60 percent, the Japanese 42 percent, the Italians 45 percent. But Americans spend only one-fifth of their take-home pay for food. And it's the best quality food in the world, as well as the cheapest.

In this country, about 9 of every 100 people in our labor force are farmworkers. Contrast this with Russia, where almost half the labor force works on farms. Because you produce more with less work, the American consumer's food costs less. This gives the American consumer more money to spend on other goods and services, creating new demands and growing markets.

The idea that farmers aren't pulling their share in the national economy is often mentioned by agriculturally uninformed people. Nothing could be further from the truth. Farmers not only produce the world's best and most inexpensive food, they also are tremendously important customers of industry.

You, and the other farmers of this country, spend $25 to $26 billion each year for equipment, goods, and services to produce crops and livestock. On top of that, you spend about $15 billion or more each year for family living items. Here are just three examples of where some of your money went last year: $2.5 billion for new tractors, motor vehicles, machinery; $3.5 billion for fuel, lubricants, and machine maintenance; $1.5 billion for fertilizer and lime.

An often overlooked fact by many people who berate farmers is that there's almost a 50–50 chance their own job exists because of agriculture. Four out of every ten jobs in private employment are now related to agriculture.

Uninformed critics of agriculture need your help. Your responsibility doesn't end when you "feed 'em," you've got to help "lead 'em," also.

Valuable Program on Good Money Management and Family Economics Developed in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great needs at this time is more consideration of family planning for good money management. I am proud to say that great strides have been made in this field in my own State of Texas. A speakers bureau, consisting of such outstanding citizens as Joel Hodges, Jack Kassahn, Caroline Brumley, Mrs. Cyalthia Benson, Mrs. H. E. Miller, and Mrs. Argen Draper, is carrying the "money management" story to the people. Mrs. Draper is the home demonstration agent of Deaf Smith County, Tex., and an outstanding leader. A highlight of the program is a film—"Personal Money Management"—produced by the American

Bankers Association. This film was purchased by the Hereford State Bank and placed at the disposal of the family economic committee. It was shown to more than 1,000 persons at the annual meeting of the Hereford, Tex., Federal Credit Union.

The program is described in an article by Mrs. Draper, "Focusing on the Financial Facts of Life," which appeared in the Extension Service Review for July 1962. I wish to insert this article in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Extension Service Review, July 1962]

FOCUSING ON THE FINANCIAL FACTS OF LIFE

(By Mrs. Argen Draper, Deaf Smith County home demonstration agent, Texas)

More than 5,600 people have heard the "Money Management" story planned by Deaf Smith County folks to stir up awareness of financial facts of life.

Local needs spurred the family economics subcommittee to plan a financial program that would reach all economic levels in the area. They did not feel limited by county lines.

National surveys showed indifference toward making wills, buying cemetery lots, and generally sound business practices. A county survey showed that this applied locally, too.

Local families were also found to need help in: managing time, energy, and finances; keeping accurate bank records; and joint husband-wife study of credit and investments.

The family economic committee was organized in October 1958, as part of the extension county program building.

SYMPOSIUM DEVELOPED

Preparation for spreading the thrift story began with a symposium workshop with the Toastmasters Club. Each organized club in the area was invited to send one member to take this instruction. Training was given on: general money management, managing your bank account, and wise use of credit.

"Family Relations" and "Family Finance" were substituted for "General Money Management" in the second symposium. Added to the program were "Thrift" and "Managing Your Charge Acounts." A speakers bureau evolved from the group taking the training.

The second symposium was recorded and televised on an area station. The committee's activities were covered in both local and area newspapers and on a local radio station.

Following the radio broadcast of a speech by Mrs. Dyalthia Benson, committee chairman, requests came from throughout the area for information on money management. Mrs. Benson was asked to talk on "Family Finance" at the annual convention of the Texas Home Demonstration Association.

The stories of good money management or family economics have been told in this area by a number of methods. Letters were sent to the presidents of 100 organized groups offering the 5 topics by the speakers bureau. Study and civic clubs, Sunday school classes, church groups, and PTA's have requested the programs.

The work of the family economic committee has become widely known over much of the State. Committee members were invited to talk to over 100 groups after the letters explaining the program had been mailed to organized groups.

To make speeches more readily available, tape recordings have been made by members of the speakers bureau on the various subjects assigned to them. Printed copies of these speeches are available for use by leaders trained in money management.

In addition, a speech by Terrell Hodges, senior student at West Texas State College, on "Charge Accounts" has been added to the tape library. He had used materials from the bureau in preparing a term paper which served as the basis of his speech.

A film produced by the American Bankers Association, "Personal Money Management," was purchased by the Hereford State Bank and placed at the disopsal of the family economic committee. It was shown to more than 1,000 persons at the annual meeting of the Hereford Texas Federal Credit Union. More copies of the film have been purchased for use in other areas.

SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

Three high school homemaking classes heard the money management story presented by four committee members. The same series of programs was requested a second year. These programs aroused the school superintendent's interest, and he endorsed the committee's plans for offering the money management subjects in school. Arrangements are made with classroom teachers.

Fourth, fifth, and sixth-grade teachers were given information on the nationwide thrift essay contest. As a result, 223 themes on thrift were entered from local schoolchildren. Larry Paetzold of Hereford placed first in Texas and third in the national contest with his essay.

State awards were made to local winners at the annual banquet of the Deaf Smith County Chamber of Commerce. First-place themes in the three grade-level divisions were read and the national award was presented at a special recognition meeting of the Hereford Rotary Club.

Thrift talks are planned for a junior high assembly, featuring 4–H members of the committee.

Perhaps the most unusual assignment in the series was that of Loreta Fowler, assistant county home demonstration agent. Asked to give a program on money management at the Parkview Parent-Teachers meeting, she discovered that she was featured speaker at graduation exercises for the elementary school. Her subject was, "Family Economics."

Home Demonstration Club women trained in "Money Management" trained girls in four 4–H club groups.

Success of the committee is attributed to securing qualified, interested persons to serve on it. Every effort is made to provide them material and training. A number of resource persons have discussed the county situation, helped make plans, and helped in carrying out and evaluating the program.

It is difficult to measure results from the work of this committee. However, the work has become widely known over much of the State.

The committee members have made talks to over 100 groups. Two groups of young homemakers have been organized and have had at least eight programs each on "Money Management."

The committee plans to continue stressing the availability of the Speakers Bureau. All possible news coverage, making talks available, and a regular radio program are on the agenda.

America's Low Prestige in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am impressed more and more every day with the outstanding reporting job being done by Mr. Constantine Brown during his extended stay in Europe. I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the Senate an excellent column by Mr. Brown as printed in the Washington Evening Star of September 6, 1962. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial entitled "America's Low Prestige in Europe: U.S. Leadership Blamed for Letting Aggressors Win in Many Areas" be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 6, 1962]

AMERICA'S LOW PRESTIGE IN EUROPE—U.S. LEADERSHIP BLAMED FOR LETTING AGGRESSORS WIN IN MANY AREAS

(By Constantine Brown)

MUNICH.—Much has been written in the last year by newspapermen reporting from Europe that the policies followed by the United States have brought its prestige to the lowest ebb in contemporary history.

In 3 weeks of travel through Switzerland and Germany your reporter has talked not only with responsible leaders but also with average citizens. In this city there was an occasion to combine a social visit and a political discussion with an old friend who, since the early days of the American occupation, has been a strong advocate of a pro-American policy for Germany. To him, America has always been the world beacon of justice and human rights.

I shall try to present in condensed form a long conversation which, in the mind of this reporter, represents the views of not only Germans, but of many European leaders regarding Washington's new policies.

"The Europeans," my German friend pointed out, "have frequently misunderstood America's policies. This is inevitable among the democracies who have different conceptions concerning freedom. But we all believed that you would never tolerate the real meaning of freedom to be snuffed out anywhere in the world. We Germans know what it is to lose freedom and our civil rights. And when you demolished Hitler for us, we believed we could look to America to lead the way for our country to regain its democracy. And we always believed that you would continue to do your utmost to prevent aggression—from whatever quarter it might come.

"But in these last few years, and especially in the last few months, we have suffered a sort of slow shock; we have reluctantly come to the conclusion that you regard aggression with equanimity, provided it is perpetrated by the Communists or neutralists. You have established the principle that aggression can pay dividends for the aggressors."

He then began to enumerate concrete cases. He started with the little enclaves such as Goa, belonging to Portugal on the Indian continent, which was gobbled up by the Indian armies overnight, needlessly reminding me that our only reaction was some outraged words from the lips of United Nations Ambassador Stevenson, and more foreign aid to India, the aggressor. Added to this has been outright hostility by Washington toward Portugal, a stanch ally.

The next example was our hostility toward President Tshombe of Katanga, a strong anti-Communist who is apparently taking literally, my friend said, the self-determination of all nations guaranteed in the Atlantic Charter. And then he went on to mention the fact that our longtime ally, Holland, had been forced through American pressure to give up a small remaining part

of her empire, Irian, and cede these poor natives to the pro-Communist president of Indonesia, Sukarno; even though the Dutch were willing to permit the natives to decide for themselves whether they should become independent or join with the Indonesians. "You actually made it physically impossible for the Netherlands to send troops to defend the natives," he added.

"Take Laos," he said. "After stating early in 1961 that Laos full independence was a matter of life and death for the security of east Asia, you have forced the creation of a so-called neutralist government. It will be a Communist government within a year.

"And now you tolerate coldblooded murders by the East Berlin Vopos right under your eyes, while at the same time you emphasize human rights for peoples all over the world.

"We know that it is not the American people who have changed. I have been to the States recently, and I know from personal contacts that they still have lofty ideals and are the same people who did not hesitate to shed their blood for the sake of freedom, and to pour out untold billions to make a better world. No, the change has come with your leadership. They are now tolerating aggression because of the new element of fear. America's leaders of the past never had a fear complex—why, you entered the last two wars totally unprepared. But that didn't stop you from your determination to stamp out aggression.

"There is a growing feeling in Europe today that henceforth they will have to 'go it alone' without America. Their leaders do not find it politic to say it outright; but the fact is that many of them are now writing off the United States as the mainstay of the remaining free world. This is the kernel of America's low prestige in the world."

How Not To Treat Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the brainy elite around the President seem to think they know how to handle Russia.

Marguerite Higgins, in today's New York Herald Tribune, tells us why they are wrong and what damage is being done by Alice-in-Wonderland type of thinking by President Kennedy.

The article follows:

RUFFIANSHIP VERSUS RESTRAINT

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—The key issue in Cuba is not whether the Soviet-supplied missiles are offensive or defensive or whether Soviet officers are in Bermuda shorts rather than battle gear. The issue is whether American policies of so-called restraint tempt the Russians into putting on more pressure everywhere or whether U.S. restraint will be rewarded by Soviet restraint.

So far, President Kennedy, with, of course, the most honorable of motives, has most often taken the advice of those officials who counseled caution even at the price of letting the Russians get away with a slice here and a slice there of the U.S. world position in areas ranging from the Far East to central Europe to the Caribbean.

The President himself at a press conference stated part of the rationale for this attitude by indicating that America had to be cautious in Cuba because action against the Communist incursions there might result in Soviet counteractions in places like Berlin.

But what a tragedy if, for example, the initial slowness of American reaction should prove one day to be the factor that decided Khrushchev to authorize a new era of brinkmanship in Berlin by threatening to use the missiles newly emplaced along the Western air corridors to the city.

And with a new crisis boiling up, it seems important to bring to the surface what has been known for several months to insiders in Washington. This is that Americans of great stature, both in and out of Government, Democrats as well as Republicans, are now asking whether President Kennedy will preside over the decline of America as a great power.

Perhaps this seems unduly alarmist at a time when America is so psychologically attuned that headlines give greater attention to a "satisfactory conversation" between the American Secretary of the Interior and the Premier of the Soviet Union than to dispatches from Berlin saying that Russians have riddled an American military car with 40 machinegun bullets.

But nonetheless, the question is being asked and soon, it can be predicted, will be put on the public record because the men involved know that the issues are too crucial to go undebated.

Indeed, some of President Kennedy's advisers most closely connected with the Berlin situation feel that in the coming months the United States is risking the most serious—and needless—confrontation with the Russians in Berlin because this country—not just in Europe but also in Cuba and elsewhere—has not faced up to the possibility that inaction vis-a-vis the Russians often runs greater risk than action.

As President Kennedy himself once remarked atmospherics have their uses, and the time to send sharp diplomatic protests to Moscow, to summon the Soviet Ambassador for stern confrontations, was at the beginning: that is, at the moment that the first Soviet ship of the recent armada (which everybody knew was on the way) headed toward Cuba in July. The long silence on this score plus official attempts to play down the importance of it all was an invitation, the argument goes, for Moscow to believe that America was looking for a way to evade the challenge.

Moscow's reaction, of course, was very ungentlemanly. For instead of playing Washington's game, Moscow threw its challenge contemptuously in America's teeth by openly announcing to the world that it was sending military personnel and supplies to Cuba. There is a conviction in many responsible quarters that a straight and tough stand from the beginning would have greatly inhibited the Soviets—and still might. Nonetheless, it is a great mistake to rule out publicly whatever means might be necessary to curb Soviet intrusion, including a blockade and all that flows from that. How can promises of any sort of immunity help but embolden such an opponent?

For Robert Frost spoke true and well in Moscow when he described Premier Khrushchev as both a ruffian and a great man. Ruffianship has never been inconsistent with greatness, and the gentlemanly approach to international politics has never impressed the Bolsheviks.

Indeed, just 18 months ago, Premier Khrushchev created a stir in diplomatic circles by this remark on Cuba: "How am I to believe that Kennedy is serious about Berlin when he permitted the failure of the invasion of the Bay of Pigs? After all, Cuba is at America's own back door." This was, of course, a conversational probe and Khrushchev later indicated he did not subscribe entirely to his own thesis.

But here in Washington, advocates of a firm line earnestly warn that nothing less than the future of this country is at stake unless President Kennedy becomes convinced of this proposition: that the risk of counterpressure to Soviet thrusts is less than the risk of doing nothing because the next time Khrushchev says America is afraid he might really believe it.

The Postal Rate Hike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Warren (Pa.) Times-Mirror, Sept. 5, 1962]

THE POSTAL RATE HIKE

As of this writing, the U.S. Senate is still reviewing the postal rate increase, H.R. 7927, based on a request from President Kennedy. The bill has been attacked by many publications, by labor unions, and others. It will destroy jobs, cut down the effectiveness of many of the smaller, more thoughtful magazines, hurt the farm press, and hurt the American public.

Here is what the AFL–CIO has to say about the proposed rate increase:

"To put it simply, doubling the second-class rate on labor papers wouldn't help the Post Office much, but it would raise havoc with the primary means of communication within the labor movement.

"Doubling the rate would mean a cost of better than 10 percent (of the total budget of a typical trade union publication) which seems unduly high to us.

"Some weekly papers would be cut back to twice a month. Some twice-a-month papers would become monthlies. A few publications might suspend publication entirely."

Leading authors also have added their voice to the protest. They point out—and rightly—that the rate hike would hurt them by cutting down the number of markets to which they can sell their material. This means more jobs lost. The International Typographical Union has opposed the hike because of what it would do to men in the printing trades.

The Government argues that it cannot meet its Post Office deficit unless rates are hiked, yet, as always, the Government ignores the obvious solution: cutting expenses.

First of all the Post Office should divest itself of all the side issues it has taken on, like handing out tax forms, collecting migratory bird fees by selling special stamps, and other unimportant duties which have been dumped on the Department over the years.

The second solution is to modernize the 1890 rule book and to mechanize the Department. Why isn't our system mechanized as it is in many so-called backward countries overseas?

This question was put to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service by A. L. Cole, vice president and general manager of the Reader's Digest.

"The population of this country has increased 33 percent since 1945," he said. "Since 1945 mail volume has increased about 79 percent. Not only has population been rising but there have been more and more pieces of mail per year. More than half the mail in the Post Office is still first-class

mail—over 33 billion of the 66 billion pieces of mail in 1961.

"If governments overseas find that money can be saved by machines, then, if it has not been done, an immediate appraisal should be made of our 60 largest post offices to find out what machines can be used, how much they'll cost, and how much money they will save.

"Most businessmen would be happy to buy machines which will pay for themselves in 6 years. Postal cost studies made in 1958 showed that the one Transorma letter sorter installed in Silver Spring, Md., would pay for itself in 5.9 years. Since that one was installed in 1957, this means there'll be some savings next year—and for years thereafter.

"This year the Post Office asked the Appropriations Committee for enough money to buy only 21 letter sorters. We have seen estimates that 400 or 500 sorters are needed. Why should we wait until 1970 to get 400 or 500 machines that could have been saving us money for the last 5 years of this decade?

"We submit that the Post Office cannot be asked to judge its own progress in mechanization. Some experts have suggested that a joint congressional committee is needed to study continuously and report to the Congress and the people on Post Office efficiency.

"We appeal to this committee and the administration to modernize the Post Office as rapidly as possible. We realize that this is the province of the Congress; we hope you will push it. The American people are entitled to the lowest possible rates for postage, and without continuing deficits. The only way to get this happy combination is through a post office of high efficiency.

"Some people say that mechanization will cost a lot of jobs for postal employees. We do not believe that the installation of modern mail-handling machinery will put any of the 582,000 postal employees out of work. Postal authorities themselves state that they do not believe they can properly handle the load without new machines."

WYNR: A Loser in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I called the attention of the House to the fact that the McLendon Corp. purchased former radio station WGES in Chicago and, contrary to its sworn promises to the Federal Communications Commission, completely changed its programing schedule by dropping foreign language programs, which had been a hallmark of this radio station in Chicago for more than 30 years.

The McLendon Corp., since it took over the station, has changed its call letters to WYNR and is now allegedly filling the cultural needs of Chicago and serving the public interest with a completely new programing formula.

I should like to call my colleagues' attention to an appraisal of this new programing policy by the McLendon Corp., which appeared in a column written by Mr. John Justin Smith in the Chicago Daily News of September 6, 1962. John Justin Smith is a veteran reporter who today enjoys a reputation in Chicago as one of that city's most highly respected journalists.

The item in Mr. Smith's column dealing with WYNR's programing appeared under the heading, "Screaming Loser."

Mr. Smith's observations follow:

SCREAMING LOSER

Chicago has a new radio station and, for my taste, it may be the worst in the city. This is WYNR, which began broadcasting over the weekend in place of WGES, a station that for years has specialized in foreign language shows.

WYNR, called winner by its announcers, is a loser in my books. It screams at you. The diskjockeys scream, the music screams, and the news announcers scream. It's a consolation to know that in the United States nobody can force you to listen to such junk.

Manager of International Monetary Fund Predicts Halt to Gold Outflow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the September 10, 1962, issue of the Washington Post.

Mr. Jacobsson, one of the most respected international economists, shows an optimism that is sadly lacking on the part of some members of the American economic community.

The article follows:

EXPERT PREDICTS HALT IN DRAIN ON U.S. GOLD

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

Per Jacobsson, managing director of the International Monetary Fund, predicted yesterday that the United States will succeed in balancing its international payments during 1963.

"It's becoming clearer and clearer, and the improvement will be very apparent by the end of this year," Jacobsson said in an interview. "I think things are going well here in America now."

The 69-year-old Fund Director is the free world's best known and most deeply respected international economic expert. He makes more forecasts than his subordinates think he should but his predictions have proved uncannily accurate.

Jacobsson attributed the improvement in the U.S. position to the policy of "moderation" that this country has been following.

WAGE CHECK CITED

He stressed that wages are being kept in check here while they are rising relatively rapidly in Germany and in other European countries—a development that strengthens the competitive position of American goods against foreign products.

The U.S. budget deficit of $4 to $5 billion in prospect for this year is "moderate," too, Jacobsson maintained. He said the red-ink entry is big enough to stimulate the economy without creating inflationary pressures.

Jacobsson's appraisal of the Nation's situation is a foretaste of the searching scrutiny that it will be subjected to a week hence when the top free world financial officials gather in Washington for the annual meeting of the Board of Governors of the Fund and the World Bank. The Governors are the finance ministers and central bank heads of the institution's 79 member countries.

KENNEDY TO SPEAK

President Kennedy will speak to the opening session and is expected to reiterate his belief that the U.S. international payments will be in balance by the end of 1963.

The President and Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon will emphasize that American economic activity is continuing to expand even though the rate of growth is slower than they would like it to be.

There has been a marked change for the better in the free world financial picture since the Governors last met in Vienna last September, and the major delegations' statements are expected to reflect the improvement.

A new structure of mutually supporting financial arrangements has been worked out. They include a nearly complete multibillion-dollar addition to the Fund's loan resources, currency swap arrangements between the United States and other countries, and intimate continuing cooperation through the secret channels of "working party three"—a committee of free world financial officials that meets in Paris.

The U.S. dollar is stronger than it was and is becoming even stronger as the weeks go by.

After the stock market broke in May and recession fears burgeoned in June, there were widespread expectations that the dollar would be under heavy speculative attack in September. But it hasn't worked that way.

The chief dissent from the general free world euphoria will come from Britain's Chancellor of the Exchequer Reginald Maudling.

PROBLEM OF SUCCESS

He will urge that the Fund countries take advantage of the current period of relative stability to devise new methods of increasing free world liquidity. The British are convinced that additional ways must be found to assure individual countries that they will have ample international financial resources.

The British worry about liquidity is, in itself, a tribute to the mounting strength of the dollar.

The United States has been adding to other countries' liquidity in recent years for it has been paying them gold and dollars to cover the persistent American balance-of-payments deficit.

But the outflow will stop when the U.S. foreign payments come into balance. The other free world countries will lose their main current source of greater liquidity.

"It is the old story that every success creates its problems," Jacobsson declared.

The People Are Learning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we approach election time, thoughts of the Members are turning increasingly to the views of the folks back home. We have had opportunity of late to check grassroots public sentiment.

This public sentiment seems to speak louder and louder in terms of opposition

to fiscal policies of the Kennedy administration, especially its complete disregard for budgetary considerations.

This subject matter is discussed in a very interesting fashion in a recent editorial appearing in the Blue Island Sun Standard, one of the outstanding weekly community newspapers in south Cook County.

I ask leave to insert this editorial entitled "The People Are Learning," into the RECORD at this point.

The editorial follows:

[From the Blue Island (Ill.) Sun-Standard, Aug. 30, 1962]

THE PEOPLE ARE LEARNING

The political writers, whose names are legion these days, have devoted innumerable words to President Kennedy's difficulties with Congress. In the view of some, the legislative record to date, of White House "must" bills, verges on the catastrophic and may have a profound influence on elections to come.

Time will tell as to that. Meanwhile, there is one element in this record that deserves more emphasis than it has been given.

Mr. Kennedy has been almost totally successful in obtaining approval of measures that are clearly necessary to the national welfare and security. The $50 billion defense budget is proof of that. The amendments and changes made were minor.

He is virtually certain to be equally successful in obtaining approval of moves and policies that, whether we like them or not, stem from the pressure of irresistible world forces. The trade expansion plan, which is to give the President great and unprecedented powers in adjusting tariffs and in making and gaining other trade concessions, is the prime example here. Sentiment, based on the hardrock logic and necessity, is powerfully in favor of it.

The President's legislative failures on the other hand, have been in areas of welfare-state expansion. Three examples are paramount—the medicare bill, the farm bill, and the bill to establish an urban affairs body at the Cabinet level. All would have advanced, one way or another, the welfare state, big brother philosophy.

It would be absurd to argue that this Congress is anti-Kennedy. His party holds heavy majorities in both branches. But the country has had heavy doses of welfare statism, and is learning what the costs are in lost liberty and independence, no less than in billions of money. There are signs that the people have had more than enough of it—and that the acts of Congress simply reflect the popular will.

Bean Soup, Pennsylvania Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, those who have become familiar with the bean soup tradition so renowned on Capitol Hill, may be interested to learn of its counterpart in the heart of the Pennsylvania Dutch country. People in McClure, a village in Snyder County, Pa., taking pride in their history, each year invite thousands to join them in their festive bean soup celebration.

Originating in 1891, the event was suggested by a Civil War veteran who proposed that the boys of his company have a campfire with rations similar to those eaten while serving in the Union Army. Almost every resident of McClure, being either a veteran, relative, or friend, attended the gathering in a grove at the edge of town.

The affair proved to be so popular that the old soldiers decided to repeat it the following year. Profits from subsequent outings were used to construct a large cooking shed, as well as more tables and seats so that many could enjoy the fine food.

Though most of its original participants have passed away, the town continues to hold the bean soup celebration annually. This festival has replaced the Snyder County Fair, offering townsfolk an opportunity to display and sell their handiwork. Last year, 18,000 guests from all over the country shared in the smalltown hospitality and good cooking. Even more are expected to join in the fun on September 12–15 while it is being celebrated this week.

Now in its 71st year, this festival has become an important event in the lives of the people of McClure. It is a pleasure to welcome to the 17th Pennsylvania Congressional District this community which chooses to maintain its historical tradition, making life today just a little more meaningful.

Soviet Russian Weaknesses and Vulnerabilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Washington Report of the American Security Council dated September 10, 1962, contains a very interesting discussion entitled "Soviet Russian Weaknesses and Vulnerabilities." The article is prepared by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University. He makes the point that the Soviets have many weaknesses but that we do not exploit these weaknesses and convert them into vulnerabilities. I ask unanimous consent that this interesting article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT: SOVIET RUSSIAN WEAKNESSES AND VULNERABILITIES

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

In analyzing Soviet Russia, it is necessary to distinguish at the outset between weakness and vulnerability. A weakness is a condition of defect and impairment which does not in itself constitute a vulnerability. For it to develop into this state, an external stimulus is required. There are many deep weaknesses in the totalitarian Soviet Russian empire, but so long as they remain untapped they are not, by definition, vulnerabilities. Policies of patched-up containment, evolution, and wishful thinking on the coming breakup of the so-called Communist bloc serve only to guarantee that Soviet weaknesses shall not become vulnerabilities. The active external agent, the catalyst, is lacking.

The prodigious irony of the current situation is the fact that beneath the surface of most Soviet Russian accomplishments and points of strength rest their most profound weaknesses.

The real decision before this Nation today is not whether to push of not to push into space, to disarm or not to disarm, to negotiate or not to negotiate, to trade or not to trade with the Red empire. Instead, the basic and real decision is whether to meet or not to meet the full cold war challenge of colonial Moscow. If we should resolve to engage the enemy in the total context of the cold war, it would not and could not be a matter of fighting this war only on our side of the 50-yard line. The best defense is the offense, and it should be obvious that the defense of freedom is being battered from Laos to Cuba because our mere defensive and reactive posture is not the best defense.

A cold war offensive would not permit Moscow's imperialism to nibble away at us, for such an offensive necessitates the conversion of well-known weaknesses in the enemy's empire into vulnerabilities and the systematic exploitation of these vulnerabilities toward his eventual destruction.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky is a professor of economics at Georgetown University. He is the author of the Captive Nations Week Resolution (Public Law 86–70) which was passed by Congress in 1959. This resolution provides that the third week of July be set aside each year to remind the world of the nations held in bondage by Russian imperialism. Dr. Dobriansky is also a member of the American Security Council's strategy staff.)

There are five major areas for analysis: (1) the ideologico—propaganda; (2) the empire; (3) the so-called economic race; (4) the military—space field; and (5) the party apparatus.

1. We have still to appreciate the central importance of propaganda in the cold war. The Soviet Russians have developed this basic art to make a relatively backward state appear as the equal of the American giant, to make the worst empire of its kind appear as the great proponent of national liberation and independence, and to move the minds of millions throughout the world in the belief that all this is so.

However, the weaknesses of Moscow's ideologico—propaganda are deep and fundamental. After 20 years of indoctrination, millions of Ukrainians, Georgians, Russians and others deserted colonial Moscow in World War II; after 10 years of heavy propaganda Hungarian students and workers staged the 1956 revolution. There are many similar examples to prove the utter bankruptcy of Communist ideology when it is put into practice.

Nevertheless, Moscow continues to capitalize on this massive deception, chiefly because of our failure to develop these weaknesses into critical vulnerabilities. This requires a realization of the central importance of propaganda. The Voice of America is but a pygmy compared to Moscow's medium. There are many good opportunities for demolishing the image Moscow casts of its empire. For example, we could easily show the Russian perversion of theoretical Marxism, the emptiness of so-called Communist ideology, the emergence of the techocratic elite in the U.S.S.R., and the colonial exploitation of the captive non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union. These are only a few points to establish the Russian mythology of communism.

If we are to win the cold war, we must recognize and repeatedly stress the real threat which Soviet Russian mythology conceals. And this is the Soviet Russian imperiocolonial system of totalitarian rule.

2. The second general area of Moscow's obvious strength is its expanded empire. One of Moscow's paramount goals in the past 5 years has been to gain Western acquiescence to the permanence of its present empire, and our increasing indifference toward the captive nations has helped in this.

Those who today preach that the Soviet Russian empire is showing signs of disintegration, that the future is with us, that all that is required is a military buildup and trade with this empire, are gravely misleading the citizens of this country. There is no substantial evidence of this. In fact, all the important and basic evidence of increasing empire strength points the other way. Of course, Moscow has its problems. Who doesn't? It had even greater problems at Stalin's death and during the Hungarian revolution, but it, nonetheless, continued to build up its composite power.

Yet, beneath the surface of this imperial power and strength lies the most profound weakness of the Soviet Union and of the entire structure of Moscow's imperial rule and power. This weakness is the immense latent power of the genuine patriotic nationalism of the captive peoples both within and outside the Soviet Union. It is this patriotic nationalism which is our most formidable weapon against Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, not the superficial disagreements between puppets and the prime power.

Khrushchev's sensitivity here is shown by his fury at the Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by Congress in 1959. Except for the U–2 incident, no event in the past 10 years has had as violent an impact on Moscow as this resolution. Khrushchev and his puppets know, if we do not, the disastrous effects that a methodic implementation of this resolution could have on their worldwide propaganda operations and on the nations within their empire.

3. In the economic area, it should be readily recognized that for cold war objectives the empire economy of the Soviet Union is strong, secure and increasingly threatening. Moscow has a long way to go to match our economy, but being a totalitarian and essentially a war economy, the U.S.S.R. poses an increasing threat as $12 to $20 billion of additional output becomes annually available to it for cold and hot war purposes.

Weaknesses in the economy are many, but most fundamental are the differences in status and real income between the ruling elite and the underlying population, and also the rampant economic colonialism to which the captive non-Russian peoples are subjected. This could be transformed into a vulnerability by focusing worldwide attention and opinion on these weaknesses. It would provide important political leverage to the liberal Russian and nationalist non-Russian forces within the U.S.S.R.

4. The U.S.S.R. devotes top priority allocation of resources to the military-space field. Over 20 percent of the gross product in the U.S.S.R. goes to military pursuits Their further development poses great dangers, particularly in significant breakthroughs capable of magnifying their military power. Today, Khrushchev threatens us and the world with "global missiles." He has been so effective in propagandizing the empire's military and space feats that in addition to naive and pacifist groups doing his work for him in the free nations, even our own leaders invoke from time to time the pangs of "nuclearitis" as an excuse for the absence of a well-defined and developed cold war policy.

But the innovation of present military—space technology in no way alters the persistent weaknesses in the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. The ultimate weapon is still man and his morale, loyalties, and will. Moscow is well aware that in all three major wars in this century, the motley and multinational forces of the Russian empire, whether czarist or Soviet, disintegrated early.

Capitalization of this vital weakness into a vulnerability rests obviously on a broader program directed at the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Along with this is the necessity for a full and superior development of all our arms, nuclear and conventional. The only sure and safe way to preserve the gray peace and to move forward to cold war victory is by attaining and maintaining unquestioned superiority along the entire spectrum of military technology and weaponry.

5. The final area for analysis is the party. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the cohesive agent of totalitarian Soviet Russian strength, and the vehicle for the subverting conspiracy beyond it.

However, it has weaknesses that could be developed into fatal vulnerabilities. The perennial problem of succession, intraparty feuding, the pressures of national parties in Ukraine, Georgia and elsewhere, and infiltration of party councils and machinery lend themselves to such a development. Here, as elsewhere, our offensive in the cold war would necesarily have to be organic, composite and totalistic. Pursuing one weakness as against others would be both foolish and wasteful. But involved in each of these major weaknesses is the basic problem of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

It is painful to observe how, today, we continue to miss our opportunities for eventual cold war victory. However, I am positive that, given an aroused citizenry, the dominant facts of international life and the predominant weaknesses of the Soviet Russian empire will lead us to the pursuit of an inescapable policy of emancipation and a cold war strategy designed for decisive victory.

Wrong Way on Fouled-Up Youths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones from the Washington Evening Star of September 10, 1962:

WRONG WAY ON FOULED-UP YOUTHS: BLAMING SOCIETY, EXPERTS SAY, GIVES THEM SOMETHING TO HIDE BEHIND

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

American psychiatry ought to be entering a new and better day if the advice of two California psychiatrists is heeded. In essence it is this: Quit explaining to wrongdoers why they are doing wrong, and instead, point out how and why they ought to do the right thing.

At the recent National Institute on Crime and Delinquency in Seattle, Dr. William Glasser, consultant psychiatrist at the Ventura, Calif., School for Girls, told of a "reality therapy" which he and his colleague, Dr. G. L. Harrington, have developed.

The two psychiatrists decided that the elaborate process of taking case histories and delving into probable causes for delinquency quickly gave too many patients the idea that there were special and compelling reasons why they couldn't be good. Many of them felt helpless to improve themselves, while others took comfort in the theory that because they were "disturbed" the ordinary rules of decency couldn't apply to them.

Says Doctor Glasser: "Regardless of what causes his bad behavior, the child is primarily responsible. We are always warm and friendly, but we never intimate in any way that entering into psychiatric treatment relieves him of the responsibility for what he does. We assume, as traditional therapists rarely do, that he has a workable set of principles, standards or values.

"We have met far too many fouled-up youngsters who have never had to face their principles in therapy, because traditional therapy requires not that they exercise their values, but only that they understand causes. If everybody working with a delinquent child holds him responsible to himself for what he does, the child soon learns the pleasure of doing well and getting credit for it."

There's a lot of wisdom here. And what better proof is there than the fact that the more we inquire into causes, and the more time we spend blaming slums or lack of playgrounds or parental irresponsibility, the higher the rate of juvenile delinquency has climbed.

We are beginning to learn to our dismay that demolishing tenements and establishing boys' clubs is not providing the hoped-for answers. Instead, juvenile misbehavior is spreading in all environments and economic strata. Kids are getting into trouble not only where papa is a penniless drunk, but also where papa doesn't let them use the Cadillac every night. The more we blame society for youthful outrages and the more society struggles to remove the causes, the more outrages we have.

The Christian Scientists have a pretty sound theory that if you spend most of your time with your finger on your pulse you are going to feel pretty sick, and the stronger your faith and the brighter your outlook the better you'll feel. Dr. Norman Vincent Peale puts it another way. He calls it "The Power of Positive Thinking."

Hanging around the corner drugstore looking for kicks doesn't lend itself to positive thinking. Listening to a psychiatrist explain that "father rejection" caused you to rob the filling station may only give you the idea that some force which you can't control is going to make you rob another. If you pay enough attention to the garrulous characters and oddballs who provided the material for the Kinsey report, you get the impression that morality is a vapor and anything goes.

In our effort to escape the hard decisions which toughmindedness requires we have become great gulpers of tranquilizing pills. You need not fight out a dilemma within yourself, to sweat and agonize and reason, until your tortured mind makes a decision and finds a pathway out of the confusion. No, you take a pill and chemical magic momentarily makes you content, with the issue unresolved.

In the August 16 number of the Reporter magazine, a perceptive poem, signed by "Sec," warns that armless babies may not be the full price exacted by the little pills. It contains these lines:

"Who knows, who knows
But that release is dearly bought when bought
Rather than won in solitary war
On the darkest nights. There is a trick in ease;
The quick escape, unfought for, should suffice
To alarm the mind."

In our effort to remove our frustrations, we have forgotten the joy and strength of

mind that arises from the effort to be simply right. The unfrustrated man ought to be the man who can do exactly as he pleases. Yet anyone who has worked with delinquent children knows that the ungovernable and incorrigible child is among the most miserable of all children.

No one gains strength as long as he is preoccupied with finding reasons for his weaknesses. While self-blame can be overdone by a few overly conscientious individuals, the effort to avoid self-blame at any cost is a far commoner and more debilitating disease.

A few weeks ago I got an interesting letter from an intelligent inmate of a Washington State reformatory. He talked about his fellow inmates:

"You can see what is wrong with most of us if you watch us play baseball. I've seen this happen dozens of times: The batter hits a long fly to the outfield. The outfielder races for it and see he can't quite catch it. So what? So he falls. And he gets up cursing and dusting his pants and pointing to an imaginary gopher hole.

"That's why most of us are here. We could never admit that we didn't move fast enough or think straight enough or work hard enough. We just kept cussing the gopher holes."

State Government and Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Dwight R. G. Palmer, State Highway Commissioner of New Jersey, which appeared in the summer 1962 issue of State Government. Mr. Palmer discusses the many problems faced by States with urban populations needing mass transit facilities. While recognizing the paramount responsibility of the State government Mr. Palmer urges Federal-State cooperation as the answer to the problem—an excellent argument for the early enactment of H.R. 11158 the proposed Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962.

The article follows:

STATE GOVERNMENT AND TRANSPORTATION

(By Dwight R. G. Palmer)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The New Jersey Highway Department in recent years, through its railroad transportation division, has taken the lead in preserving and strengthening rail commuter service for the State's people. In this paper Dwight R. G. Palmer, State highway commissioner of New Jersey, draws on that experience and his familiarity with mass transit problems of urban areas across the country to suggest major elements required for solution of the problems. He underlines that the task calls for cooperative effort by all levels of government—Federal, State, and local. In particular he points to the crucial necessity of State governmental leadership and coordination of such effort, and to a need for States to share in the financing.)

America is a land of people on the move via autos, trucks, trains, speed boats, planes, and now in capsules through outer space.

No longer are there the mass migrations to the western frontier of a century ago. Travel in past decades was reckoned by what people called long distances. Today there are no long distances as applied to the travel time involved. More and more workers are going greater distances every day to reach their places of employment. This tremendous daily mass movement of people between their homes and their jobs, coupled with the steadily increasing use of already overburdened highways for movement of goods, is placing intolerable strains upon the existing transportation facilities in every urban area of the Nation.

THE PROBLEMS GROW

The "flight to the suburbs" has become a staple feature of modern living, bringing with it tremendous demands upon the smaller municipalities for more schools, better police and fire protection, sewer facilities, and streets. The financial problems posed by disproportionately large residential populations are causing many local tax officials to lose sleep.

The larger cities, faced with loss of retail consumer business to outlying shopping centers, are feverishly attempting to cope with the myriad difficulties of urban renewal. Inevitably, all such plans must provide easier access and adequate parking to lure customers back to the long-established business districts.

When all of the pieces of the jigsaw puzzle are fitted together, the picture is plain for everyone to see: our economy is suffering from "arteriosclerosis": hardening of the arteries of transportation. Unless facile circulation of people and goods through and within our centers of population is quickly restored, the result will be slow strangulation and drifting.

TEAM EFFORT REQUIRED

What is the role of Government in this situation—what is its responsibility for providing a "cure"? The first thing that everyone—private citizens and public officials alike—should recognize is that the solution must be by team effort. No one group, no one level of Government, can function effectively in this vital area by itself. Nor can the springing up of councils or committees, though of the best of intent, substitute for or supplant State government and its duly constituted agencies. The very nature of the problem points up the fact that the State must play the leading role. There is a strong trend toward:

1. Greater recognition that the Federal Government must provide increased aid to railroad transportation and that it should provide the machinery for coordinating with local redevelopment programs, to the extent desirable, all facets of transportation for which it renders aid.

2. Greater interest in the overall transportation problem on the part of many civic-minded local and regional planning groups, which seek to take an active part in the formulation of policy.

3. Increased public awareness, and in some cases resentment, of the fact that the vast national highway construction program, now gaining real momentum, undoubtedly will inconvenience a few for the benefit of the many, and that any overall mass transit program probably will display the same characteristics.

The Federal Government and the States have worked together during the past 46 years to provide adequate highway transportation for the Nation. But this teamwork has been possible only because all of the Federal Highway Acts have placed the basic responsibility for location, design and construction of highways in the hands of the various State highway departments. The Federal Government retains the authority to withhold funds when it feels that a State decision is wasteful or contrary to the public interest or that the project is ill conceived or inadequately engineered.

A State always has the authority to build a highway on its own if the Federal Government withholds aid, and in very many instances States do go beyond the limits of available Federal aid by using their own resources to insure that new highways comply with certain safety and convenience needs of particular areas.

The problem of adjusting highway location and design to the desires and plans of local governments, civic groups, and John Q. Public is, of course, most intense in highly urbanized areas. It is a problem that highway departments not only try to work out but must work out for the benefit of all. A modern superhighway cutting through a congested residential or business area brings a host of problems in its wake. But these problems cannot be resolved on a local basis, by neighborhood vying against neighborhood and one municipality threatening to block all action unless its own particular demands are met. Nor can such situations be settled on a political basis. Highways last too long and serve too many people to be influenced by current local contests.

STATE RESPONSIBILITY IS BASIC

A State's responsibility is to promote the welfare of the residents of all municipalities within its boundaries. By law, this responsibility is executed in the realm of highway transportation by the State highway department or an equivalent agency.

The experience in many States of seeing local groups trek to Washington to appeal a highway department's plan is no longer a novelty. Too often such groups reflect attitudes that may not be in harmony with the majority's views and needs. We have found Washington departments understanding and good listeners when visited by local groups. They have also urged such local groups to work out issues on the spot with the State highway departments rather than at the national level.

This procedure, of centering the responsibility upon the State governments, has worked well as regards highways. It should be equally applicable to the field of intrastate railroad transportation. In this area the problem of diminishing commuter passenger service is worrisome. It normally is particularly a local or regional problem. Where the crossing of State lines is involved, as in the vast New York and Philadelphia metropolitan regions, agencies already created by the States in combination with one another usually are available to assure that the jobs can be handled.

COORDINATION AND PARTNERSHIP

Increased Federal aid to the railroads must come. But the decisions on how to fit this financial support into well-integrated transportation systems—incorporating the facilities of both rail and rubber—must be made by agencies responsible to the State governments.

In the same way, the Federal Government must provide the means by which the agencies, at all levels of government, responsible for urban renewal and redevelopment, can coordinate their efforts with those responsible for transportation. Here I would add insistence that State and local authorities accomplish their utmost under their own steam, rather than sit back and impose the entire problem on the Federal Government.

In short, the existing Federal-State partnership in the effort to provide new and improved highway transportation should be preserved, and it should be extended to the effort providing better mass transit facilities—on the same terms.

CRUX OF THE RAIL PROBLEM

Recognition that mass transit must be a major part of any solution to the traffic strangulation plaguing our urban areas has gained ground rapidly in recent years. Municipalities and regions threatened with loss of the rail service they had taken for granted

over a period many decades suddenly have awakened to its value.

But the problem of how to curb the slow rot that had set in, how to modernize the existing rail facilities, and how to integrate them in a well-planned transportation system has seemed financially insurmountable. There has been no lack of complicated and expensive plans, advanced by "experts" and commuter groups; the only thing missing has been the money to pay for them.

NEW JERSEY'S EXPERIENCE

Experience in New Jersey has shown that a State agency, in this case the railroad transportation division of the State highway department, can do the job if given adequate legislative support. The most essential rail commuter service has been preserved under a system of contracts with the carriers. Action taken in cooperation with the State of New York has cleared the path for rehabilitation and efficient operation of a vital interstate facility, the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad. Comprehensive plans have been developed for construction of new facilities to link all of the North Jersey commuter railroads, and thus provide proper transportation for the thousands of workers who travel between the two States every day. In south Jersey, action in cooperation with the State of Pennsylvania has likewise provided for expansion of rail commuter service in the Camden-Philadelphia metropolitan area. All of the progress so far has been without the assistance of Federal funds and without imposing an added tax burden upon the people of the States at interest.

The key to success in the effort outlined above was, of course, "adequate legislative support." The railroad industry had for decades been regulated as a profitmaking monopoly. The legislation which authorized passenger service contracts in New Jersey also turned much of this regulatory power over to the agency responsible for executing the contracts—the highway department. The highway department has also been designated as the prime mover in negotiations between States involving the transportation activities of bi-State agencies.

Without such authority, no State agency can do much more than merely advance its point of view. With it, the decisions which must precede action can be made.

THE STATE'S SHARE IN FINANCING

To implement the highway department's transit plans for New Jersey, further legislative action will be required. While these plans are based on full utilization of existing facilities in the most economical manner possible, large expenditures ultimately will be necessary. Neither the Federal Government, nor the railroads themselves, nor interstate agencies financed by tolls, nor a combination of any of them can be depended upon to bear the entire burden of financing the needed improvements. This situation is not confined solely to New Jersey.

Here again, the State government comes to the fore. Past history has shown that local governments are unwilling to contribute ready cash for transportation facilities, particularly those which extend beyond municipal boundaries. It is evident that the States will have to assume a large part of the financial responsibility.

Thus it becomes the duty of the States transportation agencies not only to develop plans for providing adequate rail transportation, but also to recommend the best way to finance these plans. In all likelihood, such recommendations will in the future contemplate contributions by both State and Federal Governments as well as by the carriers.

WORKING WITH LOCALITIES

In the background of this situation, we see renewed activity by many local and regional citizens' groups concerned with the details of urban renewal, transportation, and most of all, overall planning. The interest of these groups, their studies and recommendations, are a welcome and worthwhile addition to the activities of the State agencies which have been given the responsibility for developing and executing transportation improvements.

Knowledge of what the local communities need and want, of how proposed highways and transit lines will fit into the local scheme of things, is essential to the State; it is being acquired by both parties jointly considering each area's needs. It forms the base for decisions by the executive as well as the legislative branches of the government.

Too often self-formed groups, rather than the people's duly elected representatives, seek to put themselves in the position of charting the course and making the decisions. This cannot be permitted, for such groups neither provide the funds nor are able to spend them. As the responsibility rests with the State governments, so must the authority.

KEY ASPECTS

State governments can provide the kind of coordinated highway and rail transportation (particularly mass transit) that is so urgently needed by our urban areas. As we see it:

The railroad industry as a national institution should remain in the hands of private ownership and should be prevented from moving, by default, into the shifting quicksands of public ownership and operation.

States must recognize that railroads are no longer monopoly utilities and should adopt a modernized set of rules to recognize their situation.

The cost of providing rail transit service should be reduced through technological efforts.

Labor should make its contribution if for no other reason than to protect its employment opportunities.

The State transportation agency entrusted with the task of providing well coordinated transportation facilities for the public should avoid the complacent hands-off attitude of the past, as well as the stringent regulation which comes with public operation.

It is the job of the State agency, and not always an easy one, to act as mediator among the various and sometimes conflicting interests of the transportation industry. Carriers of all types must be persuaded to work together. The convenience of the commuter who catches the 7:05 each morning must be maintained, as well as that of the commuter who relies on his private car.

The most positive thing the State can do is let the mass transit carriers know, in no uncertain terms, that they have not been abandoned. Let the railroads know that a State agency is vitally interested in helping them to get back on the road to economic health, and that they are supported by legislative authority and appropriations, and you will witness a remarkable change in the current attitude of railroads and their willingness to help themselves. In New Jersey, the major commuter railroads have begun to think in terms of helping themselves, and have cooperated in preparation of the highway department's transit program.

Once this has been accomplished, the technicians can get down to work drafting the detailed plans. Commuter railroad stations should be shifted, if necessary, to serve the present centers of population, and suburban stations should be located where ample parking is available. Schedules should be revised to tie in with bus movements. Duplicate and unnecessary service should be eliminated by providing transfers between lines.

It has been said that the commuter passenger service business will never be a paying one. Whether this is true or not, only time can tell. Meantime, it is the function of the State government to help keep the transit lines alive by eliminating operating costs wherever possible without curtailing essential service. It is that simple.

Numerous new modes of transportation are currently offered as substitutes for existing travel facilities. All cost real money; they have yet to prove their effectiveness, and if adopted would mean scrapping all existing facilities and the securities behind them. Moreover, we must still determine if the public will return to mass transit. Let us, accordingly, "half sole and heel" what we have, and give it a try.

LEADER OF THE TEAM

What is the role of State government in solving the transportation problems of our urban areas? It is to be the leader of the team, the quarterback. The solution is not beyond our reach, but we cannot reach it by grasping at butterflies. State government has a tremendous stake in providing safe, convenient, and speedy transportation facilities. Without them, our economic life must wither away. More than that, State governments have the responsibility, the knowledge and the experience needed to build and maintain the essential arteries of commerce. No commissions, no council or committee, can substitute for the State in assuming the responsibility of enlightened public officials for the job at hand.

What's Wrong in Our State Department?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an excellent editorial edited by Mr. E. L. (Ted) Burwell, manager, radio station WTYC, Rock Hill, S.C. I might comment on the happy fact that this editorial received much favorable comment from the listeners and I am happy to bring it to the attention of the Nation in this manner.

The editorial is as follows:

WHAT'S WRONG IN OUR STATE DEPARTMENT?

Russia's latest scorching rebuke against the United States involving another U–2 flight, which they allege violates Russian air zones, is being met with dismay in the minds of many Americans—and for these reasons. Again the Russians have put us in a position of trying to justify ourselves and our actions in the eyes of the world—making us look like warmongers and aggressors. The average American citizen, we believe, is tired of these verbal attacks and threats by the Russian Government. What's wrong in our State Department when we sit idly by while Russia does what she wants to do and continually indulges in acts of aggression against the United States. While at the same time, the President reports to our people, as in the Cuban situation, that, at the present time, there doesn't seem to be too much cause for alarm concerning Russian technical and military help to Cuba. The United Press International reported that Soviet citizens reacted with "shock and dismay" at the disclosure of another U–2 flight. The American people have long been shocked and dismayed at Russian aggression against the free world. But we continue to wage a "no win" cold war while Russia piles up propaganda victories. We ask ourselves: "Is this Russian aid to Cuba an act of friend-

ship on Russia's part?" "No", we say. It is an act of aggression of the worst kind, making our U–2 flights look like childs play in comparison. President Kennedy reported to the American people:

"There is no evidence of Communist bloc combat troops or other significant offensive capability."

The Russian note to the United States with reference to the U–2 flight stated that the incident was a "deliberate provocation." They warned of possible retaliatory attacks on foreign bases where U–2's are stationed and demanded "immediate measures to prevent future violations of Soviet airspace."

The recent incident at the Berlin wall of shame found us sadly lacking also, and to our Berlin allies we lost face. Russian "fishing" boats just off our coastline recently—and we could go on listing Russian acts of aggression. Are we so dumb that we cannot fight a propaganda war also? Can we not also blister, and we mean blister, the Russians verbally for these acts of aggression and play them up to their full significance and make our rebukes ring throughout the world? Where is our backbone? The Cuban situation should have never risen to today's proportions. We should have taken a stand at the Berlin wall of shame. We should have ordered the Russian boats off our coastline. Let's not play games; we know those so-called "fishing" boats were fishing for bigger game and so does our State Department. All of these "should haves." Must we always seem to cower at the growl of the Russian bear? Will we sit by and let the Russians literally camp on our doorstep while the State Department and President Kennedy say they are no threat?

We're proud to be Americans and most of us had not rather be "Red than dead." So to the State Department and President Kennedy we plead—let's let the Russians know in no uncertain terms that we're proud of what we have and that we plan to keep it that way. Let's fight propaganda with propaganda. Khrushchev is not afraid to call us "American warmongers" and "despised capitalists" while our State Department trembles that we may offend the Russians in some way by what we say.

There are bills being introduced in Congress for a full-scale investigation of the State Department. We sincerely hope we don't wait too late.

Repeal Counterpart Privileges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be widespread agreement among the Members of the House that something should be done to prevent repetitions of abuses in the use of counterpart funds by those who travel abroad.

With that in mind, I have today introduced a bill which prohibits the use in the future of counterpart funds by committees, Members of Congress, or employees. Apparently the only way to prevent abuses is to stop the privilege completely. There are means of financing legitimate and essential travel expenses without using counterpart funds, and retain better surveillance and control over the money spent for such purposes.

It is my hope that the committee will explore this subject thoroughly.

Housing and Urban Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the President in his budget message requested funds to enable the Housing and Home Finance Agency—the fourth largest agency of the Government in terms of expenditures—to undertake a series of important research studies in such areas as the inflation of land prices in urban areas, the development of satellite towns, ways of achieving greater efficiency in providing community services, the construction of shell homes, and so forth.

The distinguished Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS of New Jersey has been fighting a losing battle to obtain the funds needed for such a project.

Mr. Speaker, the Passaic Herald-News in an editorial of September 4, 1962, makes some very cogent comments on the efforts of Senator WILLIAMS, noting the enormous disparity in the sums provided for agricultural research and the sums provided for housing and urban research. I join with the Herald-News in hoping that some day the Congress will eventually recognize and cope with the urgent problems of urban growth that face such heavily urbanized States as New Jersey.

The editorial follows:

[From the Passaic (N.J.) Herald-News]

MILLIONS FOR FARMS, THOUSANDS FOR CITIES

A complaint by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey has merit. He says that $150 million is being appropriated for farm research this year, whereas the most that Congress seems ready to give for sorely needed urban research is $375,000.

The Senator has gone over the plans to spend the $150 million carefully. He finds such items as "$281,000 to accelerate research on avian leukosis * * * $25,000 to strengthen research on dried peas and lentils * * * $100,000 to intensify research on soybean breeding."

"I am not opposing this research," he says. All he wants is a little more consideration for the need for more information about the Nation's urban areas, in which the majority of the American people now live.

Just as farm research provides knowledge that enables the American farmer to produce food in abundance, so Senator WILLIAMS believes that information about such subjects as interstate mortgage lending, construction and financing of shell homes, and development of satellite towns would "give us a better understanding of where we are going, or * * * insure the maximum benefit to the taxpayer from all the expenditures that are going into brick and mortar."

The Congress will eventually come around to see the Senator's point of view. Senator WILLIAMS needs only to be patient. The farm people have been tapping the Federal till for research funds for more than a century and they have become expert at it. And to be fair, they have made the research pay off in a better life for all Americans.

Urban research could be just as productive of good results. Senator WILLIAMS should keep up the campaign.

Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg—Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for the past 19 months, we have witnessed a truly commendable series of accomplishments amassed in the Department of Labor's endeavor to fend off inflationary settlements between labor and management and to prevent strikes, and moreover, in its effort to allay the fears and suspicions of both toward each other. In a large sense, this enviable record of achievement has been a reflection of the time and energies spent by that great American, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, to make certain that union and business officials remain ever conscious of their respective responsibilities to not only the public interest, but to the economic growth of the country as well. To be sure, Arthur Goldberg has been one of the most active Secretaries of Labor that the Department has ever known.

In the role of peacemaker, Arthur Goldberg has helped to solve a goodly number of labor disputes, notably the one of steel. From the very outset of his career as Labor Secretary, he regarded any big and threatened strike as a challenge, and as we have seen, he has invariably moved into the thick of the labor-management line of fire. He has done so as the basic key for the successful realization of the administration's policy of wage-price restraint. Without Arthur Goldberg, an early and noninflationary steel settlement this year would have been put in doubt.

Now that Arthur Goldberg's service as Labor Chief is quickly drawing to a close, I feel it necessary to express my regret over losing his extraordinary talent and dynamic capability from the Kennedy administration. I support his appointment to the Nation's highest tribunal. His appointment to the Supreme Court will bring to it a capacity for abstract reasoning of difficult issues. In addition, it will bring to the Court a vigor for objectivity and restraint which are necessary qualities a jurist must possess. If past performance can be said to accurately gage future levels of achievement, then it may be said that Arthur J. Goldberg will undoubtedly be one of the High Court's most energetic and vigorous members.

An eminent and successful practitioner of the law, Arthur Goldberg first became renowned as one of the country's leading labor lawyers. He embarked on his legal profession during the hardship period of the 1930's, and became first identified with labor law when he took on the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union as a client. In 1948, he was chosen by the late Philip Murray to serve as general counsel for both the old Congress of Industrial Organizations and the United Steelworkers. With the former, he served until 1955 when it was merged with the American Federation of Labor, an event in which he was quite instrumental in effecting; with the latter, he served until 1961. After the 1955 merger, Goldberg became special counsel to AFL–CIO and general counsel to its industrial-union department, serving in this capacity until 1961. With his association with the labor movement, he was acknowledged as being the author of the standards for organized labor that separated the good from the bad unions; those standards took the form of the AFL–CIO's Code of Ethical Practices. Besides this, he coauthored the constitution of the new AFL–CIO, an accomplishment regarded by many as the greatest achievement in the labor field.

When he first took over his duties at Labor, it was generally felt that Secretary Goldberg would be the spokesman for the organized labor movement in the Kennedy administration. The words and deeds, the level of performance of the Secretary of Labor have pointed out the ridiculousness of this supposition. Instead of serving as a functionary of labor, he has served as a dedicated public servant with a keen interest in the primacy of the national interest in labor-management affairs.

I feel quite certain that the dedication of Arthur Goldberg to the public interest that has been characteristic for the past year and a half during his service as Secretary of Labor will follow him to his new assignment to the High Court. In addition, he takes with him to his new position a credence in the very real need to extend Government activity in order to fulfill the complex requisites of a growing American industrial society.

And so at this time I reiterate my commendation of the President's choice of Arthur J. Goldberg as the new Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. His wealth of legal talents and capacities, along with his integrity and character, will do much, I believe, to make Arthur Goldberg an indispensable member of the Court.

Monroe Doctrine Is Challenged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Senate very strong and eloquent editorial comments on our policies in regard to Cuba and the Communist cancer which is growing there day by day. The editorial is entitled "Monroe Doctrine Is Challenged," and was published in the September 6, 1962, issue of the Greenville News. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Sept. 6, 1962]

MONROE DOCTRINE IS CHALLENGED

"The American Continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subject for future colonization by any European power.

"We could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing (the former colonies) or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any light other than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States"—President James Monroe in a special message to Congress delivered on December 2, 1823.

In these words nearly 140 years ago were expressed the heart of the Monroe Doctrine which bears the name of the President who first stated the American policy of opposing intervention by any European power in the affairs of any nation in the Western Hemisphere.

During the interim, the policy has been invoked and even expanded by a succession of Presidents who found it necessary to issue firm warnings or to take direct action (even using military force) to prevent:

(1) Intervention, meddling or a direct takeover of power in a Latin American country by a European country, or

(2) A deterioration of political or economic conditions in one of those countries which would make it easy for a foreign power from the Eastern Hemisphere to move in either insidiously or overtly.

Time and space do not permit a discussion of how many times and by what methods the Monroe Doctrine has been invoked. But there has been many such times, some of them more recently than most people realize, and each time the action has been at least temporarily successful—up to now.

The matter of momentous and grave concern right now is the fact that the situation in Cuba presents the greatest challenge to the Monroe Doctrine and American policy in the history of the principle enunciated by President Monroe and probably the gravest problem the Nation has faced, short of a major war, in its history.

With the acquiesence of Fidel Castro's government, or because of its impotence to resist, the Soviet Union is engaged in moving into Cuba in force, through both political influence and the power of troops and modern weapons. And it is senseless to pretend that Russia is merely assisting Cuba at its request to set its governmental and economic house in order, or that the weapons and technicians known to have been landed there are for purely defensive purposes.

The plain fact is that the Soviet Union is deliberately violating both of the principal parts of the Monroe Doctrine as quoted above.

The Communists may claim that they do not intend to make of Cuba a Russian colony, but that is nothing more than red dialectics, a play on words. For, at least, Cuba will be turned into a Soviet satellite after the fashion of the Iron Curtain countries—unless the move is stopped. What is this if it is not colonialism and imperialism in its grossest and most aggressive form?

Khrushchev and company may claim that their purpose is merely to help Cuba defend itself from aggression on the part of the United States and the other countries of Latin America. But even the most naive pacifist knows that the same troops and weapons ostensibly recruited and manufactured for defense also can be used for offense.

No Latin American country is strong enough to invade its nearest neighbor, much less to mount a water or airborne offensive against Cuba. And the United States has given no overt indications that it plans to invade Cuba and throw Castro out—up to now, that is—although it has made no move to stop refugees and soldiers of fortune from making abortive attempts.

The conclusion is obvious:

If present developments continue, the Soviet Union soon will have established in Cuba, less than 100 miles from the southernmost coast of the United States, a bastion, a beachhead from which it can threaten anything from a small invasion of Florida to a missile attack on any part of the United States.

It is ironic that the Monroe Doctrine was aimed primarily at Russia at the time of its enunciation and during its period of formulation which reached back in time before the Monroe administration.

From the earliest days of the American Republic, Russia has had designs on the North American continent. The czars, who were imperialists in much the same sense that the Communists are imperialists now, made several attempts to establish colonies in Alaska, mainly because of the fishing and fur industries.

In 1821, the czar issued a ukase forbidding vessels of any other country to approach within 100 miles of the northwestern coast of North America. The United States resisted this and war was avoided only by the negotiations which culminated in the purchase of Alaska from a czar who was hard up for cash.

At about the same time, the United States was fearful that an unholy alliance which included Russia, Prussia and, yes, France which for a time held a foothold in Mexico, would attempt to gain for themselves the colonies which Spain had lost or was rapidly losing.

So, Russia, under two different but strikingly similar sets of tyrants, has been a constant threat to the security of the Western Hemisphere and, hence, to that of the United States. The primary purpose of the Monroe Doctrine was not to protect weaker countries out of altruism but to protect our own country from just what is happening now.

In years past, the United States has been able to enforce the principle by adroit diplomacy and well-timed action. Cuba is not the first Latin American country to be threatened by Communist infiltration as late as the last decade. But the Reds have been checkmated or submerged elsewhere.

Cuba is another matter entirely and it presents new complications. Our diplomacy in this instance has been inept and such action as we have taken has been both halfhearted and shamefully ill timed.

President Kennedy has said this country will do what is necessary to prevent aggression by Cuba with its newly acquired arms. But when he says Cuba he means the Soviet Union.

The problem, or perhaps it is more of a dilemma, is quite apparent. The methods by which it can be solved are not so clear. In the days of Monroe and of his successors up until recent years, such things were simpler to handle.

Now we have to contend with the fact that, with few exceptions, the countries of Latin America are incapable of governing them-

selves. They have been stabilized either by dictators or by powerful military cliques which have kept the heads of the so-called republics in line.

And we also must find a way to reconcile our commitments to the United Nations and to the Organization of American States, for we have pledged ourselves to avoid intervening in the affairs of other countries. So, it isn't as simple to do something as it is to say that we should send troops and planes and weapons into Cuba and throw the rascals out.

What, then, to do?

By all means—at the very least and at once—we should demand that the U.N. and the OAS convene in extraordinary session, at the same time or successively, to take concerted action to counter what can be defined only as an act of aggression. We should demand, at the very least, sanctions against the Soviet Union and the Castro regime.

Failing that, we must consider unilateral action, up to and including the force of arms.

For the United States cannot tolerate the present situation in Cuba and the further developments which can be easily predicted if we do nothing.

St. Louis Meets an Education Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Merrimon Cuninggim, executive director of the Danforth Foundation of St. Louis, Mo., was the guest editorialist for the May 12, 1962, issue of the Saturday Review. Mr. Cuninggim's article tells of the establishment of the Educational Council for Responsible Citizenship composed of the St. Louis County public school system, the private schools of the area, the Catholic and Lutheran parochial schools and the area's two universities, Washington University and St. Louis University.

The author feels that the real significance of the group, apart from its purpose, is the joining of public, private, and parochial schools for a cooperative educational program—this is the first time they have joined in such an endeavor.

The purpose of the council, as Cuninggim notes, is to "enable the schools to do a better job of educating their students in an understanding of America, an awareness of the dangers we face at home and abroad, and an appreciation of the meaning and marks of freedom in our society."

This is a pilot project in a joint endeavor to face up to a national problem, a project which, if successful, has ramifications that could be evidenced in the curriculums of our school systems throughout the country. I believe this constructive effort deserves recognition and I am placing Mr. Cuninggim's editorial from the May 12 Saturday Review in the RECORD to more fully explain it:

ST. LOUIS MEETS A PROBLEM

(By Merrimon Cuninggim)

At least one good thing can be said for the present crop of know-nothings. Sometimes they wake the educators up.

In many a place across the land schools and colleges have been under raucous attack—they use dangerous books, they examine alien ideas, they probably harbor Communists. But every time a State legislature gets pushed into requiring its high schools to provide a course on communism, educators become alert to the invasion and determined to fend off the efforts of propagandists. Every time a vigilante spreads his—or her—suspicion in the PTA, the schoolmen respond, sometimes in fright, always in self-analysis, often in constructive action.

But two other alarms have also waked up the educators. The second negative one is the real, as distinct from the imagined or under-the-bed, threat of communism. Schoolmen have begun to realize that they are indeed vulnerable to the charge that their students have not been sufficiently informed about the nature of the Communist ideology and the spread and power of its system. Even when a legislature has not invaded the school's domain, the educators themselves have been eager to repair this deficiency in their programs. Solid instruction about communism, perhaps not in a separate course—at least not on the high school level—but certainly in the regular curriculum, is long overdue.

The third factor is the only affirmative one, and the most powerful. The chief reason that schools and colleges want to provide better instruction in civic understanding is not fear and distaste either of the far right or of the far left, but is the positive belief in the idea of America, the meaning of freedom, the value of a democratic society. That students do not sufficiently understand and appreciate these is now everywhere recognized. The handwringing stage is passing fast; educators are hard at work in a number of ways—overcoming their embarrassment at the use of simplicities in language that the general public will applaud, retooling their courses of study, upgrading the teaching of democracy's meaning and its denials, and striking common cause.

An illustration of this new mood and activity on the part of educators is furnished by recent happenings in metropolitan St. Louis. A year ago things were rocking along pretty much as usual—no special attention paid to communism, a few pseudopatriots buzzing around, and faith in America pretty much taken for granted. But an uneasiness among the educators themselves, sparked perhaps by a local anticommunism "school" last spring, produced a willingness among representatives of various educational agencies to talk about the problem informally. Through the summer and fall their conversations removed initial distrust of others' motives, provided for exchanges of similar experiences, fears and hopes, and produced a desire for a cooperative program.

Accordingly, announcement was made in December of the formation of an agency which they called the Educational Council for Responsible Citizenship. Its constituent members at the time of formation were the public school systems of St. Louis County (including some of the strongest small systems in the country), the private schools of the area, the Catholic parochial schools, the Lutheran parochial schools, St. Louis University, and Washington University. Never before had this group of institutions come together for a cooperative educational program; and apart from the particular task to which they pledged their common effort, their very cooperation was a significant departure from customary unilateral action.

This is reflected in the first slate of officers: Chairman of the Council Herbert Schooling, superintendent of Webster Groves public schools; Vice Chairman Thomas Eliot, chancellor elect, Washington University; Father Robert Henle, dean of the Graduate School, St. Louis University; Treasurer Paul Lange, superintendent of Lutheran high schools. The council's first executive secretary was recently chosen: R. M. Inbody, presently assistant superintendent for the St. Louis public schools.

The council has already developed an ambitious program of analysis of existing curricula and teaching resources, locally and nationally, and a varied group of projects to improve their current efforts. Each project is administered by one or more of the constituent member institutions of the council, under the general aegis of the total group; every project must be submitted to and approved by the council as a whole. Some of the projects are: Two 6-week summer study institutes for selected high school civics teachers, one on freedom, the other on communism, offered by St. Louis University; an intensive 5-week summer seminar for gifted high school students on the principles of American democracy, offered by Washington University; a workshop in American and un-American ideologies, for high school teachers of various subjects, sponsored jointly by the public, Catholic, and Lutheran school systems of St. Louis; a continuing study by 18 or 20 high school social science teachers of syllabi and bibliographical materials, sponsored by the county public school systems. The general response can be gauged by the excellent attendance at a series of 12 late afternoon lectures on "Freedom Under Law" arranged by the Bill of Rights Committee of the Bar Association of St. Louis as its contribution to the program of the council (of which the bar association, along with two or three other community groups, is an associate member); a total of 125 high school teachers have actually attended these lectures for graduate credit.

The point of it all, of course, is to enable the local schools and colleges to do a better job of educating their students in an understanding of America, an awareness of the dangers we face at home and abroad, and an appreciation of the meaning and marks of freedom in our society. Those who would argue that this could easily become indoctrination and propaganda would find ready agreement among the educators of St. Louis—and this is why they mean to keep this task in their own hands. But those who would argue that this is not the proper business of education at all (yet are there really any such these days?) would provoke strenuous rebuttal from the local group. They believe that we Americans are long overdue for a genuinely educational effort at building an informed, inspirited, and responsible citizenry.

Thus, backed by generous local support, the Educational Council for Responsible Citizenship is making a conscientious try in St. Louis at meeting and solving what is, surely, a national problem. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat editorialized, "The council can be a positive force for good, and set a pattern here in St. Louis which eventually, we hope, might be emulated in countless cities and communities throughout the Nation." And the St. Louis Post-Dispatch said: "The schools are wise to emphasize the positive side of American life in this way. The Nation will be more secure when more of its citizens understand what it stands for."

The Drain on Our Gold Supply Threatens the Security of Every Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the continued policies of fiscal irresponsibility being followed by this administration cause a constant drain on our gold supply and pose a permanent threat to the value of our dollar. The end result will be tragedy for every citizen of this country and it's time the people do something to halt the wild spending of President Kennedy.

The following column by Lyle C. Wilson in the Washington Daily News should be read by every Member of Congress and every American citizen:

MORE DOLLAR GOSSIP
(By Lyle C. Wilson)

Americans who are condemned to earn and spend a dollar which continues slowly to shrink in value are not alone in questioning the stability of U.S. money.

There is gossip abroad that the United States will be compelled soon to devalue the dollar officially in its relationship to the price of gold. There is more than gossip. There is the fact that Europe's central bankers are so doubtful of the paper dollar's staying power that some prefer not to hold dollars in their vaults as a backing for their own currencies. Many of them prefer to hold gold.

U.S. citizens may not exchange their paper dollars for gold. F.D.R. withdrew that privilege in 1933 in the process of taking the United States off the gold standard. Foreign governments' central banks, however, can exchange for gold the dollars they accumulate. Foreign nationals who gain dollars in trade with the United States may exchange those dollars through the banks.

When a foreigner exchanges an accumulation of U.S. dollars for U.S. gold, that foreigner has protected himself against a further slide in the dollar's real value, its purchasing power. Most especially, he has protected himself against any action by the United States to devalue the paper dollar by increasing the price at which the U.S. Treasury will exchange U.S. gold for U.S. dollars.

The gold price fixed by F.D.R. in 1933 was $35 an ounce. This was the effect of reducing the value of the dollar in terms of gold from 100 cents to 59 cents. President Kennedy found it necessary some weeks ago firmly to deny any intention of hiking the price of gold and thereby reducing the gold value of the U.S. dollar.

Perhaps the President will find it necessary to repeat that denial this month when the Governors of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development meet here. The date is September 17.

The mere fact that Mr. Kennedy has had to deny once and may need to deny again that he intends to devalue the dollar is disquieting evidence the U.S. dollar is sick. The necessary remedies are obvious but difficult.

One remedy would be to prevent the further rotting of the paper dollar by the process of currency inflation. This dollar rotting is caused in large part by bigtime Government spending beyond revenues with ensuing Treasury deficits.

Another remedy would be an adjustment of the U.S. balance of trade with all the world so that at the end of a trading year the balance would be in favor of instead of against the United States. When the balance of trade is against the United States, foreigners accumulate dollars or other claims against the United States in excess of any currencies or claims against foreigners that may have been accumulated by the United States.

This excess of foreign claims in dollars and otherwise against the United States represents a potential direct or indirect drain on U.S. gold stocks. The American Institute for Economic Research calculates that foreign claims of all kinds against U.S. gold now exceed the total of U.S. gold stocks by $1.9 billion.

The almighty dollar is in a bad way at home and abroad although the voters seem not to know or, maybe, to care.

A Plan for the Solution of the Macedonian Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a communication which I have received from the Macedonian Patriotic Organization of the U.S.A. and Canada, presenting a plan for a solution of the Macedonian question.

The declaration follows:

FOR A SOLUTION OF THE MACEDONIAN QUESTION

Macedonia occupies the very center of the Balkan Peninsula and comprises a country of about 25,000 square miles with a population of almost 3 million people. For over five decades she has been the bone of contention not only among the neighboring states of Yugoslavia, Greece, and Bulgaria, but among some European powers as well. On numerous occasions the Balkan countries have resorted to war for the possession of Macedonia and it has been, and still is, the cause for friction, antagonism and mistrust among the Balkan peoples.

The Bucharest Treaty of 1913, which precluded the Second Balkan War, unjustly and arbitrarily divided Macedonia between Greece, Yugoslavia (then Serbia), and Bulgaria and this very artificial political settlement, loaded with explosives, was sanctioned by the Paris Peace Treaty of 1919 and thus, instead of settling the most crying problem of the Balkans, the peacemakers of Bucharest and Paris created a more acute political problem and placed the people of Macedonia under an oppression which is a disgrace for our 20th century civilization.

The treaties that followed the World War II did not alleviate the situation in Macedonia. The country remained divided and oppressed. The noble stipulations of the Atlantic Charter like the 14 points of President Wilson 20 years before, remained a dead letter as far as Macedonia is concerned.

The Communist regime of Yugoslavia treats it spart of Macedonia like a conquered territory. It has imposed severe police decrees which are steadily destroying the cultural, religious, and economic life of the people. To expediate the serbianization of the Macedono-Bulgarians they have created by decree a new Macedonian language. The Communist Party and its enormous secret police are the sole governing body of the country and they control the life of the people in every possible way. All criticism of the regime and of Tito is strictly prohibited and when discovered it is treated as treason. One has only to mention the name of Milovan Djilas to illustrate the point and in Yugoslavia there are thousands of others who like Djilas have been thrown in jail because they dared utter a few critical words of the regime. In Macedonia under Yugoslav rule there is no freedom of religion whatsoever and most of the oldest Bulgarian churches are either closed or turned into museums. As in every country under Communist domination, the church is completely subjugated to the State. All church functionaries, who do not abide by the Communist approved rules, are jailed or persecuted. In order to expedite the serbianization of christened as Macedonian Orthodox Church the people the centuries old Bulgarian Orthodox Churches in Macedonia were rechristened as Macedonian Orthodox Churches and placed under the rule of the Serbian patriarch.

Public meetings and freedom of speech are strictly prohibited in that unfortunate part of Macedonia which is under the Tito regime. However, to impress the politically gullible foreigners and foreign representatives, when necessary, the government agents organize such meetings on a grand scale. The purpose of these meetings is to show the people's devotion to the regime in general and dictator Tito in particular. Private enterprise is almost nonexistent in Macedonia under Yugoslav rule. And in spite of false stories emanating from Belgrade, the economic noose becomes tighter not looser. This is especially true in Macedonia which the Belgrade regime treats like a subjugated colony.

In spite of historic facts and treaties, which it has signed in the past, the Greek Government persists in its refusal to recognize the existence of Bulgarian speaking people in Macedonia. The hundreds of Bulgarian schools and churches which flourished in that part of the country during the Turkish regime prior to 1912 have been taken over and closed by the Greek administration. The people are forced to pray and to study the Greek language and not the Bulgarian which has been the language of these people for many centuries. We maintain that an international inquiry commission at any time could verify the presence of Bulgarian speaking people in Macedonia under Greek rule.

In the part of Macedonia which is now under the rule of Communist Bulgaria the inhabitants are subjected to all the terror and arbitrary laws which characterize the governments behind the Iron Curtain. The people cannot participate in activities which the government considers contrary to its policies. The one-party rule in Bulgaria does not allow any divergent political activity and the press and radio are exclusively in the hands of the ruling Communist Party.

Thus, nearly 20 years after the Second World War, the establishment of the United Nations, the proclamation of the universal declaration of human rights and the European Convention on Human Rights, the Macedonian question—the powder keg of the Balkans—remains unsolved, Macedonia continues to be divided and her people to be subjected to forceful denationalization. At this propitious time of history, when the world has seen the emergency into statehood of many Asian and African nations, it is a crying injustice that Macedonia should still be divided and oppressed. The world must remember that nearly 23 centuries ago she spread her name in the glaring pages of history and that she was the first among the

European nations to open the door to Christianity. To avoid new disturbances in that part of Europe and to put an end to the oppression under which our brothers and sisters live in Macedonia today, the nations of the world must act, and act quickly. They should not remain indifferent to the plight of the Macedonian people.

What is the best possible solution of the Macedonian question?

Guided by the cause of peace and brotherly understanding among all people the 41st Annual Convention of the Macedonian Patriotic Organizations of the United States and Canada, held September 2, 3, and 4 in Buffalo, N.Y., deems it as its imperative duty to propose this simple and best suited solution of the Macedonian problem:

Give the Macedonian people the right to govern themselves, to organize the country into an independent State of Macedonia, to create a Switzerland of the Balkans. The creation of an independent Macedonia State will unite all freedom-loving people in the country and will eliminate the bone of contention among the Balkan peoples. This in itself will be a great contribution toward European and universal peace.

To facilitate this solution of the Macedonian problem we recommend as a first step that the three divided parts of Macedonia be place temporarily under the protectorate of the United Nations and we are certain that the people in Macedonia will cooperate fully with such United Nations Commission. A few years after this, when the United Nations Commission deems it is the right time, a free plebiscite, under United Nations supervision should determine the future organization of an independent Macedonia with equal rights and equal obligations for all its inhabitants.

We believe this to be the only and just solution of the Macedonian question and urge all men of peace and good will to help us attain it.

Very Rev. VASIL MIHAILOFF,
Convention Chairman.
DAN THEODOROFF,
Secretary.

United States Won't Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a disturbing reaction of the Soviet, is reported by Robert Frost, the poet, who says that Khrushchev thinks we will not fight for principle.

Ever since President Kennedy assumed office he has talked big and acted little.

In its usual, hard-hitting fashion, the New York Daily News expresses its concern for our pussyfootedness.

The article follows:

KHRUSH: "UNITED STATES WON'T FIGHT"

Chattering to reporters at Idlewild Sunday after a 10-day tour in Russia, the poet, Robert Frost, inserted his foot several times, it seemed to us, in his mouth.

One thing the 88-year-old New Englander said, though, keeps worrying us.

Mr. Frost reported that N. S. Khrushchev told him that the United States is too loaded with liberals to fight for anything.

This, though the Kennedy administration satisfied itself long ago that it had convinced the Red Hitler of U.S. willingness and ability to fight for Western Allied rights in West Berlin.

Apparently Khrushchev isn't yet convinced. That could account for his renewed threats to West Berlin, and for his brassy impudence in publicly admitting that he is beefing up Communist Cuba.

Hence, it seems to us that the administration, in hope of insuring continued peace, should redouble its efforts to show Khrushchev that we mean business.

How about some Berlin and Cuba moves which Khrushchev will scream are aggressive and imperialistic, but which will hammer into his skull the realization that when we say we'll fight we mean we'll fight?

The Federal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the postal and Federal employee pay bill is one of the most important measures remaining for consideration by the 87th Congress.

During my 14 years in Congress I have always favored bringing Federal employees' salaries in line with those paid by private industry.

We are still far from that goal.

As President Kennedy said in his special message on Federal pay reform:

Federal salaries generally do not compare favorably and cannot compete successfully with private industry.

Every objective study—

The President continued—

demonstrated that salaried Government employees at almost every work level receive less compensation, on a national average basis, than private employees performing similar work.

In certain areas of Federal employment the servant of all the people—which is exactly what the Federal employee is—has fallen behind other occupational groups so far as his financial status is concerned.

We can all remember the time when the postal employee, for example, was considered to have one of the best jobs in his community. Now, however, even a carrier who has reached the top step of grade 4 after 25 years of postal service still earns less than the amount which the Bureau of Labor Statistics considers necessary for a family of 4 in 20 leading cities and their suburban areas.

Over the years I have become personally acquainted with hundreds of postal employees and their families. These people perform a vital service and should be paid accordingly.

I hope, therefore, that we soon will have an opportunity to consider H.R. 9531, the pay bill sponsored by our colleague, Mr. MORRISON, which recently was ordered reported favorably by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

This bill contains many of the pay reforms requested by the President but it provides more adequate compensation for several employee groups, particularly rural mail carriers and classified employees in the lower grades, than the administration's original proposal.

Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1962, I introduced H.R. 10340 which is known as the quality stabilization bill.

This bill would enable the manufacturer and the retailer to protect legitimate prices on nationally advertised brands of merchandise.

The following manufacturers' and retailers' associations have endorsed this bill:

NATIONAL TRADE AND PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL

Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc; National Retail Hardware Association; National Office Machine Dealers Association; Independent Garage Owners of America; National Association of House to House Installment Cos., Inc.; National Sporting Goods Association; National Association of Retail Clothiers & Furnishers; National Retail Furniture Association; Retail Jewelers of America; Master Photo Dealers & Finishers Association; National Appliance & Radio-TV Dealers Association; National Wholesale Jewelers Association; National Stationery & Office Equipment Association; Wholesale Stationers' Association; Toy Wholesalers' Association of America; Billiard & Bowling Institute of America; Gift & Decorative Accessories Association of America; Marine Manufacturers Safety Equipment Association; Sporting Goods Jobbers Association; American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association; Archery Manufacturers & Dealers Association; National Wholesale Hardware Association; Fountain Pen & Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers' Association, Inc.; American Watch Association, Inc.; Watch Material Distributors of America; Automotive Service Industry Association; National Association of Bedding Manufacturers.

The National Association of Shirt, Pajama & Sportswear Manufacturers; National Industrial Distributors Association; Christian Booksellers Association; National Congress of Petroleum Retailers; National Shoe Manufacturers Association; Wallcovering Wholesalers Association; National Small Business Association; American Research Merchandising Institute; American Retailers Association; National Art Materials Trade Association; National Shoe Retailers Association; Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association; North American Heating & Air-conditioning Wholesalers, Inc.; National Association of Women's & Children's Apparel; Salesmen, Inc.; American Watch Manufacturers Association; National Bicycle Dealers Association, Inc.; National Audio-Visual Association, Inc.; National Office Furniture Association, Inc.; National Outerwear & Sportswear Association; National Frozen Food Association, Inc.; the Automotive Warehouse Distributors Association, Inc.; National Association of Glove Manufacturers; American

Association of Small Business; National Marine Products Association; National Association of Retail Druggists; Paint & Wallpaper Association of America, Inc.; Retail Tobacco Dealers of America; National Association of Tobacco Distributors; National Retail Farm Equipment Association; American Pharmaceutical Association; National Conference of State Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries; Metrepolitan Cities Drug Association Secretaries.

Barbara Frietchie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, just a century ago yesterday, September 10, 1862, Confederate troops passed through Frederick, Md., on their way from their bivouac south of the city to engage the Union forces at Sharpsburg on the battlefield of Antietam. As a result of the occupation of Frederick by the army under command of Gen. "Stonewall" Jackson there were several incidents reported by the press which indicated a strong loyalist sentiment among the citizens of Frederick. The discussion of these incidents led John Greenleaf Whittier to compose "The Ballad of Barbara Frietchie."

Historians are divided on the subject of Barbara Frietchie as an actual heroine. Her biographers, William R. and Dorothy M. Quynn, have reached the following conclusion:

In the face of much conflicting evidence it is impossible to decide exactly what happened. Certain facts emerge. There is no proof that Mrs. Frietchie or Mrs. Quantrell waved a flag at the Confederate Army or any part of it. It seems certain that neither Stonewall Jackson nor any other Confederate general was involved in any way, and almost equally certain that no serious altercation occurred, or anything which involved firing. On the other hand there unquestionably were minor incidents connected with the display of Union flags during the occupation which tradition may have confused with the demonstrations staged on the occasion of entry of the Union troops after it. Barbara Frietchie's obituary states definitely that she participated in the latter. Many women waved flags on this occasion. Since we have no unimpeachable evidence that she also waved a flag at the Confederate Army, we can state only that there exists a tradition that she did so.

There is no controversy, however, on the question of "Barbara Frietchie" as a living legend and a symbol of passionate patriotism. The ballad has been translated into many languages. It is known to distant people to whom it is a familiar folk legend of America.

On a recent visit to my house near Frederick, General Eisenhower recalled that "Barbara Frietchie" had been discussed during World War II at his headquarters in North Africa. In his memoirs, Winston Churchill claims victory in a recitation contest between himself, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Mr. Harry Hopkins. They were reciting "Barbara Frietchie" by memory, as they drove through Frederick to Shangri-La, now Camp David.

A century of dust and change today obscures the facts of the "Barbara Frietchie" story beyond any reasonable hope of clarification. But the passage of a century has not dimmed the interest of the world in the basic emotions that underlie the poem. A century of familiarity has, in fact, made "Barbara Frietchie" a part of the legend of America. There is no better way to commemorate the passage of a century than to spread the words of Whittier upon the pages of the RECORD and so I append the "Ballad of Barbara Frietchie":

BARBARA FRIETCHIE

Up from the meadows rich with corn,
Clear in the cool September morn,
The clustered spires of Frederick stand
Green-walled by the hills of Maryland.

Round about them orchards sweep,
Apple and peach tree fruited deep,
Fair as the garden of the Lord
To the eyes of the famished rebel horde.

On that pleasant morn of the early fall
When Lee marched over the mountain wall;
Over the mountains winding down,
Horse and foot, into Frederick town.

Forty flags with their silver stars,
Forty flags with their crimson bars,
Flapped in the morning wind: the sun
Of noon looked down, and saw not one.

Up rose old Barbara Frietchie then,
Bowed with her fourscore years and ten;
Bravest of all in Frederick town,
She took up the flag the men hauled down.

In her attic window the staff she set,
To show that one heart was loyal yet.
Up the street came the rebel tread,
Stonewall Jackson riding ahead.

Under his slouched hat left and right
He glanced; the old flag met his sight.
"Halt!"—the dust-brown ranks stood fast.
"Fire!"—out blazed the rifle-blast.

It shivered the window, pane and sash;
It rent the banner with seam and gash.
Quick, as it fell, from the broken staff
Dame Barbara snatched the silken scarf.

She leaned far out on the window-sill,
And shook it forth with a royal will.
"Shoot, if you must, this old gray head,
But spare your country's flag," she said.

A shade of sadness, a blush of shame,
Over the face of the leader came;
The nobler nature within him stirred
To life at that woman's deed and word;
"Who touches a hair of yon gray head
Dies like a dog! March on!" he said.

All day long that free flag tost
Over the heads of the rebel host.

Ever its torn folds rose and fell
On the loyal winds that loved it well;
And through the hill-gaps sunset light
Shone over it with a warm good-night.

Barbara Frietchie's work is o'er,
And the Rebel rides on his raids no more.
Honor to her! and let a tear
Fall, for her sake, on Stonewall's bier.

Over Barbara Frietchie's grave,
Flag of Freedom and Union, wave!

Peace and order and beauty draw
Round thy symbol of light and law;
And ever the stars above look down
On thy stars below in Frederick town!

The New York-Montreal Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have on several occasions in the past pointed out the need and the desirability of a new seaway; namely, the New York-Montreal Seaway. I have pointed out that an inland seaway would not only restore the former paramount position which New York enjoyed, but would carry with it economic advantages in times of peace and would provide safer shipping facilities in time of war. A New York-Montreal Seaway would reduce the cost of shipment of goods, would be a boon to industry along the Erie Canal and the areas in which the seaway runs and would eventually reduce the consumer cost of foods and commodities. The advantages, the need, and the desirability of a New York-Montreal Seaway were described in full and graphically by one of my constituents, William Lathrop Rich, a retired colonel who testified before the Joint Legislative Committee on Commerce and Economic Development of the State of New York in the senate chamber in Albany on August 28, 1962. His remarks merit consideration and reading. They are as follows:

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM LATHROP RICH

Mr. Chairman, members of the joint legislative Committee on Commerce and Economic Development of the State of New York, honored guests and ladies and gentlemen, your chairman has invited me to participate in these hearings and to submit comments and recommendations on the proposed construction of a deepwater seaway between the State of New York and the St. Lawrence River in Canada, commonly referred to as the Champlain Waterway.

The committee for the New York-Montreal Seaway, of which I am chairman, has been advocating just such a deepwater seaway since the fall of 1956 and we have consistently recommended that it follow the historic route, used since its discovery in 1609 by Samuel de Champlain, because it was and is the shortest practical route between the St. Lawrence River in Canada and the Hudson River in New York State.

Six months after we had first proposed that this route be adequately modernized, we were informed that our recommendations were in accordance with those in a report made by the International Joint Commission in 1937, that concluded with the statement that the route from the St. Lawrence River at Sorel, Province of Quebec, up the Richelieu River to Lake Champlain and by way of the Champlain Canal to the Hudson River at Fort Edward, "is the most practicable from an engineering standpoint and the least impracticable from an economic point of view of all the five routes that had been considered."

Since its discovery, this route has, from time to time, been improved and its capacity increased but no improvements have been made upon the Canadian part since 1938 and on the United States part since 1918, that would alter its capacity.

This so-called Champlain Waterway has now become so uneconomical and obsolete that the New York State Legislature constituted a joint legislative committee on the barge canal in 1960 to determine the future of the barge canal system, of which the Champlain Canal is a part. What conclusions that committee has reached are not known to us or whether it ever reached any.

It is my understanding that these hearings today are to assist your committee in your study of this proposed Champlain Waterway.

Our committee's 6-year study of this proposed waterway has caused us to reach certain conclusions that I will now enumerate.

First, may I state that we firmly believe that the future economic expansion and prosperity of the New York-New England section of our United States is contingent upon the building of an adequate deep-water seaway, that will connect the Hudson River in New York State and the St. Lawrence River in Canada and make available a "short cut" for ocean shipping to compete with the St. Lawrence River.

Up to the 5th of July 1962 all of our efforts had been concentrated upon securing the updating of the 1937 survey because, without a current survey of this route, all statements, pro and con, about it would, of necessity be based upon opinions and not upon facts.

On July 5 last, our efforts were crowned with success when "the Department of State announced that the United States and Canada have agreed upon the text of a joint reference to the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, concerning the Richelieu River-Lake Champlain Waterway. The Governments in similar letters on July 5, 1962, requested the Commission to conduct a study on the feasibility of improving the existing waterway or developing other routes for a waterway from the St. Lawrence River in Canada through Lake Champlain to the Hudson River at Albany, N.Y.

We, therefore, have not made a detailed economic survey of this proposed seaway route, and we are of the opinion that it can be done best by the Corps of U.S. Army Engineers, by a survey similar to the one that they made for the Joint Commission in 1937.

We have heard numerous opinions as to the saving of time and money that this shortcut between New York and Montreal would make possible, such as a saving in freight rates for newsprint from the Quebec region to the New York metropolitan area of from $9 to $10 a ton and an estimated reduction of 4 sailing days with a saving of $10,000 for a ship like the *Santa Rose* of the Grace Line, for a round trip between New York City and Montreal, Canada, and that this saving in time and money would put such similar lines into a competitive position so that they could secure tonnage that is now not available or economically feasible for them to handle. These and similar comments are estimates and opinions and we shall have to await the completion of the new survey until we can deal in facts.

We have repeatedly asked ourselves, Is this shortcut feasible, desirable, and necessary? To all of which we have concluded in the affirmative.

It is feasible because previous research studies have indicated that there are no great engineering problems involved.

It is desirable because it makes available to ocean shipping, sometimes called the salties, a short cut from the heartlands of the American Continent, also called the fourth coast to the ports around the world, by some few up to 2,700 miles for a round trip, with accompanying reductions of shipping costs.

It is necessary first, because it will be a latent factor in our national survival, which of necessity I will not detail here.

Second, because it will stimulate the economic revival of the regions through which it passes by making them more accessible and it will also make seaports possible, at any point along its route, from which direct shipments can be made to any port in the world.

We believe that the completion of this proposed seaway will result in the following benefits provided that this waterway is designed to have adequate capacity for the purpose for which it is intended.

Adequate capacity, to us, means capacity, ultimately, at least equal to that of the St. Lawrence River at Montreal, Canada, which interms of controlled depth, at present, means not less than 37 feet deep. It will:

1. Hasten the return of the port of New York to its former position as the greatest seaport in the world.

2. Provide justification for the modernization of all the facilities of the port of New York.

3. Justify the construction of the World Trade Center in lower Manhattan.

4. Make available a fresh water supply for the States of New Jersey and New York and for Long Island and eliminate all future demands upon the Delaware River watershed for additional fresh water for this same area.

5. Stimulate the tourist trade to and from New York City and make practical the introduction of scenic tours, to the Adirondack Mountain-Lake Champlain-Richelieu River regions, to the Montreal-Quebec-Saguenay River regions, and via the St. Lawrence Seaway to the Thousand Islands-the Great Lakes ports and other lake points of interest, such as the Great Bridge across the Mackinac Straits and the new Soo locks near Sault Ste. Marie.

6. Encourage foreign tourists to visit the United States and make use of those tourist facilities to visit the heartlands of our country and Canada.

7. Stabilize the water level of the Hudson River at Albany, N.Y.

8. Make possible the development of a steel center in the vicinity of Albany, similar to that of the Pittsburgh area.

9. Make desirable the building of subsidiary pleasure boat plants in this same general area.

10. Reduce the number of locks between Waterford on the Hudson River and Lake Champlain.

11. Stimulate the economic and financial growth of the regions all along its route.

12. Provide jobs during its construction, the result of which will be growth of employment in all the regions through which it passes.

13. Stimulate population increase through economic expansion of all facilities and services near its path.

14. Make possible the transformation of all locations along its route into seaports.

15. Materially reduce the present industrial and natural contamination of the waters of the south end of Lake Champlain.

16. Provide a means of flood control for the Lake Champlain and the Richelieu River regions by the stabilization of the water level of Lake Champlain.

17. Result in the elimination of the annual losses in this same region, due to spring flooding, estimated to be more than $20 million since 1938.

18. Make accessible all these same regions to the motor and sailboat mariners, which they are now denied through lack of accessibility.

19. Benefit all transportation facilities, for movement in and out and through its regions, as well as all communication facilities.

20. Make possible the reduction of the number of locks around the Chambly Rapids in the Richelieu River in Canada.

21. Make possible the restoration of the necessary water level in the Sorel-Montreal regions, which can materially reduce the strength of the currents at the docks at Montreal and assist in the elimination of the pollution along the shores of Lake St. Louis due to the at present alltime low-water level of the lake.

Again I state that all those benefits can be secured by the construction of an adequate deepwater seaway.

May I now close my remarks by asking your serious consideration of the following points during your study of this proposed Champlain waterway:

1. That the design of this proposed deep waterway provide it with an ultimate capacity, at least equal to that of the St. Lawrence River, with which it must compete to justify its existence as a shortcut for ocean shipping, sometimes called "The Salties."

2. That the locks have a sill depth of not less than 40 feet; the present depth of the St. Lawrence River plus a 3-foot factor of safety. That sill depth will make it unnecessary to rebuild the locks when traffic demands that the capacity of this waterway be increased to equal that of the St. Lawrence River.

3. That the initial depth of this waterway be, at least, 32 feet between the locks. That depth is the depth that the Hudson River is now being deepened to, from New York City to Albany. Of the 450 mile length of this proposed waterway, within a short time more than half of that mileage will be 32 feet deep or deeper.

4. That provisions be incorporated in the planning that will allow the use of this passageway by small as well as the large boats.

5. That the bridges, necessary for the passage of vehicular traffic across this waterway, be of the bascule type, so as to eliminate any restrictions in overhead clearances and that their footings be placed far enough back from the banks of this waterway to permit free and clear passage of any ships that can make use of this waterway.

6. That provisions be incorporated in the design to assure the maintenance of a constant water level at both Albany, N.Y., and the Sorel-Montreal, Canada regions.

7. That the number of locks along this route be kept down to the minimum, to possibly only 2 large locks along the Canadian section, in place of the present 11 small ones, as the total lift in this section is not more than 80 feet, because the level of the St. Lawrence River at Montreal, Canada, is 20 feet above sea level. The New York State section may only require 3 large locks in place of the 12 small ones, because there the total lift will not be more than 98 feet. The water level of the Hudson River at Albany is only plus or minus 1½ feet, due to the tidal fluctuations. This 98-foot maximum lift, which is the lift up to the proposed level of Lake Champlain, is secured by the leveling off of the hump in the route of the present Champlain Canal, making the water level of Lake Champlain the maximum water level of the whole route.

8. That provisions be made in the design layout of this waterway for the future twinning of the locks, without their rebuilding, when the increase in volume of traffic so demands.

9. That this seaway be set up as a self-liquidating project and to be so amortized that the initial tolls can be kept down to a minimum to stimulate its use as a shortcut.

10. That naval and commercial large ship navigators be consulted during the design of this seaway so that the mistakes, inherent in the design of the St. Lawrence Seaway, be not repeated in this seaway project, particularly the lack of consideration given to the basic requirements for the proper navigation of large long boats through a restricted waterway.

For confirmation of that last statement, read "The Freshwater Cruise" of the U.S.S.

Macon, by Capt. J. C. Wylie, U.S. Navy, in the April 1960 number of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings. The *Macon* escorted H.M.S.S. *Britannia* up the St. Lawrence Seaway for the opening passage in June 1959.

We are aware that some interests historically oppose the use of waterways for commercial purposes, because they represent competition, but, when it can so easily be proven, that when any region is opened up and it prospers economically and financially, all means of transportation prosper and gain new business.

You ask, What is my interest in the seaway project?

It is to try to assure that this waterway shall have a capacity to justify its existence.

Let all of us cooperate to assure that this seaway be so designed that it will not have to be rebuilt in the foreseeable future.

I have endeavored to compress the results of our 6 years concentrated study into this statement.

May I now end by stating that I shall be pleased to interpret and explain how we reached our conclusions at any other time at our mutual convenience and that I have attached copies of four other statements, which contain additional pertinent information relating to this proposed seaway, for the convenience of your committee.

What Is a Republican?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Stamford Advocate has written a thoughtful definition of the meaning of republicanism today. He has, I think, successfully expressed the dynamism of Republican principles which seek to preserve the grand heritage of our country as a foundation for creatively meeting the needs of the people. I congratulate the writer of this piece and am happy to submit it for the RECORD.

WHAT IS A REPUBLICAN?

Dwight Eisenhower said that a Republican was a social progressive and an economic conservative. Richard Nixon said that a Republican believed in doing as much for himself as possible depending on the Government only for those things which the private citizen could not do for himself. Both of these statements are in accord, not only with the Constitution as drawn, but with the spirit of those who drafted the Constitution.

The Republican today is one who believes in the fundamentals of the American heritage.

The Constitution as drawn had as its purpose the formation of a government full of checks and balances designed to secure man's natural God-given rights. This government was to be, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, "a wise, a frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from labor the bread it has earned."

The Constitution as drawn and conceived by our Founding Fathers protected the individual from the Government. It did not envisage a huge bureaucracy so costly that even those intent on adding to it speak of its depressive burden. The Republican today opposes a general expansion of Government social agencies not because he is reactionary but because social progress can be advanced more effectively by the individual and by agencies at the local level. The Republican opposes the expansion of Government at a time when those running the Government admit its burden is too great to bear, because he does not want to pass on to his children even greater burdens.

The Republican is not an ultrarightwinger, he believes in a Constitution which includes protection for individuals in a Bill of Rights. The Republican cannot be a "liberal" because he believes in a Constitution which protects a minority from the tyranny of a "democratic majority." A Republican is a conservative in that he would conserve the American heritage. He is a progressive in that he would free our citizens of the burdens and controls of a huge Federal bureaucracy so that he might progress to a better life for himself and his family, in accord with his initiative and ability.

In short it could be said that a Republican is also a patriot who believes in supporting the word and spirit of our Constitution under which our Nation became the envy of the world.

The Hanford Power Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a covering letter to a comic strip type presentation about the 1962 Hanford project entitled "Only the name's the Same." The comic on the cover says, "I am aware! I know about things." The entire presentation apparently is an attempt to convince the 232 Members of the House that voted against the Hanford power proposal that black is white and night is day and "Only the Name's the Same."

Let us look at the record. However, before we do I think it well to remark that this Hanford proposal may be comic strip stuff to the proponents but it is deadly serious business to the conscientious Members of Congress who are seriously concerned about their taxpaying constituents who will have to bail this project out of the red when it goes sour.

Here are the facts:

THE PLANT IS THE SAME

In 1961: The comic strip author told us last year that the Hanford generating plant was to be more like the Robert Fulton steam engine of 154 years ago. He also said, referring to the proposed Hanford powerplant, "the people overseas are going to look at such foolishness and laugh at us."

In 1962: The Hanford generating plant is to be exactly the same old Robert Fulton vintage type plant which would make the people overseas laugh just as hard as they would have last year, perhaps harder. The only difference actually is that it will cost about $35 million more than last year.

COST TO TAXPAYERS COULD BE MORE

In 1961: Hanford power cost estimated to be $95 million to be put up by the U.S. taxpayers.

In 1962: A bond issue of $130 million is now contemplated for financing the construction of the Hanford powerplant. Bonneville Administrator admits contract would be security for this bond issue. Also, under the contract, conditions could occur that would obligate the U.S. taxpayers to pick up the check for the entire $130 million.

POWER WOULD BE DELIVERED TO BONNEVILLE IN EACH INSTANCE

In 1961: AEC would deliver Hanford power to Bonneville.

In 1962: Washington Public Power Supply System would operate Hanford plant under Bonneville direction and control and would make actual delivery of power to Bonneville. There is only a theoretical or paper transfer of Hanford power to participating utilities with contract providing for immediate retransfer of the Hanford power to Bonneville.

HANFORD POWER NONFIRM POWER IN EACH INSTANCE

In 1961: Even the proponents admitted Hanford power was nonfirm. Actually, no one knows how unreliable it really would be, as serious incidents could occur that would put plant out for indefinite periods of time.

In 1962: Construction difficulties and unsolved problems at Hanford may well make Hanford power less reliable than ever.

HANFORD POWER COULD BE ALL PUBLIC POWER IN EACH INSTANCE

In 1961: Hanford power would be Federal public power to be distributed by Bonneville Power Administration.

In 1962: The comic strip says that Hanford in 1962 would have no Federal public power and that one-half would be local private power and one-half local public power. Actually, all the Hanford power is to be turned over to Bonneville Power Administration, a Federal agency. An amendment was proposed which theoretically would have required the offer of 50-percent participation to privately owned organizations. Offer could well be made to private industrial organizations whose refusal of offer would permit 100-percent retention of Hanford power by Washington Public Power Supply System and Bonneville. Nothing in the proposed amendment requires that the offer be made to a competing private utility system. Even if offer were made to privately owned utility companies there is a serious cloud over their position under the existing preference provisions of the Bonneville Power Act.

U.S. TAXPAYERS WOULD PAY FOR ALL LOSES

In 1961: As a Federal project U.S. taxpayers would assume all losses.

In 1962: Proposed contract could result in U.S. taxpayers paying off entire $130 million bond issue. In actual fact, the Washington Public Power Supply System takes no risk since Bonneville pays completely for all the operation, maintenance, repairs, replacements,

bond amortization, interest, and everything else imaginable. This payment is made with firm kilowatts of power rather than dollars, but the payment is still made by Bonneville. Use of Bonneville firm power for payoff of Hanford power costs could result in losses much greater than under the 1961 deal.

ALL HANFORD NET REVENUES (IF ANY) WOULD GO TO U.S. TREASURY

In 1961: The comic strip, speaking of Hanford power revenues, says "All revenues to Bonneville Power Administration."

In 1962: The comic strip, speaking of Hanford steam revenues, says "Up to $125 million to U.S. Treasury."

Even a comic strip character should know all Bonneville's revenues go to the U.S. Treasury. To say this latest Hanford proposal could result in payments for steam that would put up to $125 million additional revenue in the U.S. Treasury with $50 million as a firm estimate is fantastic. The payment for steam is still going to be made by Bonneville in the form of firm kilowatts. So, to argue that the taxpayers will be better off by taking from one Federal agency and giving it to another Federal agency is political chicanery of the first magnitude.

The Hanford power deal could easily cost the taxpayers of the Nation anywhere from $130 million to $400 million. The proposed payment for the so-called waste steam would be only $100,000 for the first year of dual-purpose operation, with a total of only $600,000 for the first 4 years of dual-purpose operation. If dual-purpose operation should then cease, the $600,000 would not pay 10 percent of the interest cost to date on the convertibility features alone.

In conclusion I urge each of my colleagues who voted with me in opposition to the Hanford power proposal to continue to oppose this uneconomical project. As much as the 1961 proposal deserved thumbs down, the 1962 proposal deserves even greater thumbs down, as the pitfalls for and potential cost to the taxpayers are boundless.

The Will Behind the Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, various reports have been made that the United States is taking steps to persuade our European allies to help counteract the Communist menace in Cuba through helping to isolate Cuba economically.

U.S. officials are reported to have asked the NATO Allies to take steps to discourage ships flying the flags of allied nations from being chartered to ship Communist supplies to Cuba, to cooperate in preventing U.S. embargoed goods from being shipped to Cuba through their countries, to examine their trade in materials with Cuba to determine what goods of strategic military and economic importance are being shipped to Cuba, and to maintain close check on commercial credits being extended to Cuba.

It is my view that while much more is needed to rid our hemisphere of this Communist beachhead, a move to obtain cooperation from our allies along these lines is definitely needed and should be pursued aggressively. I wonder however just how aggressively the administration is going about trying to accomplish these ends. The following will show one of the reasons for my concern.

It will be remembered that earlier this year there were various reports that the United States had spoken to representatives of NATO nations with regard to the U.S. embargo on trade with Cuba. Mr. Walt Whitman Rostow, Counselor and Chairman of the Policy Planning Council of the Department of State, went to Europe at that time. The reports on what occurred varied but many of them appeared to be designed to leave the impression that our position was firmly stated and that strong representations were made in behalf of getting our allies to cooperate on embargoing Cuba.

I was interested in knowing at that time just how the administration had gone about this task so I addressed a letter dated February 28, 1962, to Secretary of State Rusk asking to be advised "as to whether the United States through Mr. Rostow specifically requested various NATO nations to curb trade with Cuba in line with the action by the United States and, if so, the response of the nations to such request. Which nations, through their representatives, were contacted by Mr. Rostow?"

I am setting forth the Department's reply to my inquiry and invite close attention to it.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1962.

Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: I refer to your letter of February 28, 1962, to the Secretary concerning Mr. Rostow's report to the NATO Council on the Meeting of Foreign Ministers of the American Republics held at Punta del Este, Uruguay.

The Secretary stated on March 1 that Mr. Rostow had told the members of NATO about the discussions and the decisions reached by the Organization of American States Foreign Ministers. Mr. Rostow, said the Secretary, had requested the NATO countries to take into account the attitudes expressed at Punta del Este in the formulation of their own policies toward Cuba. The Secretary cited as an example the resolution of the Foreign Ministers to suspend immediately the trade and traffic in arms of every kind, and expressed the hope that our friends in NATO would aline their policies accordingly.

Please call on us if we can be of any further assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned there is nothing set forth in this letter which does not describe anything other than the fact that the trip by Mr. Rostow was a "hat in hand" mission and the complete lack of favorable results obtained certainly appears to bear this out. There is nothing in the letter to show that there was any firmness about our request, or anything specific to indicate that the embargo was represented as a matter of much importance to the United States. Mr. Rostow's trip in my view is a prime example of how not to go about getting the results necessary to deal with Cuba.

It is a matter of concern to me and I know it is to many others who are wondering whether the same type of thing is happening again and whether we will see another example of the all too familiar technique which calls for strong words and tragically little real action.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the September 9, 1962, issue of the Los Angeles Times entitled "The Will Behind the Words." The Times is absolutely right when it says that we must have immediate action in dealing with Cuba and that the President should demand, not merely ask, that our NATO Allies cooperate in this regard.

Concerned citizens everywhere are watching with interest just how effectively we deal with the Communist menace. They are expecting what the Times alludes to in the title to the editorial: A will behind our words.

The editorial follows:

THE WILL BEHIND THE WORDS

The defiant warning issued by President Monroe against the designs of imperialist Russia was composed of strong words—and a strong will to enforce them. Our capacity to resist was slight but it was magnified many times by our great determination.

Ten days ago the reverse seemed true. President Kennedy said at his press conference April 29 that the Monroe Doctrine still "means what it meant" in 1823. But many Americans wondered if it did; many nations were acting as though they were sure it did not.

The will that had first given meaning to the words of the doctrine seemed strangely lacking in the months that followed the disastrous Bay of the Pigs expedition.

Caution and inaction were interpreted as weakness by the Soviet Union as it boldly stepped up its transformation of Cuba into an armed Communist base. Our close NATO Allies—Britain, West Germany, Norway, and Greece—were so unimpressed with our passive attitude that they stood by as their merchant ships carried arms, equipment and technicians to the island outpost.

Not until Moscow publicly admitted its coarse intervention did the will of the Government again manifest itself.

Mr. Kennedy issued another reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine last week. This time, however, he began to take the first steps in demonstrating our determination. There could be no doubt as to the impatient mood of the Congress and the Nation: they possessed the will; they lacked only the leadership.

When the President asked Congress, Friday, for permission to call up 150,000 reservists, the bipartisan support was immediate and strong. Its leaders did not need to be told that the Reserves were necessary "to permit strong, prompt, and effective challenges * * * which may be presented anywhere in the world."

Mr. Kennedy should now act upon the proposal of Republican leaders that he request permission to use armed forces "as he sees necessary," just as President Eisenhower did to meet the Communist threat in the Formosa Straits. Congress will not say "No."

There should also be no hesitation on the part of the President in taking other necessary responses.

He should demand, not merely ask, that our NATO Allies cease allowing merchant vessels carrying their flags to aid our common enemy. It is an outrage that those nations whom we have helped to defend and to rebuild should repay us in this way.

He should in fact insist that NATO countries and the members of the Organization of American States immediately join us in collective action against the Cuban threat, including an effective embargo. It is late, yet, not too late.

If our friends are irresolute, we must act alone, reserving to ourselves the right to take any action necessary "aginst those who would endanger hemispheric peace and safety."

We will surely be accused of rattling our saber. We are not, but we have drawn it from its scabbard and it will stay unsheathed.

San Leandro's Sister City Is Explained by Brazilian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great programs currently being pursued throughout the Nation by municipal governments is the so-called sister city program of the Town Affiliation Committee, which is formed as a part of the people-to-people program for better international understanding.

Several of the cities in my congressional district have been pursuing this project with great enthusiasm. A new association is being formed between the city of San Leandro, Calif., and Ribeirao Preto, Brazil.

From past experience, I know that the results of such an affiliation between communities can be very productive of greater understanding between the citizens of the respective communities. The projects undertaken under the sister city program allow various facets of the community, such as church groups, chambers of commerce, employee associations, unions, schools, league of women voters, and businessmen to exchange ideas and to exchange visits with the cities concerned.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an account of San Leandro's first endeavor of town affiliation, in the visit of Walter B. McNealy, president of a Brazilian Baptist college, and his first-hand account of the activities in sister city Ribeirao Preto:

[From the Morning News, Aug. 28, 1962]

SAN LEANDRO'S SISTER CITY IS EXPLAINED BY BRAZILIAN

(By Josephine Roberts)

"The most influential people in Ribeirao Preto, Brazil, are highly conservative with family histories dating back to the earliest days of the South American nation's colonization," Walter B. McNealy, president of a Brazilian Baptist college in a nearby town, told Vice Mayor Valence Gill and a group of town affiliation committee members on Sunday.

The American-born educator, who has spent most of his adult life in Brazil, indicated that because the officials of Ribeirao Preto are inclined to move slowly in making important decisions, it is bound to take time to complete arrangements for a sister city program.

MORE FORMAL

"Brazilians are quite different in their attitudes which are far more formal than those of the breezy, informal North American," he said. "I have spent 25 years in Brazil and have returned only four times to the United States in those years, so I have a rather good idea how the officials of Ribeirao Preto would react to any new and revolutionary suggestion.

"The town affiliation or sister city program is entirely new to me and so I presume it is quite new to South Americans.

"The rather unpleasant image of the North American which has been a stereotype in South American history and political life has to be destroyed and this sister city program is an excellent start toward better understanding and harmony between North and South American countries," the visitor remarked.

"Ribeirao Preto is a beautiful city with an almost ideal climate," according to McNealy. "The city's population is quite cosmopolitan. However, its most important businessmen and officials are descended of good families of long residence and bearing names famous in Brazilian history."

STABLE GOVERNMENT

"The city has long had a stable government and economy. It is considered one of the wealthiest of the 'interior or feeder cities' through whose banks and mercantile establishments flow millions of dollars worth of commerce, raw materials, and finished goods."

The educator indicated that he was very much opposed to "giveaway programs" which he says are rarely ever appreciated.

"Exchange, if possible, high school and college students; invite a bank employee to come to San Leandro for 3 or 4 months and send a well-mannered, highly capable banking employee to represent you in Ribeirao Preto. Make contacts in other lines of business so that there is a real people to people program in operation."

Walter B. McNealy, who maintains a U.S. address at 196 Jules Avenue, New Orleans, La., or can be reached at Caixa Postal, 145, Est do Rio, Brazil, said he was most willing to help establish contacts with Ribeirao Preto.

FRIENDSHIP ESSENTIAL

"Sound friendships between South American countries and the United States are essential for the survival of the free world. This is a tense time in history and the sister city program could help foster international understanding which is so desperately needed these days."

The Baptist college president was introduced to Vice Mayor Valence Gill and town affiliation committee members by William Chandler of the Second Baptist Church on Pacific Avenue in San Leandro. McNealy had made a brief talk before members of the church. Chandler is a charter member of the sister city program.

Communist Cuba a Dagger at Our Throat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, communism in Cuba has grown to the second most powerful military force in this hemisphere since President Kennedy has assumed office.

The President has no one to blame but himself for this. He cannot pass the buck anymore. Why he does not take action, I do not know. Where is his courage?

David Lawrence in the New York Herald Tribune for September 4 and 11, respectively, discusses this problem, as does Robert G. Spivack, in the newspaper's September 9 issue. Both show concern and pinpoint the urgent need to change this policy of appeasement by President Kennedy:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 4, 1962]

WHAT POLICY NOW ON CUBA? COMPLETE BLOCKADE URGED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The Soviets have political control of Cuba and now have openly acknowledged that they are supplying Castro with military aid. This action flagrantly violates and denounces the Monroe Doctrine. President Kennedy, however, said, in effect, 6 days ago that he will not "invade" Cuba at this or any other time. Does this mean that the Soviet Government can consider it has obtained a free hand to take over any Central American or South American country and can assume there will be no opposition by the military forces of the United States?

This is the dilemma in which the Washington Government finds itself today as news dispatches from Moscow tell of the issuance of a formal communique in which the Soviets inform the world they have agreed to comply with the request of the Cuban Government to supply it with "help by delivering armaments and sending technical specialists for training Cuban servicemen."

The Soviet Government contends that "all Cuba's true friends have every right to respond to this legitimate request" and that the Cuban Government has "every justification for taking necessary measures to insure its security and safeguard its sovereignty and independence."

HOW FORMULA WORKS

So the Soviet formula for conquest is at last made clear. The Communists infiltrate a country, get possession of the government there, and cause it to file with Moscow a request for military aid. This is supposed to be the legal justification for sending armament and military personnel to "train" the local troops. It so happens that the Monroe Doctrine, since the 1820's, has warned the world that no European country would be permitted to get a military foothold anywhere in this hemisphere.

President Kennedy may not realize it, but what he said at his news conference last Wednesday could be responsible for his present embarrassment. Had he not responded at the time to an impromptu question and had he consulted with the Secretary of State

before issuing any statement, it is doubtful whether Mr. Kennedy would have given the reply he did on the spur of the moment. A correspondent had asked the President to comment on the suggestion of Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, that Cuba be invaded by the United States. Here is the verbatim reply as taken from the tape recording:

"The PRESIDENT. I am not for invading Cuba at this time. No, I don't—the words do not have some secondary meaning. I think it would be a mistake to invade Cuba——

"Question. Mr. President, the Soviets, as you well know——

"The PRESIDENT. Because I think it would lead to—that it should be very—could be very casually suggested; an action like that, which could lead to very serious consequences for many people."

Just previously in the same news conference, the President, in discussing possible action in Cuba, had referred to American "obligations all around the world, including West Berlin and other areas, which are very sensitive," and had added:

"Therefore, I think that in considering what appropriate action we should take, we have to consider the totality of our obligations and also the responsibilities which we bear in so many different parts of the world."

This comment could mean that the President is fearful that, if he takes action in Cuba, it might lead to greater pressures in West Berlin—a reaction which the Soviets doubtless are trying to foster. The Soviets, on the other hand, may be waiting to see whether the United States is hesitant to use military force even as close as 90 miles away from its shores. They could misconstrue the President's reluctance as implying that the United States might not even fight to protect West Berlin or any part of Europe when a showdown came.

The situation strangely parallels the 1930's, which Winston Churchill describes in his book, "The Gathering Storm," published in 1948. He speaks of the "milestones to disaster" in the 1930's and of the series of acquiescences in Hitler's aggressions in the Rhineland, in Austria, and in Czechoslovakia, until finally the climax came in Poland. Mr. Churchill writes:

"Here is a catalog of surrenders, at first, when all was easy and later when things were harder, to the ever-growing German power.

"Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly, you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival.

"There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

NOW WHAT?

What could Mr. Kennedy really do now? He could order a complete naval and aerial blockade of Cuba and demand that all Russian advisers brought in by the Cuban Government to train military forces in that country be expelled at once. He could proclaim that no further shipments of any kind, either by air or by sea, military or nonmilitary, will be permitted to enter Cuba from any country until the Cuban Government restores to American citizens the properties taken from them in the last few years.

To apply this policy could lead to some fighting. But whatever sacrifices are made would achieve the patriotic purpose of preventing any misunderstanding as to the resoluteness of the West in and around Berlin. It could prevent a world war.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 9, 1962]

ACTION ON CUBA AND BERLIN URGED TO BAR MAJOR WAR

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Vacillation, indecison, irresoluteness and a policy of wavering from day to day by the Western powers brought on World War I and also World War II.

History may be repeating itself. The West is again giving the impression of weakness. The United States, the most powerful military force in the West—without whose aid World War I and World War II could not have been won by the Allies—is wobbling in its policies. This could lead to a gross miscalculation by Nikita S. Khrushchev, just as indecisiveness on the part of Washington misled Kaiser Wilhelm in 1914 and Adolph Hitler in 1939 as each assumed that the United States would not go to war over any European question.

Today, the situation seems to be growing more serious, as it is being assumed in Moscow that the United States will not even go to war over an American question—the taking over of control in Cuba by the Soviets, who are supplying military equipment to the Cuban regime under an open agreement between the two governments.

This defiance of the Monroe Doctrine has been ignored by President Kennedy. He has made no public protest over Soviet policy. He has announced, in effect, that he agrees with the Soviet viewpoint that Cuba is merely engaging in a "defensive" operation with Soviet help.

CHANGE CALLED STARTLING

This startling change in America's historic policy has apparently been accepted by supporters of the administration in Congress, though here and there some exceptions are noted.

The President, in his public statements, shows that he considers the Cuban situation not to be an American question by itself, but as somehow directly related to the Berlin crisis The Soviets may be interpreting this stand to mean that Mr. Kennedy is hesitant to do what he would perhaps like to do in Cuba for fear that the Soviets might intensify the East German problem and might be tempted to take chances on a belligerent move against West Berlin.

President Kennedy doubtless hoped to give an impression of resoluteness when he asked Congress for standby authority to call up 150,000 reservists. The trouble with the move is that it implies vaguely that some time in the future he might use the troops somewhere—he doesn't say whether in Berlin or in Cuba. The Reserves aren't actually being ordered up now. Mr. Kennedy says he might call them up if matters get critical somewhere.

This ambiguity in American policy implies that the United States isn't really acting on principle, but is feeling its way expediently from one crisis to another while it waits for its adversary to continue step by step with its aggressive course.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, assistant Democratic leader, gives the reasoning back of the administration viewpoint. In an interview quoted by the Associated Press, he says:

"I think it should be clearly understood that the President has no immediate intention for use of this authority. Prompt congressional approval will be a demonstration to our allies and our enemies that the elected representatives of the people are firmly behind our Commander in Chief."

But will the men in the Kremlin take this to mean that Congress approves inaction in Cuba? If the United States will not fight on a clear issue that arises 90 miles away from its shores, will the passage of a resolution authorizing the call for Reserves produce the psychological effect which the administration intends to create? The resolution itself makes no mention of Cuba, and in all probability the regular Marine Corps—not the 150,000 reserves—would be used if there were any intervention in Cuba by the United States.

Not a word has been spoken publicly to Moscow, moreover, by the Washington Government about her violation of the Monroe Doctrine in shipping to Cuba arms and technicians. Does this mean that the administration acquiesces in the Soviet move and that all that's necessary now for the Communists to gain a foothold in a Latin American country is to infiltrate a government there, call the military buildup defensive, and the United States will not object?

OTHER MEASURES URGED

The same hesitation and vacillation that characterized American policy between 1914 and 1917 and between 1939 and 1941 are being repeated. The end result then was war, because America was believed to be unwilling or unable to fight. At least in those days, however—both with respect to protesting the violation of American rights on the high seas and in supplying destroyers to the British Navy—the United States wasn't entirely inactive or inarticulate, though at no time in the prewar period was the German Government convinced that the United States would fight.

Is entry into a world war the only way a nation's resoluteness can be expressed? There are many measures short of war—a sea and aerial blockade of Cuba and an economic boycott of East Germany and of the Communist bloc—which could multiply Moscow's troubles and prevent a major war.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 9, 1962]

OCCUPIED CUBA

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—The Soviet invasion of Cuba poses a grave threat to the future of democracy in the Western Hemisphere and to the military security of the United States.

To pretend otherwise is to underestimate the dimensions of Soviet ambition, to misread Communist history and to delude ourselves about the potential of the Alliance for Progress.

President Kennedy's promise by "whatever means" to oppose the "aggressive purposes" of Castroism is a first effort to meet the Nation's and the hemisphere's present needs. It reads well and sounds tough, but is open to misinterpretation because it is too vague. The real question about the presence of Soviet "technicians" in Cuba is: Why are they there?

The overriding issue is no longer whether Castro plans aggression against his Latin neighbors; it is that Cuba herself is a Soviet-occupied satellite.

Soviet troops are not there to repel an attack from the United States. They are there to keep the restive Cubans from overthrowing their Communist dictatorship. If we continue to talk about defensive Soviet weapons and possible aggressive purposes we could wind up accepting the presence of the Red army much as we accepted the wall in Berlin.

Cuba has been a problem for American Presidents for more than 60 years. We have made many mistakes there from the time when we practiced dollar diplomacy through our close alliance in the Batista era with reactionary elements, political and clerical, right up to the abortive CIA-sponsored attempt to overthrow Castro.

That long history helps to explain White House hesitancy in the present situation. But it is one thing for the President to proceed carefully in the troubled waters of the Caribbean. It is something else to proceed cautiously while the enemy is proceeding boldly.

If you proceed carefully the implication is that you know where you are going; while cautiousness could be interpreted throughout Latin America as timidity.

Recent developments force us to consider these questions:

How do we get Soviet troops out of Cuba, without delay?

How do we prevent future Soviet troops, as well as military equipment, from being landed on her shores?

What are we prepared to do to help Cuba free herself from Soviet domination?

None of these are easy questions and the President has declined to put the problem in these terms. Perhaps he is reflecting on his own comments during the 1960 political campaign when he castigated the former administration for failure to do anything about the Soviet menace "90 miles off the coast of the United States."

Undoubtedly he hopes to avoid the same kind of criticism. That's perfectly understandable. It was wrong in 1960 to oversimplify the issues posed by Castroism and it is just as wrong now to make a domestic political issue of Cuba.

But the problems remain. Second-guessing about the Russian reasons for indulging in their provocative demonstration of contempt for the Kennedy administration is, for now, a fruitless enterprise.

What should we do? A first step would be to blockade all shipments of materiel and men to Cuba, whether carried on Soviet or Allied vessels. The second would be to encourage with all means at our command a democratic Cuban revolution. Third, would be to bring before the Organization of American States the whole issue posed by the Soviet occupation of Cuba.

Fourth would be to intensify the work of the Alliance for Progress, setting target dates for starts on public works projects. Fifth, would be to let the world know we are ready and willing to work with reform-minded, genuinely democratic elements in all Latin nations, not with military juntas as in Peru.

Along with all these activities we should inform Soviet Russia that we regard the presence of her troops in Cuba as inimical to the welfare of the Cuban people and to our own welfare. The Soviet "technicians" must be given a deadline for departure. If they are not gone by deadline time then we must be ready by "whatever means" to oppose their "aggressive purposes" against the Cubans and all others of this hemisphere.

Latin American Problems and U.S. Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Latin America remains confused and is no nearer a solution now than it was a year or two ago. Cuba, Brazil, and British Guiana represent a threat from the left. The situation in Argentina, the Dominican Republic, Peru, and other countries has not been resolved.

In recent months I have inserted several articles dealing with Latin American affairs by Fred A. Orleans, who is an expert in the field. These articles have aroused considerable interest. Mr. Orleans has lived in several Latin American countries for a number of years. A prominent international lawyer, he is a member of the Academia Mexicana de Derecho International—Mexican Academy of International Law—one of the leading organizations in that country to which not many U.S. citizens have been admitted to membership.

I have before me seven short articles written by Mr. Orleans in which he deals with such problems as the policy of nonintervention in Latin American affairs, the economic squeeze, a look at Brazil and Cuba, the need for a doctrine of self-preservation, and the need for qualified policymakers. Some of these articles have been written recently, others about a year or so ago, but they still remain timely in essence and the problems they raise are still unsolved. Developments over the past year, particularly in relation to Cuba, indicate the validity of the views expressed by the author.

Although I do not subscribe to all the views expressed in these articles, they are accurate and to the point, the criticism is nonpartisan, and the purpose is definitely constructive. I feel they are a worthy contribution in this field and should help bring greater clarity into our thinking on the subject. I commend these articles to the attention of my colleagues.

They read as follows:

NONINTERVENTION

(By Fred A. Orleans)

The word "nonintervention" has assumed major significance in the relations of the United States and the other nations of the Americas.

In 1936, at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, the the United States agreed to subscribe to the doctrine of nonintervention in its most absolute form. The United States voluntarily deprived itself of the right to send American marines to any Latin American country, no matter how badly American property or American citizens were treated. The United States voluntarily relinquished the right to use her own judgment in dealing with violations of American rights and agreed to the establishment of mutual security arrangements.

This doctrine of nonintervention has been the main restraining force which has prevented the United States from unilaterally acting to rectify the Cuban situation. This doctrine of nonintervention has forced the United States to depend upon collective action by all nations of the Americas in regard to Cuba, and, accordingly, little action has been taken.

The glaring inconsistencies in our so-called policy of nonintervention in the internal affairs of Latin American countries comes into sharp focus when we allow a Communist dictatorship to exist a few short miles from our border and we are unable to do anything about it; when we maintain relations with, and aid governments in, Latin America which were not constitutionally elected by the people, but are in power as a result of uprisings, or governments which originally constitutionally elected by the people, but continue to maintain their position through dictatorial means.

But our Government does not hesitate to break relations with a friendly Peruvian Government and deprive the people of Peru of badly needed Alliance for Progress programs because a military group stepped in to prevent a leftist government from taking power. Our Government chose to ignore the fact that the military takeover in Peru was not the result of a bloody revolution and that new elections and return to civilian rule was promised by the military group. Our Government chose to ignore the fact that the people of Peru are not objecting to the temporary change in government. If this is not intervention in the internal affairs of a friendly nation, then just what does constitute intervention?

If the United States feels justified in intervening in the internal affairs of Peru, then it should give more thought to many more "situations" in the Western Hemisphere which merit and cry out for active U.S. intervention. Some thought should be given to the unfortunate people of Cuba, shackled by the chains of international communism and deprived of the rights to which every human being is entitled; some thought should be given to freeing the many American citizens, including both men and women, who are still languishing in Cuban prisons.

Just what or who determines when the United States should or should not intervene in the affairs of a Latin American nation?

ECONOMIC SQUEEZE

(By Fred A. Orleans)

The writer has repeatedly stated for many years that one of the greatest motives which disturbs the cordiality of the relations between the United States and the Latin American nations is the exchange of our products. Latin America produces strategic materials and agricultural products of basic worldwide consumption. The United States, in turn, is the supplier to Latin America of machinery and industrial products needed for its economic development. This interchange takes place under conditions that are adverse to Latin America.

Briefly it can be explained as follows: The United States has had until now the power to set by itself the prices of its own products. These prices are fixed in accordance with costs of production, but in these costs the just and fair wages of its workers are strongly protected. Latin America, on the other hand, does not have the power to set its own prices. Until recently its principal consumer and practically only customer has been the United States. Latin America fixes prices also in accordance with production costs, but in these costs the wages of the Latin American worker lack equitable protection. The wage of the American worker on an average is 10 times higher than that of the worker in Latin America. This can be explained in accordance with the blind forces of economics, but we should not forget the new forces which are working throughout the world.

The weak foreign trade situation of the Latin American countries brought about by their poor earnings on basic commodities and the continuous rise in the cost of the manufactured goods they import has placed these countries in a serious economic squeeze.

Neither the Alliance for Progress nor any other U.S. plan to assist Latin America can succeed until the Latin American countries are able to develop a favorable balance of trade. Countries which are unstable economically and unable to earn enough from exports to pay for their imports and pay back their debts cannot successfully implement an Alliance for Progress program.

LET'S LOOK AT BRAZIL

(By Fred A. Orleans)

Earlier this year the Governor of Rio Grande do Sul State, Brazil, expropriated a

telephone company without offering adequate compensation, and then continued to make additional expropriations of U.S. investments in his State. At the time he complained that Brazil was like a sieve and Alliance for Progress funds will just flow back to the United States without material benefit to the people of Brazil.

This gentleman was obviously very confused in his presentation of the facts since a report by the Swiss Bankers' Association indicated that the total amount of Latin American deposits held by Swiss banking institutions are, according to a most conservative estimate, well in excess of $10 billion. Swiss, United States, and other banking institutions probably hold at this time close to $20 billion originating from Latin American sources.

In order to smooth the way for continued aid to Brazil, a plan was devised for "compensation" of the telephone company and other expropriations. However, no indication was made as to just how Brazil, which is on the verge of financial insolvency could pay for these companies. It is quite obvious that aid grants from the United States which should be used for the maximum benefit of the people of Brazil would have to be diverted to make the aforementioned payments for expropriated industries. Accordingly, the U.S. taxpayer would, in the final analysis, have to pay the U.S. companies for their property seized in Brazil. This in itself is the height of folly and can lead to many dangerous repercussions by setting a precedent which the governments of every other Latin American nation will feel free to follow.

The political philosophy of the President of Brazil is well known from his past actions and open acknowledgments demonstrating his leaning to the left. Recently a new Prime Minister, Francisco Brochado da Rocha was elected in Brazil. Mr. Brochado is a political protege of the Governor of Rio Grande do Sul who expropriated the U.S. Telephone Co. It should be pointed out that the Governor, who is anti-American, is the brother-in-law of the President of Brazil, Joao Goulart, who has never indicated any displeasure or disagreement with his actions.

The new Prime Minister of Brazil was the chief legal officer of the State of Rio Grande do Sul and assisted in the expropriation of the U.S. companies. In his initial address to Congress, Prime Minister Brochado threatened to crack down on foreign investments, called for closer relations with the Soviet bloc and indicated his support for Communist Cuba in its dealings with the United States. With the Prime Minister, who was handpicked by the President and the President now voicing the same views, these views can very well become the official foreign policy of Brazil in the near future.

The big question remains as to why the United States was so completely unaware of what has been and is taking place in Brazil that President Goulart was invited to this country and wined and dined in New York, Washington, and Chicago, and addressed Congress. He then proceeded to "cash in" on this tacit support and approval from Washington by going to Mexico to be hailed and cheered by the leftist elements who could point to the prior welcome and reception he had received in the United States.

LET'S LOOK AT LATIN AMERICA—CUBA

(By Fred A. Orleans)

The plane incident involving a Pan American plane being forced to change its course of Mexico City to Guatemala City, to land in Havana, resulted in statements from Washington to the effect that the American people should not become too excited or concerned about the matter since it was not actually Castro who was involved in this plane incident or previous ones, but psychopaths who were not even Cuban citizens.

The psychopaths were merely emulating the most successful psycopath of modern times, Castro, and the more he gets away with, the more others will try throughout Latin America to carry on an eventual wholesale takeover or expropriation of U.S. property.

By allowing Castro to go his merry way, the United States emphatically encourages many others of his ilk to try to do the same he has done. It is not important if the Cuban Government actually encouraged the attempted theft of the plane at El Paso and the theft of the Pan American plane since the important thing is that they forcibly hijacked an Eastern Airlines plane within the sovereign boundaries of the United States and they kept possession of that plane for over 3 weeks despite our State Department's "requests" for its return, and then only returned the plane on the so-called exchange deal for a Cuban "patrol boat" through which the U.S. Government provided Castro with his usual "out" and also headed off congressional demands for action on the Cuban situation.

The United States became the laughing stock of the world through these plane incidents.

This recent series of plane incidents, preceded by the drawn-out drama of tractors for prisoners, preceded by the series of expropriations, and all overlapped by a continuous series of insults, threats, and abuses from Castro and Cuba, have effectively distracted the people of the United States from what should be their primary concern and that is the occupation of the island of Cuba by those who are the sworn enemies of the United States and who are allied with those who are on the record to destroy our Government, country, and way of life.

The people of the United States have been so distracted that they lost sight of the fact that Cuba is daily becoming more and more a threat to the future survival of many countries in the Western Hemisphere and through the building of short-range missile bases, even an eventual threat to the United States.

We are losing sight of the fact that Czech technicians are in Cuba in ever-increasing numbers, surveying and planning the establishment of modern industries which can produce indirect competition with the United States and induce many countries of Latin America to forsake their trade ties with the United States and depend instead upon Cuba and its Communist bloc supporters.

We are losing sight of the fact that every day that the Cuban situation remains unresolved, more and more political leaders in Latin American countries, eye with a more covetous eye the U.S. investments and industries in their countries with the thought that if Cuba can get away with it, why can't they.

We lose sight of the fact that many countries in Latin America are inclined to blackmail the United States for more and more aid on the threat of turning to those who back Cuba, and also of expropriating U.S. property in their countries.

In the latter part of 1960, responsible experts in the United States recognizing the danger inherent in an uncorrected Cuban situation enumerated the minimum steps the United States must immediately take. We have finally taken step one, although most reluctantly, after unnecessary delay and only because Castro pushed us into it. We have been too indecisive, too timid, and too unnecessarily afraid of world opinion to take all the proposed and necessary steps.

The suggested steps were as follows:

1. Break diplomatic relations with the Cuban Communist regime.

2. Recognize a responsible Cuban government in exile.

3. Give the government in exile full support with arms and money.

4. Invoke a blockade of Cuba so that she would not be able to trade with the Communist nations and induce other countries to desist from trading with her.

5. Once the Communists have been driven out of Cuba, assist and guide the country back to freedom and constitutional representative government.

The simple fact remains that as long as Castro or his ilk remain in control of Cuba, the United States will continuously face problems in Latin America.

WHERE DO WE MAKE OUR STAND?

(By Fred A. Orleans)

The hijacking of an Eastern Airlines plane enroute from Miami to Dallas has sharply brought into focus the fact that the sovereignty of the United States has again been flaunted and the inviolable rights of its citizens again violated by a two-bit dictator.

Are we to assume that American citizens flying from or to Miami do so at their own risk in view of the proximity of Miami to Cuba? Is Miami now off limits to U.S. aircraft and have we finally reached the stage, despite all the brave talk of making a stand in Berlin and Laos, of not only being unable to cope with the Cuban situation, but to even protect U.S. citizens within the United States of America?

As a weak nation, not yet established as a world power, we went halfway around the world to met and beat the Barbary Coast pirates in their own lair and defend the rights of American citizens to travel any place without fear of mistreatment and abuse by anyone.

In recent years, we have read about Americans being murdered, abducted and mistreated in faraway places as Korea, countries of southeast Asia, Africa, Egypt and Iraq.

All these places seemed distant and remote and the average American remained apathetic and unconcerned with this startling change in world attitudes towards the United States and its willingness and ability to protect the property and person of American citizens abroad.

Recently, the happenings in Cuba, including the wholesale theft of the property of all Americans working or residing in that country, including both the big companies as well as individuals owning small businesses and Americans who lived and worked in Cuba for many years as well as descendants of American families who have resided in Cuba for generations, has brought into sharp focus the tremendous decline of both the prestige of the United States abroad as well as respect for our country and its citizens by foreign nations and their nationals.

We have now arrived at the sad state of affairs where neither Americans nor their personal property are even safe in the United States itself from personal abuse or actual theft by any foreign government that seems so inclined.

Exactly where do we make our stand?

If Cuba is not close enough, will Miami do, or do we draw the line at Jacksonville, or do we give up Florida because it's close to Cuba and we do not want to antagonize Castro or his friends? Exactly what is to stop Castro or any like him from abducting American citizens from any part of the United States if they disagree with their views or oppose their acts?

When the United States ceases to be on the defensive and again becomes the vigorous and positive leader of the past, giving definite and firm leadership and acting with a purpose with policies both full expounded and backed up, then and only then will our growing international problems diminish and eventually disappear.

U.S. NEEDS A DOCTRINE OF SELF-PRESERVATION

(By Fred A. Orleans)

British Guiana, a small country with slightly more than one half million people, is located on the northeast coast of South America and borders Venezuela and Brazil.

This country is a British crown colony which in 1963 will be released from the British Empire and become completely autonomous. It is expected that Chedi Jagan, a Communist, will be elected to power and the United States will then face the unusual situation of a constitutionally Communist government in the Western Hemisphere.

The United States, sooner or later, could find some justification on its own or in combination with the Organization of American States, to rectify the Cuban situation. However, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to intervene into the affairs of a country where the government has been established through a democratic election.

British Guiana represents a far greater threat to Latin America and to the Western Hemisphere in general than Cuba because it will be a government which has come into power through popular election, is located on the mainland of South America, and can act as a base for Communists throughout Latin America.

The advances of communism into the Western Hemisphere must be stopped immediately and neither the United States nor our friends in the Western Hemisphere can wait for any "plan" to become an effective instrument in stopping the inroads of communism in the Americas. It is feared that by the time our present plan for Latin America becomes effective, it will be too late since communism will already have made too great inroads.

Cuba has proven, and British Guiana will further prove, that the Monroe Doctrine, which in effect warned European powers against taking control of countries in the Western Hemisphere, is no longer effective since the Monroe Doctrine referred to physical intervention through armed might by a foreign power which would constitute military intervention.

In the war we are currently fighting against communism, the Russians are unlikely to send troops to any Latin American country. Their blueprint for taking over the Latin American nations is through subversion from within and then arming the government friendly to them with the guns, tanks, and planes needed to maintain power. Communists send technicians of all types, but not actually troops in uniform. This leaves the United States out on a limb and brings into sharp focus the need of a new doctrine to replace the outdated, obsolete and inoperable Monroe Doctrine.

The Russians have set the precedent in their actions toward Hungary in 1956 on the basis that a hostile, non-Communist government in Hungary would constitute a threat to the actual security of Russia. This, in effect, brings into force a new doctrine—the doctrine of self-preservation.

The United States, sooner or later, will have to take whatever steps deemed necessary to eliminate any threat to its security in the Western Hemisphere or face the ultimate danger of being completely isolated.

QUALIFIED LATIN AMERICAN POLICYMAKERS NEEDED

(By Fred A. Orleans)

The Latin American policy of the United States can be compared to a man putting new furniture into a burning house.

While the United States pours monetary and economic aid into Latin America, the fires of communism being fanned from the blaze in Cuba, continue to burn and spread. Commonsense would dictate putting out the fire before furnishing the house.

We are continuously being informed about the inevitability of "social revolution" and the necessity that we support it in order to hold the good will of the people of Latin America; that we must support Socialists in Latin American countries as an antidote to communism. The truth is that our reform program for Latin America is inoperable until communism is driven out of the Western Hemisphere.

The question still remains unanswered as to why a nation so well endowed with qualified experts on Latin America, should have to resort to the use of the services of persons so poorly equipped to give counsel, because of lack of experience, as those who "mastermind" our Latin American policy.

As long as our most vital Latin American policy continues to be formulated by sincere but inexperienced policymakers, we continue to face the ever-increasing danger of Khrushchev soon burying us in our own backyard.

Agricultural Research To Ease the Cost-Price Squeeze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, so that we may be better informed of the extremely valuable service performed by the Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following article which appeared in Successful Farming, September 1962:

SUCCESSFUL FARMING ASKS: WHAT'S AHEAD IN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Bryon T. Shaw, Administrator of USDA's Agricultural Research Service, heads up one of the largest research organizations in the world. Here, he tells what new developments you can expect, and what they may mean to you.)

Question. First, Mr. Shaw, could you put on a "dream cap" and give us a peak at some possible farm research breakthroughs?

Answer. One possibility that's not as fantastic as it may sound is a product which will form a film on the surface of the soil—letting water in but not out. It might be applied right along with fertilizer or pesticide The significance will assume even greater importance as new varieties, new insecticides, and the like, make moisture more and more the limiting factor in plant growth. We are working on such a product now.

Another breakthrough may be discovery of a way to enable nonlegumes, like corn, to fix their own supply of nitrogen—as legumes do now. We did this in one test.

Question. Now, what specific crop developments may soon be out of the test tube and into the field?

Answer. One of the most promising is the use of surfactants—soaps, detergents, and shampoos—in combination with herbicides. These are commonly used as sticking, spreading, and wetting agents. Now our scientists are finding they greatly increase the killing power of some herbicides.

Because surfactants improve the effectiveness of herbicides, less chemicals will be needed per acre. They can also make today's herbicides effective against weeds that are now difficult to kill.

What's more, surfactants may have a future in plant disease control. We've found that certain of them inhibit plant viruses that may also stop insects from infecting plants with disease organisms.

Question. What about promising developments in fertilization?

Answer. Our most promising research in this area concerns ways farmers can use fertilizer more effectively. For example, you can expect to hear much more about the relationship between fertilizer and moisture. One result will be that we will be able to show farmers how, during periods of short rainfall, they can "save" water by using the proper amounts of fertilizer. To illustrate, on experimental plots, native grass that yielded 85 pounds of forage per inch of rainfall when unfertilized, jumped to 349 pounds when fertilized with nitrogen and phosphorus.

Question. Any other soil and water research that may pay off soon?

Answer. One illustration is that, in the years ahead, farmers and ranchers in dry areas will be harvesting and storing rainwater for their livestock and themselves. Even a scant 8 inches of rainfall a year translates into 217,000 gallons per acre—enough for 200 cattle for 100 days.

Research has demonstrated that butyl rubber sheeting can be used to make a catchment basin to successfully gather rainfall. The water can be stored at low cost and without evaporation losses in collapsible butyl-covered nylon bags.

Question. We've been hearing about research dealing with the effect of light on plants. What does this promise?

Answer. That's difficult to say, specifically. So far, the application of this research has been limited largely to nurserymen, but from a broader view, it means we are one step closer to controlling plant growth.

Question. Can you mention examples of livestock research?

Answer. Our most promising research is in two areas—breeding and nutrition. For example, we are finding that an animal's blood antigens may identify associated hereditary characteristics of economic importance. Certainly, it will be a major breakthrough if we are able to accurately predict—at birth—such things as the animal's rate of gain, ratio of lean meat to fat, etc. The implications are obvious to livestock producers and to breeding research.

As to nutrition research, though it is difficult to pinpoint specifics, new research-proved diets should add 10 percent gains per animal in yields of eggs, broiler meat, and milk in the next few years.

Question. What about farm machinery?

Answer. One target, nearly within reach, is the mechanical harvesting of tree and bush fruits, now mainly a hand job. Harvesting equipment has been designed and tested with good success.

Still another possibility may be development of a corn drill which would plant all kernels the same direction. We know from experiments that this will control the direction of the plant leaves. So with all leaves growing across the row, there would be a maximum exposure to sunlight and a sharp cut in evaporation and erosion.

Question. How is the outlook for improved insect control?

Answer. There are several interesting developments just around the corner. Prospects, for example, are good that the chemical residue problem in using insecticides can be largely solved in the next few years. Development of better methods of formulating pesticides and more precise application will give farmers effective pest control with much smaller pesticide dosages than they use today.

Combining pesticides with baits or attractants is another way around chemical residues. Toxic baits placed near—but not on—crops would lure insect pests away from the crops and to their deaths.

One more promising possibility is the use of chemical sterilants against insects. Our scientists have discovered several organic chemicals which, used in minute amounts, prevent sexual reproduction in insects. Sterilants, combined with effective attractants, will be used by farmers for rapid elimination of an insect species.

Question. What are the most promising developments in new uses for farm products?

Answer. There are a number of them that are hope may "break" soon. In the food field, dehydrofreezing is just now coming into its own and should result in increased use of fruits and vegetables.

In a second area, if our early successes are borne out, expanded outlets for cereal derivatives in paper manufacture could result in new uses for 100 to 180 million bushels of grain a year.

Third, we're close to developing new paints from vegetable oils, to help offset the inroads made by synthetic resins.

A fourth is the development underway of high-stretch all-cotton yarn. This may prove as valuable to the cotton industry as did earlier USDA research on all-cotton wash-and-wear fabrics.

Fifth is our encouraging work toward a commercial process for making wool shrink-proof and wrinkle-resistant.

A sixth example is our research to develop new crops. Three, in particular, which are suitable for growing on land now in food and feed grains, are the African-daisy, crame, and lesquerella. All three have seeds that contain unusual and valuable oils that are different from each other and from other domestic oilseeds. They are definitely promising.

Question. Finally, Dr. Shaw, it's suggested American agriculture might be better off—for a while at least—with fewer research breakthroughs. Do you agree it's time to "slow up"?

Answer. Anyone who concludes from surpluses in a few commodities that we've "over-researched" has simply failed to keep abreast of the kind of research we are doing. Some people still think of agricultural research as an all-out effort to make two blades of grass—or bushels of corn—grow where one grew before. But research has many other objectives.

Question. You mean objectives other than just to increase production?

Answer. Yes—the whole area of reducing farm costs, for example. If our farmers were still using the same production practices they did at the start of World War II, it would have cost about $15 billion more to produce what we did last year. It's noteworthy that $15 billion is roughly $2 billion more than present net farm income.

So, I'd say one of our most important objectives has been—and is—to help farmers reduce their costs. There are dozens if not hundreds of such projects in various stages of our research right now.

Another area is seeking to develop new and broader markets for farm products.

Question. How's that?

Answer. One way is quality improvement. Our scientists are making real progress toward developing cattle that produce a higher proportion of lean tender meat, dairy cows that produce milk with more solids in proportion to fat, and hens that lay eggs which stay fresh longer.

A second way our research is pointed toward selling more farm products is through new uses, such as by industry.

To sum up, a major goal of our research is to give farmers some dollars and cents relief from the cost-price squeeze. This will become more apparent as the "breakthroughs" just ahead begin to unfold.

Biography of Guy Cardillo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the dedication ceremony held in the Roslindale section of Boston, Mass., in honor of Guy Cardillo, a young man who gave his life for our country during World War II.

A biography of Guy Cardillo is as follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF GUY CARDILLO

Guy Cardillo, service No. 31931684. Born February 10, 1915, in Roslindale, Mass.

Private First Class Cardillo was killed in action May 23, 1944, in Italy.

Guy Cardillo was born and raised in Roslindale. He attended the John D. Philbrick and Washington Irving Schools and Hyde Park High School. Before his induction he resided at 729 American Legion Highway, just a few houses down the street from the Army Reserve center. His parents still reside at this address.

Before entering the service, he was employed as an optical technician at a local firm and was among the first group to be inducted from the Roslindale area on March 19, 1941.

In January 1942, he married the former Marie V. Hiatt, of Roslindale, in Washington, D.C. In Christmas 1943 he last visited his wife and son, Stephen Guy, before his departure overseas.

After induction, Guy Cardillo was assigned to Company H, 181st Infantry, which at that time was stationed at Camp Edwards and later at Fort Dix, N.J. In January 1944, he was sent overseas where in March 1944 he joined Company E, 7th Infantry in Italy.

Pfc. Guy Cardillo, U.S. Army, was killed in action May 23, 1944, on the road to Rome from the Anzio beachhead as a member of an Army advanced infantry patrol. Private First Class Cardillo is believed to be the first person from Mount Hope district to lose his life in World War II.

Private First Class Cardillo was authorized Bronze Star Medal; posthumously awarded Purple Heart for having made supreme sacrifice; Good Conduct Medal; American Defense Medal; American Campaign Medal; European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal with two Bronze Stars for participation in the Anzio and Rome-Arno campaigns; World War II Victory Medal and Combat Infantryman Badge.

Pfc. Guy Cardillo was credited with active service from March 19, 1941, to May 23, 1944.

THE DEDICATION CEREMONY OF GUY CARDILLO, U.S. ARMY RESERVE CENTER, 675 AMERICAN LEGION HIGHWAY, ROSLINDALE, MASS., SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1962, 2:30 P.M.

PROGRAM

Col. John E. O'Neil, U.S. Army Reserve, program committee chairman.

Processional march: The national anthem, 18th U.S. Army Band, Fort Devens, Mass.

Invocation: Rt. Rev. Edward G. Murray, S.T.D., Sacred Heart Church, Roslindale, Mass.

Introduction of distinguished guests.

Presentation of decoration: Hon. JAMES A. BURKE, Member of Congress.

Unveiling of plaque: Hon. JAMES A. BURKE, Stephen G. Cardillo.

Benediction: Chaplain (Maj.) John J. Keilty, U.S. Army Reserve.

Distinguished military guests

Maj. Gen. William J. Verbeck, commanding, XIII U.S. Army Corps.

Maj. Gen. Michael J. Galvin, U.S. Army Reserve, commanding, 94th Infantry Division

Brig. Gen. Seymour A. Potter, commanding, U.S. Army Engineers.

Col. Robert A. Claffee, commanding, Massachusetts sector.

Rear Adm. C. L. Harding, represented by Commander Weiland, 1st Coast Guard District.

Rear Adm. J. H. Wellings, represented by Captain Burke, 1st Naval District.

Distinguished civilian guests

His Excellency, John A. Volpe, Governor, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, represented by Brig. Gen. Paul Mozzicato.

Hon. John F. Collins, mayor, City of Boston, represented by Mr. Robert DeSimone.

U.S. Army Reserve units in Roslindale: Headquarters, 3d Battle Group, 13th Infantry, Col. John E. O'Neil, commanding officer; Headquarters, 319th Engineer Battalion, Lt. Col. John D. Marr, commanding officer; Headquarters, 5th Howitzer Battalion, 10th Artillery, Lt. Col. Clinton A. Petersen, commanding officer; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 3d Battle Group, 13th Infantry, Capt. John E. Fitzgerald, commanding officer; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 319th Engineer Battalion, Lt. John W. Steiner, commanding officer; A Company, 319th Engineer Battalion, Lt. John R. Poskus, commanding officer; D Company, 319th Engineer Battalion, Capt. John F. Connolly, commanding officer; Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, 5th Howitzer Battalion, 10th Artillery, Capt. Henry K. Bramhall, commanding officer; A Battery, 5th Howitzer Battalion, 10th Artillery, Capt. Paul J. Carey, commanding officer; B Battery, 5th Howitzer Battalion, 10th Artillery, Capt. Louis J. Totino, commanding officer; A Troop, 4th Reconnaissance Squadron, Lt. Robert J. Tamulis, commanding officer; C Troop, 4th Reconnaissance Squadron, Capt. Walter F. Laughlin, commanding officer; B Company, 94th Signal Battalion, Capt. Randall Burrell, commanding officer; 245 Ordnance Company, Capt. Michael M. Albanese, commanding officer.

U.S. Army Advisory Group, Roslindale Reserve center; Officer in charge, Capt. Charles R. Voccio; chief clerk, M. Sgt. Alfred Marzilli; armor adviser, M. Sgt. Luca DeFillippo; artillery adviser, M. Sgt. James W. Smith; engineer adviser, Sfc. Hugo A. Kalns; infantry adviser, M. Sgt. Gordon A. Morris; infantry adviser, Sfc. P. H. Sandifer; supply noncommissioned officer, Sfc. LéRoy E. French.

Dedication committee: Col. John E. O'Neil; Capt. Charles R. Voccio; Capt. Robert M. Stapleton; Capt. A. Wickstrom; Capt. William J. Cavanaugh; Lt. Angelo C. Sciarratta; Mr. Fred Hubrich, American Legion; M. Sgt. Alfred Marzilli; M. Sgt. Luca DeFillippo; M. Sgt. James W. Smith; and Sfc. Hugo A. Kalns.

Refreshments served by Shea Post, American Legion, Roslindale, Mass.

Refreshments by Supreme Markets, Zayre, Woolworth, Housefold Finance Corp., American Legion Barber Shop, Selma's Shoe Store, Abbott & Rocco Hair Styling, A. & P. Markets, Sherbros, C. & C. Landscaping, Anderson-Little Co., Heritage Coffee Shops, all located in American Legion Shopping Center, Roslindale, Mass.

ROSLINDALE SUBSECTOR COMMAND, XIII U.S. ARMY CORPS

Roslindale Command was activated on August 1, 1958. Prior to that time it was part of Boston Area Command. This command encompasses the general geographical area of Roslindale, Dorchester, Roxbury, West Roxbury, Mattapan, Hyde Park, Milton, Randolph, Weymouth, Hull, Hingham and Quincy.

Here is Roslindale we have a Government-constructed, standard-design 1,000-man, 5-unit facility. This facility was initially occupied during March 1958, and formal opening was held on Armed Forces Day, 1958. It presently accommodates 11 U.S. Army Reserve units.

The mission of this command is to provide advisory support to Reserve units located in this area. The principal duty of this command is in furthering the efficiency and mobilization readiness of Reserve units assigned to this Reserve center. This is accomplished by assisting and advising units on matters pertaining to organization, administration, training, and operational capabilities. The form and substance of this advice and assistance may be indefinite.

At the present time there are 13 persons involved in the accomplishment of the above mission, consisting of 1 officer advisor, 7 enlisted advisers, and 5 civilian aids.

The advisers are the Active Army representatives to the Army Reserve units and the civilian community. They are highly qualified in the newest developments in doctrine, tactics, techniques, and the modernization of weapons and equipment. Advisers' effort, action, and enthusiasm plays an important part in the achievement of the objectives of the Army Reserve.

The 11 Reserve units assigned to Roslindale Subsector Command consist of approximately 900 men.

Facts Not Fancy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune—the paper the President does not read—has rendered a great public service by the reprinting of the report of a British reporter on what has actually happened in Cuba. I submit the two articles for the consideration of the House.

It would seem that President Kennedy should read facts instead of the fairy tales his advisers have told him about how the Communists mellow and how we really can do business with Castro.

FOR CONVENIENCE OF HOLIDAYERS, WE REPRINT CUBA REPORT NO. 1

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Because of the Labor Day holiday, many Herald Tribune readers may have missed the first article on "Inside Cuba Today," by Keith Morfett, of the London Daily Mail. Its significance is so great in the light of the Soviet buildup in nearby Cuba that the Herald Tribune is reprinting the article today.)

(By Keith Morfett)

Thousands of strapping young Russians are moving quietly into tented military encampments close to the outskirts of Havana in a vast Soviet buildup that is causing deep concern among diplomats in the Cuban capital.

From 5,000 to 8,000 Russians have arrived so far.

A Western ambassador in Havana told me categorically:

"I have reported to my government, despite all denials, that many of these men are Soviet troops, that they are arriving in increasing numbers, and that this is all part of a carefully planned military operation to underwrite the Castro regime."

Many of the Russians are in their early twenties. All have reached Cuba aboard three Soviet passenger liners.

At the same time, a continuous armada of cargo ships is now stretched out between Russia's Black Sea ports and Cuba, carrying trucks, jeeps, machinery, food, guns—and ground to air missiles for Fidel Castro's armed forces.

Arrivals of the Russians in such large numbers is seen by many diplomats in Havana as driving a final nail into the coffin of the Monroe Doctrine—the statement of U.S. foreign policy which established, over a century ago, the hands-off attitude to outside powers with ambitions in the American Hemisphere.

This much is certain from what I have just seen in Cuba:

No large-scale attempt to overthrow the Castro regime could now be launched by the United States or Cuban exiles without Russian blood being spilled in the process.

I watched the Russians in two separate encampments—after being told they were a ghost army existing only in the imagination of Americans.

They looked pretty healthy ghosts to me.

Hefty, athletic, and looking a lot better fed than their Cuban hosts, they crowded up to barbed-wire fence at the first camp I found near the village of El Cano.

They appeared to be members of the kind of unit usually moved in advance of regular fighting troops to set up camps, establish communications networks and accomplish other related chores.

In the tropical heat they looked unhappy and homesick. They had cloth caps and denim trousers and clustered together for comfort like sheep on the range in a rainstorm.

The contrast between the El Cano crowd and the next lot I looked at was so great that it became clear Cuba's Russians fall into two distinct categories.

The El Cano Russians were recruited into labor battalions rather like the British Army's Pioneer Corps. They will dig trenches, lay cables, and do all the donkey work.

A few miles away, down a rutted side road the whole countryside was suddenly swarming with Soviets. This time they were obviously on different business. Hundreds of them moved around among military vehicles parked under trees, in fields alongside hedges and between row upon row of khaki-colored tents.

Nearby, antiaircraft guns in freshly dug pits were manned by Cuban militiamen. Machineguns were mounted at all approach roads into the camp. By the tasks they were doing, checking their equipment on radio trucks, command vehicles, and signal equipment, these Russians appeared to be military technicians such as signal, staff, and electronic engineers.

Out in open spaces around the camp, dozens of them were dressed in identical physical training outfits of the kind troops would wear. They were doing gymnastics under the direction of instructors. Others were playing volley ball—dressed in the same dark blue trunks and running shoes. Still others were out on an improvised running track.

In every field for a couple of miles around were military vehicles, including some armed cars. Groups of heavily armed Cuban militia patrolled the camp's perimeter.

Many of the Russians at this encampment were billeted in what was the former boys reformatory at Torrens, about 14 miles from Havana. But they had quickly spilled over into tents.

Still more tents were being erected by the Russians as I drove past. Trucks filled with more Russians were rolling in through the bright red dust from the port town of Mariel, where a high wall—called little Berlin by the locals—is being built to screen off the dock area. Three miles from the Torrens encampment in the direction of Havana is a big Soviet vehicle park.

More Russian vehicles are packed in neat rows near Havana's seafront Malecon Drive, behind the American memorial commemorating the sinking of the battleship *Maine* during the war against the Spanish. These vehicles are all painted blue and stamped with the name Zil.

Down in Havana's dockyards, trucks were leaving the Soviet vessels from early morning until late at night piled high with huge, unmarked wooden crates.

All dock entrances are heavily guarded. Hundreds more military trucks, jeeps, and command vehicles were lined up five deep for quarter of a mile along the street called San Pedro on the Havana waterfront. These vehicles are all marked in Russian "Goriskovsky Avtozavod" and are being moved quickly to all parts of the island.

The Soviet liner *Gruziya*, yellow hammer and sickle painted on its scarlet funnel, was unloading while I was in the dock area.

In addition to its Russian passengers, the *Gruziya* brought back to Havana hundreds of young Cubans who had been on special courses in Moscow and Leningrad. All carried cheap Russian travel bags which matched their blue uniforms. They were met at the docks by their families. The next day about 2,000 young Cubans boarded the *Gruziya* for the return journey to Russia.

The Cuban Government insists that the young Russians now pouring into Cuba—yet to be seen on the streets of Havana—are all civilians.

The tightest censorship ever imposed since Castro came to power is now operating in the Cuban capital. Extent and scope of the Soviet buildup is being deleted from cable dispatches by military censors.

Twenty Soviet ships have reached Havana harbor in the last 3 weeks. In addition to the Soviet vessels, a fleet of chartered ships including some flying the British flag are under commission for the Cuban buildup.

Ten more Soviet vessels are at this moment Havana-bound on the high seas. They include the *Ustiuzhna*, the *Ivan Polzunov*, the *Usoliet*, and the *Ojotsk*. From Soviet ports also now Havana-bound are the East German *Westfalen*, the Norwegian *Tive Lilian*, the Greek cargo ship *Parnow*, the Italian *Airone*, the West German *Atlas*, and half a dozen ships flying the Liberian flag.

A number of British vessels are on the way to Russian ports to begin the long haul to the Caribbean.

What is behind it all? It began following the recent visit to Moscow by Fidel Castro's brother Raul Castro, who heads the Cuban armed forces, and economic chief Ernesto (Che) Guevarra.

I understand the Cuban Government urged Soviet Premier Khrushchev to provide the revolution's leaders with some sort of guarantee that the now openly Communist Cuban regime would not be allowed to collapse in the face of mounting economic chaos and shortages.

The Cubans sought similar guarantees against the possibility of direct American intervention to topple Castro's regime. They suggested Cuba might join the Warsaw Pact.

Instead of a pact, Mr. Khrushchev gave them a promise—and a better guarantee than they had bargained for. "I'll send you Russians," he reportedly said. "What better guarantee could you ask than that?"

While the Russians continue to arrive, Castro is anxious to keep his part of the bargain. This is that no incident of any kind involving the Americans should be allowed to arise while the Russians are still settling in.

This, it is believed in Havana, is why no fire was returned when an exile group steamed into Havana Bay 10 days ago and pumped cannon shells into a seafront hotel housing Communist technicians. It is also why Fidel Castro not only denied that his ships fired on an American plane last Friday, but also why he was reported enraged at the trigger-happy gunners who allowed it to happen. The Russians want no trouble, not at the moment anyway.

An air of anxiety now pervades Havana. It's as though everyone knows something big is about to happen—but no one knows quite what it will turn out to be. The presence of the Russians has given many Cubans a sense of quiet despair. They are convinced that "the Yanks won't come now—it's too late and they know it."

The city itself is almost totally Sovietized. The only hint of efficency anywhere is in the big bright posters everywhere extolling the glories of the revolution, the workers, and solidarity with the Soviets. The posters are superbly painted and lend the only color to the city of drabness and despair.

During the last few hours before I left Havana, six more Cubans went to the firing wall. Four hundred Cubans were rounded up amid rumors of a plot to topple Castro. Communist newsmen in the city—whose sources are usually good—say they expect a Castro speech soon giving details of how the plot was smashed.

The militia has been mobilized for a week. The food shortage is worsening daily. More Cubans are guardedly critical of Castro than at any time in the past 2 years. They must be careful. The "Committee for the Defense of the Revolution" has its ears on every street and block.

Notices I had not seen before in the bare shelved shops say "no dogs here—but we have teeth to bite those who talk against the revolution."

All security has been tightened. Every Cuban must now get not only police permission but also clearance from his local vigilante committee before he can even apply for an exit permit to leave the island.

The once elegant splendor of the big hotels is no more. Havana Hilton, where I stayed, is dirty, and everything is breaking down including the bathroom taps. Instead of a menu in the hotel restaurant, two plates of cold food are carted 'round on a trolley, and guests have to point to the plate they prefer.

At Havana Airport I watched a pitiful sight. Clothes of all kinds taken from departing Cubans as well as other cheap belongings were piled into a big heap. I was taken by militiamen to a small room and searched in case I was taking out anything for Cubans. Rings, watches, family heirlooms, all these must be left behind.

UNCENSORED EYEWITNESS REPORT NO. 2—LIFE IN CASTRO'S SOVIETIZED CUBA

(By Keith Morfett)

Forty-three months after the sweep of his bearded heroes into Havana from the mists of the Sierra Maestra, Fidel Castro has turned Cuba into a tropical 1984.

The swelling concentration of Russians in camps beyond the capital has coincided, over the last 10 days, with a final, unsecretive spurt toward total Sovietization and the creation of a closed society of 6 million people barely 50 minutes by air from the Florida coast.

All pretense is now tossed aside. Cubans are at last learning the meaning of the Migs in their skies and the "Big Brother" images of Lenin and Mao Tse-tung that look down from walls, billboards, and banners across the islands, towns, and cities.

Before a crowd of Campesinos the other day Fidel Castro, speaking with the simplicity of a schoolmaster addressing children, said: "Put up your hands all those who think they knew what a revolution was 3 years ago?" Not a single hand went up.

Castro said: "Put up your hands, all those who think they know what a revolution is now." Suddenly you could not see the heads for the waving hands.

Castro was unquestionably correct as Cubans are just discovering, the revolution was not the mountain battles against the troops of Batista; it was not the heady sense of victory at the seizure of Havana, nor the long, bitter wrangle over taking from America what Cubans considered their own.

The revolution is now. Even the slight degree of cautious gradualism of former days has gone out the window. The Soviets have arrived, and today the curtain is falling on Cuba with a finality that is startling even to many of those once proud of the name, "Fidelista."

From this week on, Cuban citizens increasingly will be prisoners in their own homeland. Exit permits will be hard to get. Every obstacle against leaving is set up.

All emphasis on the country's future direction will be unashamedly Communist. Minister of Industry Ernesto (Che) Guevarra was in Moscow to set the final seal on the massive movement into the Caribbean of Russian personnel, armaments, food and oil that will now form the island's lifeline.

In Sloppy Joe's Bar just off the Prado, where Alec Guinness shot scenes for "Our Man in Havana," I looked across the world's longest bar at the barman with the world's longest face.

"No, senor. No hay beer. No senor. No hay whisky. No senor. No hay gin. No senor. No hay orange juice."

His face brightened—but saddened just as suddenly with an awareness of the bitter irony of what he was saying.

"Senor, solo Cuba Libre." We both laughed. And he made me up the rum drink that is known nowadays as "Free Cuba."

The bare-shelved shops of Havana are no better. I cannot buy an egg—but I can buy a newly arrived booklet by Mao Tse-tung on "Correcting Contradictions in the Minds of the People."

I cannot buy a beef sandwich or a tin of milk or a pair of shoes—but I can buy a badge with Lenin's head on it or a dozen records of Russian folksongs.

I can make a telephone call, but I must not mind if a vibrant recorded voice comes on before the number goes through, chanting: "You are in the glorious free territory of Cuba. Venceremos (we will win)."

This is the lot of Cubans in Havana and throughout the island.

Cut this Soviet lifeline and Cubans must starve. Attack this island and Russians must die. It is now as simple as that.

I found Havana a strange city. Its streets are almost as free of traffic as a country town on a Sunday afternoon. Its restaurants are dismal, deserted places that you telephone first to see if they have food to serve at all.

Even the fish that abound off Cuba's coasts and the big Morro crabs from Havana Bay are seldom on sale in the city. The fishing fleets are tied up most of the time for "security reasons." And the chances are that if Ernest Hemingway's "Old Man" put out after marlin at the Gulf Stream's edge, he would be blasted out of the water by a Cuban gunboat.

But if Cubans are going short of things to eat, there's plenty of "new thought" to fill their minds. While I was in Havana a new batch of school textbooks, fresh from the printers, was going into the schools. There is a "new" geography book for 7-year-olds. Its author is Castro Cabinet member, Nunez Jimenez. Its title "This Is My Country."

It is superbly printed and illustrated, but all the maps of Cuba and its countryside are inset with little pictures of the revolution's leaders. Its first five pages consist of extracts from Castro speeches and under an early chapter heading, you read:

"Imperialism and the exploitation of the people."

The first grade learns that "in our schools before the triumph of the revolution, Yankee imperialists taught our children the theory that our country, 180 kilometers from United States, would never be able to free itself from the tentacles that imprisoned Cuba. Today, the struggle of the people destroys the lies of the false geography."

After this and other glimpses into the "new" geography in the same vein, it is no longer surprising to come across columns of slogan chanting schoolboys, marching like a miniature militia through Havana's streets.

The Castro revolution is creating its own art, its own music, its own poetry. A new volume of poetry has also gone into the schools. I have it beside me at this moment. Here is a poem written in tribute to Castro troops that fought in last year's disastrous invasion attempt by the Florida-based exiles.

The poem's title: "Bay of Pigs."

"With my useless hands, that know nothing
else but how to write,
I wish to gather your heads, my brothers,
compatriots.
The heads of those who died under a different sun, the heads that flew to
undo the abuses.
And in my being will be your blood, and
the need for avenging your deaths.
Now I do not fear the words: 'Justice; liberty; bread'."

Or this one—the lines of which will soon be known by heart by a million schoolchildren:

"I believe in the life that is to come for all,
I believe in the life that was born out of
the fires of hatred,
I believe in the Communist Party,
I believe in the revolution,
I believe in the budding roses,
And in the peasants of my country."

With this "Orwellian world," comic contrasts sit strangely in the sadness of its streets.

Like the stickers on all the buses saying: "Consume the produce of your country"—when Cubans would quite happily consume anything from anywhere to supplement beans and dry bread.

Like the single island of elegance atop Havana's highest skyscraper where diplomats (and an occasional Cuban Cabinet Minister) eat duckling while Cubans far below go empty bellied to their beds.

Said one Cuban: "It's way up there in the sky so no one can see what's on their plates."

Like the new tourist literature, superbly done, that claims in bold letters across the front of gay brochures: "Cuba has a flavor all its own."

Like the barmen in the world-famous "Floridita," who have removed the solid gold brooches, shaped into their names, from the lapels of their white jackets.

They stand now before the large lettering along the bar, "Da Cuna del Daiquerí" (the cradle of the daiquiri) and explain a little sadly: "It seemed all wrong to keep wearing the gold brooches—with customers coming in with open-neck shirts."

Like the taximan who jerks his thumb toward the building that housed the U.S. Embassy and says reassuringly: "I tell you frankly, senor, the Yanquis will be back in there 12 months from now."

But when you hope it will be nice for him he adds, apologetically: "Ah senor, I am leaving soon with my family for Florida."

Through all of this the Cubans have retained their infinite capacity for courtesy and friendliness.

In many visits to Cuba I have never once been treated with discourtesy—despite being taken much of the time for an American. The same applied on this occasion, even though I tried to buy American magazines. The shelves were stacked high with Mao and Lenin, and a flood of Communist-bloc literature.

From the harbor wall where boys still cast for snapper, I looked back, before leaving, on a city that has worn itself out.

Russians move in by the thousands; but the heady fervor of rebellion has spent its force.

For Havana, 3 years and 7 months later, the "Barbudos" (bearded ones) are but a memory of what might have been.

Nothing is left now but the soldiers—and the slogans—and everywhere the guns.

Home Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am pleased to include an editorial and feature article printed in the East Side News, a local publication with wide distribution in my congressional district relating to a "home peace corps" proposed by one of my constituents, Mr. Joseph Fisch.

I have, in this session of Congress, introduced legislation to create a domestic peace corps whose primary purpose would be to combat the problem of juvenile delinquency. Mr. Fisch's proposal would, in my opinion, foster better international relations between our country and the nations abroad. I think Mr. Fisch is to be commended on his excellent proposal and am contemplating the introduction of legislation based thereon:

HANDS ACROSS THE SEAS

Never before has the home peace corps been presented to the American people.

It is a novel plan which should merit the earnest consideration of our President. It is replete with unlimited potentialities to foster a better understanding between our Nation and the countries abroad.

Under the plan proposed, American hosts would have an opportunity at firsthand to show the American image in action. Foreign visitors would see how we live at home, how we work in factories, plants and businesses, how our schools and universities are conducted, how we spend our leisure time, etc.

With the adoption of such a plan, America's true national image could be projected, which would do more to create good will and better international relations than the propaganda we constantly hear on radio or read in the foreign press.

We urgently call upon the editors of our city's newspapers to help us in bringing this plan to the attention of the American people, because we believe that a better appreciation of our way of life could best be promoted between ourselves and those who visit our shores.

HOME PEACE CORPS PROPOSED TO PRESENT TRUE AMERICAN IMAGE TO THE WORLD AT LARGE

A bold plan which would permit virtually all Americans to participate personally and directly in the objectives of President John F. Kennedy's Peace Corps was proposed today by Joseph Fisch, lifetime East Sider, attorney, and prominent community leader, in an interview with Abraham Schlacht, publisher of East Side News. Fisch's idea would enable Americans from every walk of life to become part of a "home peace corps" and serve their country without any interruption of their normal life or business routine, and without the necessity of leaving America.

President Kennedy's Peace Corps program, Fisch explained, has basically two objectives: (1) The export of specialized technical skills to select underdeveloped countries, and (2) the dissemination abroad of a favorable American "image" by Peace Corps members who serve, in a sense, as American ambassadors overseas. These Peace Corps members promulgate, indirectly rather than as militant propagandists, America's true national character and purpose.

Fisch stated that his program would supplement the second objective of the Peace Corps plan; namely, the presentation of the true American image to the foreigner. His plan, he explained, "is designed for the millions of Americans who were stirred by the President's inspiring call to service, and who are eager to serve, but who either do not possess the technical skills required for service abroad, or who are unable to leave the country."

Fisch's proposal does not require sending additional Americans abroad, but is aimed instead at the hundreds of thousands of foreign visitors who come here to America each year.

"Unfortunately, these foreign visitors see little more of America than its tourist sights, national monuments and museums. A country's true national image is reflected not in marble edifices but in its people and their manner of life. Access to an average American family is rarely available to the visitor from abroad. Because of this, we are failing to utilize our most valuable evidence of America's true image and purpose—our people," he said.

Under Fisch's plan, a foreign visitor would be invited to meet and visit a typical American family with whom the visitor shares a common interest. Basically, the program would operate as follows: Home peace corps offices would be established, under the auspices of the U.S. Information Agency or Peace Corps, in major American cities. These offices will maintain files of volunteer Americans who have offered to invite foreign visitors to their homes, listing the professions of these Americans, their educational background, hobbies, etc.

A foreign visitor wishing to avail himself of this service merely contacts a home peace corps office, indicates the intended length of his visit, his background, profession, hobbies, etc. The files will then be examined and an appropriate American family contacted. Arrangements can be handled through the home peace corps office which will contact the foreign visitor, inviting him to visit the American on a particular day. Or the American can contact the foreign visitor himself. In this way, a foreign visitor who, for example, is a teacher by profession, might be invited to meet an American teacher and his family and dine with them at home.

The program need not be limited to merely a dinner invitation, of course, but has unlimited potential. The cost to the American host is completely a matter of his own discretion, as is the amount of time he wishes to allot to a foreign guest. These matters would be part of the information on file in the home peace corps office and would be checked again when an American host is being selected for a particular foreign applicant. If the volunteer American so chooses, he can take his foreign guest to a concert, to the theater, etc. There are many free attractions and amusements which would have greater appeal to a foreigner if he were in the company of an American. The Greenwich Village outdoor art exhibition, the free concerts at Central Park, and the East River Park Amphitheater, are but a few examples.

The foreigner can also be invited to visit with his American host at work. Thus the foreign teacher can visit a class taught by his American teacher host, the lawyer from abroad can see our courts in session, and the merchant can visit the shop of his American friend. Of course, it need not be a similarity of occupations or educational background which bring the American and foreign visitor together, but perhaps a mutual hobby. It may, therefore, develop that an American officeworker is selected to act as host to a physician from abroad because they share a strong interest in amateur photography, or stamp collecting, or Dixieland jazz music, or abstract art.

"The most important advantage of this plan," Fisch declared, "is that it permits direct personal contact and communication between people."

"I am confident," he continued, "of the enthusiastic support for such a plan by Americans who wish to do their share for their country. How many of us would not be willing to invite a foreign visitor to our home for dinner, to meet our family and friends and to discuss matters of mutual concern?

"The foreign visitors should be afforded an opportunity to see more of America than the Empire State Building, and more of Americans than the tourist guide or hotel clerk. He should be permitted to communicate with our people so that he may return to his country and inform his countrymen of what he has seen. This program would extend to countless average Americans the opportunity to further personally the interest of universal understanding."

Mr. Fisch is a Phi Beta Kappa member of New York University, a graduate of Harvard Law School, assistant counsel to the New York State Investigation Commission, and chancellor commander of the Albert Einstein Lodge, Knights of Pythias.

Susquehanna River in Pittston Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles A. McCarthy, a historian in my congressional district, has written a series of articles on the early history of the Susquehanna River, particularly in the Pittston area. The latest installment in this series appeared in the Pittston Sunday Dispatch on September 9, 1962, and as part of my remarks today I quote the text of that article.

The article follows:

FROM LOCAL HISTORY: SUSQUEHANNA RIVER IN PITTSTON REGION—PITTSTON FERRY BRIDGE VICTIM OF WINDS, ICE, AND FLOODS

(By Charles A. McCarthy)

As early as 1858, H. Litts was employed as the tolltaker on the Pittston Ferry Bridge.

In February, 1858, a windstorm carried away one-third of the bridge roof. This damage was completely repaired by May 28, 1860.

A contract for a new two-lane, covered bridge was awarded on August 28, 1863, to Kellogg & Canner, contractors from Easton, Pa., by the Pittston Ferry Bridge Co.

The new bridge was to be erected in approximately the same location as the old bridge.

Regarding the old bridge, soon to be replaced, an oldtimer of that era later remarked: "The first bridge became moss and dust covered—dingy, like the old oaken bucket. He stated "Old Hoyt" was the tolltaker at that time.

While the new bridge was being built, temporary ferry service was established. Toll rates on the ferry were: double team, 5 tickets for $1; one horse and vehicle, 10 tickets for $1. Many boats were also pressed into service to carry passengers back and forth across the river at this point.

Mr. Phillips' raftload of oak plank, for the bridge's construction was washed away in the high water on Sunday, May 15, 1864.

Harry Polen was the foreman in charge of construction work on the new bridge. Barnet Serfass was a carpenter.

On August 31, 1864, B. F. Snyder and Harry Stetlar, both employed as carpenters, were hit by an overhead crane and were knocked from the bridge into the river, falling 30 feet into 5 feet of water, without serious injury to either of them.

The initial crossing on the new bridge, by teams, took place on the south side of the structure on Saturday, September 17, 1864. This bridge withstood the high water of St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1865, the biggest flood in Wyoming Valley up to that time. Houses, barns, canalboats, lumber, trees, fences, horses, cattle, chickens, sheep, pigs, and other valuable property were swept away.

Paving of the bridge's east side approach with cobblestones on November 23, 1865, was considered a great improvement and was beneficial to pedestrians and wagons.

PLANKS RELAID

J. S. Carpenter and several men cleaned and relayed the planks in the bridge roadway, on June 15, 1868. About the same time a director's room was erected on the south side of the Pittston end of the bridge.

Footwalks on the bridge were widened, after January 4, 1869.

It was mentioned on July 14, 1870, that West Pittston Borough Council had built an iron railing on the bridge's west end, at a cost of $2.50 per foot. Jonah Howell modeled and installed the railing.

Officials of Pittston Ferry Bridge Co., on October 13, 1870, placed hemlock brush and stones around the piers to catch and settle dirt at the pier bases.

FLOODWATERS

Ice and floodwaters, which rose 8 feet in 1 hour devastated the area on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1875, and washed the Ferry Bridge away.

The Lackawanna & Bloomsburg (D.L. & W.) Railroad bridge was wrenched from its moorings by the seething ice gorge and turbulent waters and it floated down the Susquehanna River where it struck and lifted the Ferry Toll Bridge clear of its piers and carried it to a point 3 miles above Wilkes-Barre where remnants of the debris were left on the riverbank.

FINAL CROSSING

The last persons to cross the Ferry Bridge before it was swept away were Mr. and Mrs. John Hurlbut and Mrs. Charles Law. They first rode to the Water Street Bridge in Mr. Hurlbut's wagon but, finding it in a precarious position, they hurried to the Ferry Bridge which they crossed over safely to the west side.

Immediate plans were formulated by Ferry Bridge Co. officials for the construction of a new, iron bridge at the same site.

A contract for the erection of a new, iron bridge was awarded to the King Iron Bridge Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, at a cost of $71,931.62.

On April 5, 1875, bridge company officials requested permission of Pittston Borough Council to extend and raise the proposed bridge to the level of North Main Street. The borough solicitor, Stark, rendered the opinion that council had the right to grant such a permit. Attorney Ferris, the representative of the regional property holders, took the opposite view. The permit to raise the bridge 15 feet and extend it to connect with North Main Street was granted by Pittston Borough Council on April 15, 1875.

NEW BRIDGE

The new bridge, 1,100 feet in length, was completed within 11 months from the commencement of its erection. It was opened to public traffic on July 1, 1876.

Acting on the authority of borough council, the burgess and borough engineer of Pittston hired E. W. Miller on April 30, 1877, to construct a railing on the wall at Ferry Bridge, on the Pittston end of the structure, at a cost of $125.

If Red Cuba Was a Threat Before, It's More So Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people, in ever-growing numbers, demand action against Russian intervention in this hemisphere.

The Florida press has been particularly alert to this threat at our southern door—only 90 miles from our own beaches. Our editors and feature writers report from the vantage point of close proximity to the danger, and with the advantage of contacts with Cuban exiles now living in Florida.

Over the past months I have had reprinted here in the RECORD stories and editorials from Florida so that these events would be called to the attention of all Members of Congress and other Government leaders. As a further indication of the feelings of our citizens on these matters, I include the following in the RECORD:

IF RED CUBA WAS A THREAT BEFORE, IT'S MORE SO NOW

"If the circumstances in 1960 and early 1961 justified decisions by two administrations that a U.S.-sponsored invasion of Cuba was essential, how can the far worse circumstances of today require less? Inaction can be justified at this point only by a no-win policy of paralysis. The longer the United States waits to expel communism from Cuba, the more difficult will be the job."

The inescapable logic of that analysis Sunday by Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, of the situation facing the United States cannot be disputed. The debacle of the Bay of Pigs remains to haunt President Kennedy and those advisers who prevailed upon him to withhold the vital American assistance that the valiant Cuban freedom fighters needed to make their invasion a success.

Even those who formerly thought that Castro should be let alone to fall eventually to internal forces have changed their thinking. John S. Knight, publisher of the Miami Herald, wrote the other day:

"I am among those who long ago opposed the idea that Castro should be thrown out simply because we did not approve of him. Cuba had a right to have a revolution. * * * But today's situation is totally different. Castro has betrayed the people who supported the revolution. He is a Communist dictator who would spread that insidious ideology throughout Latin America.

"He has collaborated with a foreign power—Russia—to extend its system to the Western Hemisphere. This is a flagrant violation of the Monroe Doctrine, and should be dealt with as such."

Unfortunately, the people who have the President's ear on foreign affairs are the Walt Rostows and the Arthur Schlesingers who are not unfriendly to leftwing dictatorships. In fact, Professor Rostow merely considers communism a "disease of modernization." He holds to the belief that Communist regimes eventually will "mellow."

As far as we can see, the only mellowing that has taken place in recent years has been in the official backbone of the Nation's leadership. We suggest that the President scorn at this time the advice of Messrs. Rostow and Schlesinger, and ask a famous Democrat from Missouri what he would do about Castro. Even Harry Truman's most bitter critic knows that something would have been done long before now if he were still in the White House.

The first thing we think should be done is the setting up, as Senator SMATHERS has suggested, of a Cuban government-in-exile. And then we should take whatever steps are necessary to put it back in power in Havana—regardless of Moscow's threats.

As it is, President Kennedy can always switch his cool-weather vacation spot from Palm Beach to southern California. But we south Floridians must live here and face the daily reality of an ever-stronger Red menace just over the horizon.

We say something should be done to dispose of that menace, and done fast.

President Kennedy's Views on Amending Constitution Questioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's recent declaration in apparent support of the process of amending the Constitution by interpretation, has aroused considerable concern.

The President delivered an extemporaneous address at the White House to a group of students in which he discussed the Constitution, and spoke of the need of men to "make it work," in the light of new and changed conditions.

The President told the students:

Well, the American Constitution is an extraordinary document and it is certainly the most extraordinary written Constitution in the history of the world, but it has required men to make it work, and it still does today.

After all, the Constitution was written for an entirely different period in our Nation's history. It was written under entirely different conditions. It was written during a period of isolation. It was written at a time when there were 13 different units which had to be joined together and which, of course, were extremely desirous of limiting the central power of the Government.

That Constitution has served us extremely well, but all of its clauses, the general welfare, and due process and all the rest, had to be interpreted by man and had to be made to work in an entirely different world from the day in which it was written, both at home and abroad.

The President said it "had to be interpreted by man," meaning—I assume—the Supreme Court, "and had to be made to work in an entirely different world from the day in which it was written."

But the Constitution does not provide for making it work by the technique of interpretation, if the effect of that interpretation is to change the document, and nowhere does it permit a change by interpretation by virtue of the fact that the times may be quite different now from what they were.

This doctrine thus enunciated by the President is obviously a dangerous one. The late Franklin D. Roosevelt complained that the process of amendment as contained in the Constitution was "too cumbersome," and he deliberately called on the Congress to enlarge the Supreme Court in order that he could appoint new Justices who would interpret the Constitution to suit F.D.R. And when that failed, he achieved the same objective by filling several vacancies which occurred shortly after that.

That marked the beginning of the end of constitutional government in this country as was provided and contemplated by the Founding Fathers. To be sure, we still have a Constitution, though somewhat tortured and battered as a result of repeated judicial assaults upon it since the Supreme Court was packed. And those attacks upon the supreme law of the land have been somewhat intensified by decisions rendered since Mr. Chief Justice Warren's appointment. The result is that the Constitution no longer has either the sanctity or the meaning that was formerly the case.

The President in his August 29 speech said the Constitution "had to be interpreted by man and had to be made to work," apparently by interpretation, to meet changed conditions.

In other words, the President rules out the principle of interpretation according to what was said and intended by those who wrote the Constitution and according to the time-honored principle of conformance to precedent in applying the interpretation.

If the President did not mean just that, then he owes it to the American people to restate his position and to clarify the meaning of what he did say.

The conclusion is inescapable that Mr. Kennedy means to imply that he shares the views of the late F.D.R. to the effect that it is alright to amend the constitution through a process of interpretation.

F.D.R.-KENNEDY DOCTRINE IS DANGEROUS

Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize too strongly my conviction that such a doctrine is dangerous, and if followed by the Supreme Court in the future it can lead to the destruction of our Republic.

Indeed, irreparable damage has already been done by the application of that rule of interpretation. Perhaps it is not too late to mitigate that damage, but in that respect there is certainly no solace to be gained from the President's speech to the students.

In fact, the practice of judicial restraint by the Supreme Court became prevalent by several 5-to-4 decisions last year and the year before, following several years of irresponsible judicial abuse by a majority of the members of that tribunal. But with the recent resignations of Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Mr. Justice Whittaker, it now appears quite likely that the trend will be reversed.

It would be foolish to argue that precedents should not be changed if they are manifestly wrong. Yet well established precendents have been ignored and all but held in contempt by the majority of the Court in many decisions that have been handed down in recent years.

The late and lamented Judge Learned Hand, one of the wisest and most respected jurists in modern times, in discussing the place that precedents has in our jurisprudence, once referred with approval to his friend and colleague, Judge Thomas Swan. "He will," Hand commented, "not overrule a precendent unless he can be satisfied beyond peradventure that it was untenable when made; and not even then if it has gathered around it the support of a substantial body of decisions based on it."

It follows that such precedents would be tenable if interpretations when made were in keeping with the intention of those who wrote the Constitution. As Justice Miller once wrote:

We are to place ourselves as nearly as possible in the condition of the men who framed that instrument.

JOHN MARSHALL OPPOSED INTERPRETATION TECHNIQUE

Chief Justice John Marshall in Gibbons against Ogden, a historic decision, declared that:

The enlightened patriots who framed our Constitution and the people who adopted it must be understood * * * to have intended what they said.

Judge Cooley, author of "Constitutional Limitations," often used as a textbook or dependable reference work by most of our law schools, declared that:

A Court * * * which should allow a change in public sentiment to influence it in giving to a written Constitution a construction not warranted by its Founders would be justly chargeable with reckless disregard of official oath and public duty.

Mr. Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo, who graced our Supreme Court for many years, in his "Judicial Process," referred to the contention that a judge may substitute his individual sense of justice for rules of law, and stated:

That might result in a benevolent despotism if the judges were benevolent men. It would put an end to the reign of law.

The late Justice Edward Douglas White, one of the most eminent and respected men who has ever served on the Supreme Court, discussed the subject with great wisdom and foresight, in these words:

In the discharge of its function of interpreting the Constitution, this Court exercises an august power * * *. It seems to me that the accomplishment of its lofty mission can only be secured by the stability of its teachings and the sanctity which surrounds them * * *. The fundamental conception of a judicial body is that of one hedged about by precedents which are binding on the Court without regard to the personality of its members. Break down this belief in judicial continuity, and let it be felt that on great constitutional questions this Court is to depart from the settled conclusions of its predecessors, and to determine them all according to the mere opinion of those who temporarily fill its bench, and our Constitution will, in my judgment, be bereft of value and become a most dangerous instrument to the rights and liberties of the people.

Thus, it can be seen that if the Constitution is to be interpreted in accordance with the whims of a sitting Justice, without regard to precedent or the intention of the Founding Fathers, then that great document must become unstable and uncertain, and of little beneficial value in maintaining constitutional government in this country.

James Madison, the Father of the Constitution, spoke of the probable "useful alterations" of the Constitution "to be suggested by experience." And Madison said that with that in mind the delegates who drafted the Constitution included article V, which describes the method by which that document may be amended. He said the Convention preferred that method because "it guards equally against that extreme facility which would render the Constitution too mutable, and that extreme facility which might perpetuate its discovered faults."

It seems crystal clear that the framers of the Constitution thought they were guarding against allowing that document to be amended by mere interpretations that might reflect the changing moods of public opinion, or in order to conform with the views of a President, or of the philosophies of a group of men who might sit on the Court at any particular time.

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON WARNED OF DANGERS THROUGH JUDICIAL ABUSE

Mr. Speaker, there has been a radical departure from those basic principles in recent years. That fact is widely recognized. Not long ago 36 chief justices of the then 48 States in a meeting in California approved a report that expressed that view:

It has long been an American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men—

They stated—

We believe that any study of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at

least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast.

That group of distinguished jurists went on to state that members of the Supreme Court were exercising insufficient judicial restraint and were in effect enacting law as well as interpreting it.

It will be recalled that many of the Founding Fathers foresaw the appearance on the American scene of those who would change the Constitution by interpretation. And they warned of the dangers inherent in such a turn of events.

In his farewell address George Washington, in referring to possible attempts to change the Constitution without conforming to article V, stated:

Let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

And Thomas Jefferson, the father of separation of powers, and a stanch defender of the Supreme Court where its powers are judiciously exercised, solemnly warned:

There is no danger I apprehend so much as the noiseless, and therefore unalarming, instrumentality of the Supreme Court.

There can hardly be any question but that if the President's speech regarding the Constitution could have been submitted to Washington, Madison, and Jefferson for censure, it would never have been given, because it condones amendment by interpretation, and therefore by usurpation.

That is not the constitutional way of doing it. The Supreme Court has the power to do it that way, but it does not have the right to do it.

German Harvest Festival Held in Philadelphia, September 3, 1962, by the Cannstatter Volksfest Verein, a German-American Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege to accept an invitation on September 3, 1962, to deliver the principal address on the opening day of the 90th annual commemoration of a German harvest festival sponsored by the Cannstatter Volksfest Verein, a German-American organization of Philadelphia, Pa.

The 3-day festival which was held from September 3 through September 5 commemorated a German folk festival instituted in 1818 by William I, of Wuerttemberg, after the years of starvation and hunger in 1816–17 in Cannstatt which was the city district of Stuttgart.

In attendance at the festival were members of German societies from various counties in Pennsylvania together with a group of 200 tourists from Germany who joined in the 3-day festivities.

The visiting Germans included public officers, business and professional men who live near Stuttgart in Wuerttemberg a state in West Germany. Philadelphia is their first stop on a tour of 12 American cities.

One of the highlights of the festival was a 40-foot-high tower of a variety of vegetables and fruits and 20,000 nails used to attach them to a wooden structure.

My address delivered on September 3 follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 90TH COMMEMORATION OF A GERMAN HARVEST FESTIVAL SPONSORED BY THE CANNSTATTER VOLKFEST VEREIN, A GERMAN-AMERICAN ORGANIZATION, PHILADELPHIA, PA., SEPTEMBER 3, 1962

I consider it a genuine privilege to join with the Cannstatter Volkfest Verein and other German societies represented here in a spirit of gratitude and thanksgiving. Today we pay homage to a lasting tradition that was born out of hardship.

The United States is not listed among the oldest nations of the world but we have rapidly developed a tradition of celebrating important local events through what we term "festivals." This type of grassroots community party is an expression of our desire to join in fellowship.

This has been a good habit for Americans. In days past a similar urge sparked quilting bees, helped to build a neighbor's barn or a local church, brought about town meetings and afforded fire protection. We are reminded that this "folk festival" was instituted in 1818 by William I of Wurttemberg after the years of starvation—years of hunger—in 1816–17 in Cannstatt, which was the city district of Stuttgart. The wish to commemorate and give thanks resulted in the tradition of building "the column made from fruits of the lands."

It is good for America that this celebration has survived the years. America has had an opportunity no other country has ever had, the opportunity of assimilating the old traditions of many lands into a new tradition of her own.

In the complexity of our modern industrial life we too often forget the seasonal consciousness which has so potently influenced the development of other races. Our great cities are so congested and the pressure and tension of the daily routine is so tremendous, that little heed is paid to the significance of a long-ago event.

The festival was the channel through which early man poured forth his wonder at ever-changing events. Through the medium of festivals we in America may preserve much of the idealism and beauty of other peoples. We recall that tradition has been a mighty power in Germany. For that reason the vast majority of German festivals stem from circumstances that prevailed many years ago.

Incidents, including the desire to give thanks, have been plucked from the records of victories and heroism and fashioned into an array of pageants and festivals.

Someone has said, and I quote:

"The folklore of a land constitutes the unobliterated tracks of both individuals and nationalities that have crossed and dwelt on that land."

From the number of reasons why it is worth while for a community to hold a festival perhaps the best is that it fosters a new respect for one's neighbor. A fair may show the rest of the country what excellent farmers live there. A commercial exhibition may show how keen and forward are the businessmen. But a festival, based on tradition, brings all together.

It is the expression of a community, the expression of a native spirit. Nothing reaches more directly to the roots of a people than their legends and history. A folk festival brings "lost" backgrounds to the front. In so doing it brings also a new understanding to a community.

A day of thanksgiving is not in all respects a solemn occasion. It is a feast day in the clearest meaning of the term, but beneath the surface there is a note of solemnity.

Americans have always been able to find ample reason for thankfulness in a free land, in a land of great abundance. Each individual has his own private reasons for feelings of gratitude for the things he has or the things he has escaped.

We are in the midst of a great commonwealth. We are surrounded by the rich resources of nature. Science and industry through the "mind of man" are providing us with physical comforts in great abundance.

Certainly no people on earth have more reason for gratitude for material things. These material blessings carry with them responsibilities as well as privileges and opportunities. Material abundance affords opportunities for development of the Nation's spiritual and cultural values, without which material wealth is empty.

The state of the Nation's material welfare places upon it grave responsibilities for wise and careful and generous leadership in a world in which so many other peoples are denied the abundance that is ours.

The freedom which we enjoy—such freedom as few other nations have ever known—represents our bounty in all its fullness. And this carries the responsibility to use our means and our energies and our resources where they can be used best to help keep the world free.

I do not think this celebration is a matter of any particular creed. It is an occasion for all—each in his own way—to give thanks to Almighty God for the bounty of a free land which has provided spiritual and material blessings.

Within what is now this great commonwealth many peoples of different cultures, customs, and tongues came to lay the foundations of an experiment in government that might well be termed a wellspring of liberty and freedom. Today the descendants of the first pioneers, together with those of later immigrants who sought the opportunities afforded free men, have grown into millions. They enjoy that priceless heritage and are living witnesses to the fulfillment of the concepts and ideals of freedom.

Is it not fitting, therefore, that such cherished shrines as Independence Hall—the Nation's birthplace; Valley Forge—where the cause of liberty lived through its darkest hours; and Gettysburg—where the Union survived its greatest wound, should all rest within the borders of Pennsylvania?

The Germans were a most important element in the early population of America. A number of the artisans and carpenters in the first Jamestown Colony were of German descent. In 1710 a body of 3,000 Germans came to New York.

Most of the early German immigrants settled in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and the Carolinas. The ethnic pattern of Pennsylvania was complex from the earliest days of the province and each group brought with it its own social ideals and cultures. Immigrants from the German states formed a large group. A reliable estimate of their numbers at the time of the Revolutionary War places their total number at 110,000 out of a total population of 225,000.

In 1776 Benjamin Franklin stood before the Parliament of Great Britain answering

questions. The inquiry went something like this:

Question. What number of white inhabitants do you think there are in Pennsylvania?

Answer. I suppose there may be about 160,000.

Question. What number of them are Quakers?

Answer. Perhaps a third.

Question. What number of Germans?

Answer. Perhaps another third—but I cannot speak with certainty.

We do not know by what means Franklin arrived at his estimates. William Penn had traveled in Germany. His mother was Low Dutch and through his continental associations he had formed a high opinion of the husbandry of German farmers.

The Mennonites and other members of the plain sects held many religious beliefs which were similar to those of the Quakers.

"They are very near the truth," Penn declared in a letter to his confidant, James Logan.

Here were desirable settlers for his far-off wilderness. Consequently his invitation went forth. It spoke a message of hope to the forlorn victims of centuries of strife; it proclaimed a new chance for those who wished for a sanctuary.

For almost a century thereafter the Germanic states were being depopulated by emigrations Pennsylvania bound. Love of liberty was innate among the German people of Pennsylvania. They had suffered much and traveled far to find it.

The repressive acts of 1774, by which Parliament and the British King tried to punish the American colonies, struck a blow at liberty. The particular punitive measure—which incensed the people of Pennsylvania—was the closing of the port of Boston. Such arbitrary actions reminded the Germans of the dreaded Hussars who had swept down upon their farms, pillaging and slaughtering as they mercilessly ravaged those in their pathway.

The colonial Germans joined in the protests which were raised against the intolerable acts and they helped to raise money for the relief of Boston.

Committees of correspondence were formed in most of the German communities. Once involved in the conflict for American liberty the Pennsylvanians of German parentage entered into the fray with a zeal commensurate with their new born status as American citizens.

One summer day in 1783 Gen. George Washington stood on the long veranda at Mount Vernon and said farewell to the escort of mounted men who had accompanied the victorious leader to his estate on the Potomac.

The horsemen were a detachment from Maj. Von Heer's Independent Troop of Horse, which had served the Commander in Chief as his bodyguard during the last years of the war. The original bodyguard was disbanded in 1777 when a plot of treachery had been uncovered.

In organizing a new guard Washington selected the Independent Troop of Horse, a body of troops recruited largely from the Germans living in Pennsylvania and Maryland. The Germans of Pennsylvania were among the first to answer Washington's call and they were the last to leave his side at Mount Vernon.

When the War of Independence had ended the Germans in Pennsylvania and neighboring States were no longer foreigners living in America. They were Americans entitled to the full enjoyment of the freedom which they had helped to win. Diverse cultures were free to integrate and blend into a new and distinctly American pattern. By the time the Constitution was formed a new nationality had developed in the New World, the American nationality.

We recall that the State convention, elected in Pennsylvania to ratify the Constitution of the United States, numbered persons of German descent in the delegations from most of the counties. Many discussions of the provisions were conducted in the German tongue.

The first Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States was Frederick August Conrad Muhlenberg. It would be an endless task to call the roll of distinguished persons who have sprung from Pennsylvania German stock.

But their contributions to our culture and our freedom should be a portion of the spirit of thanksgiving that rests in us today. The Great Seal of the United States—adopted at the very birth of the Republic—bears the Latin phrase "E Pluribus Unum." The years have made those words familiar to countless Americans.

Even those who do not know their precise meaning have a deep understanding of the significance of the phrase "Out of many—one." The achievement of that goal has been one of the central experiences of the United States.

The Founding Fathers had two elements in mind when they adopted that motto. They recognized by it that the Nation they were creating would emerge one and united out of the 13 separate Colonies. They did not wish to destroy the peculiarities of Pennsylvania, or New Jersey, or Georgia or the other new States, but they were striving to make them one country. By the same token they recognized that the population of the United States had been drawn from many different sources.

It included Germans, Englishmen, and Dutchmen, French and Huguenots, Jews and Catholics in a variety that could be found nowhere else on the globe. The Founding Fathers had no desire to weaken any of these strains or to subordinate some to others, but they wished them all to blend into one people. It was in that spirit that the "Letters of An American Farmer" explained as the Revolution drew to a close that the Americans were "A mixture of English, Scotch, Irish, French, Dutch, Germans and Swedes."

"From this promiscuous breed," the quotation continues, "that race now called Americans has arisen; here individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men whose labors and posterity will one day cause great changes in the world.

"Americans are the Western Pilgrims who have carried along with them that great mass of arts, sciences, vigor, and industry which began long since in the Near East.

"They will finish the great circle."

In the 180 years since then the prophecy of the "American farmer" has been amply fulfilled. In that period about 45 million newcomers entered the United States. They and their descendants form the American people.

Still are retained many of the cultural signs of their origins. But they have been welded into one Nation, capable of acting constructively together. We in America have gained from your festival of thanksgiving.

It has given us—through the years—opportunities to pause and be grateful. It has provided us with the time and place to look over our shoulders into the events of the past that have contributed so vastly to the cultural pattern of this commonwealth and this Nation.

As I join you in thanksgiving today for the blessings of the past, I am particularly aware that today's events represent a spirit of cooperation which brings individuals, races, and institutions together in a common community interest.

The problems of learning how to live together within the boundaries of the United States have been solved with practical and satisfying results.

But the problems of nations learning to live together in the world under rapidly changing conditions are still with us. But so long as Americans retain their faith in the institutions under which they grew great they have much to teach the rest of the world.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Sept. 4, 1962]

VAN ZANDT STRESSES U.S. LEADER ROLE IN GERMAN FESTIVAL TALK

Although the problems of many creeds and nationalities learning to live together "have been solved with practical and satisfying results in the United States, the problems of nations learning to live together in the world—under rapidly changing conditions—are still with us," Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate, said here Monday.

VAN ZANDT addressed the 90th annual 3-day Canstatter Volksfest Verein of Philadelphia, at 9100 Frankford Avenue. The festival opened Sunday and will continue through Tuesday.

MUCH TO TEACH

"So long as Americans retain their faith in the institutions under which they grew great, they have much to teach the rest of the world, the Altoona Congressman said.

"As I join you in thanksgiving today, for the blessings of the past, I am particularly aware that today's events represent a spirit of cooperation which brings individuals, races, and institutions together in a common community interest," VAN ZANDT stated.

TRIBUTE TO PIONEERS

He paid special tribute to the pioneer German immigrants as "a most important element in the early population of America," but he added:

"Within what is now this great Commonwealth, many peoples of different cultures, customs, and tongues came to lay the foundations of an experiment in government that might well be termed a well-spring of liberty and freedom."

PRICELESS HERITAGE

"Today the descendants of the first pioneers, together with those of later immigrants who sought the opportunities afforded free men, have grown into millions," VAN ZANDT said.

"They enjoy that priceless heritage and are living witnesses to the fulfillment of the concepts and ideals of freedom," he said.

Tuesday night, VAN ZANDT is scheduled to invade the home area of his democratic opponent, Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, in a speaking tour. It embraces the 21st, 22d, 38th, 42d, 49th, 50th, and 59th wards in the Germantown, Chestnut Hill (and Northwest section of Philadelphia. His first appearance will be at 8:15 p.m. at the 50th Ward Republican Club, 6618 Wyncote Avenue.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Sept. 4, 1962]

TWO HUNDRED TOURISTS FROM GERMANY FIND TORRESDALE FESTIVAL IS JUST LIKE HOME

(By Lawrence M. O'Rourke)

A group of 200 tourists from Germany felt right at home in Torresdale last night.

They drank and swayed to the "oom-pah-pah" of a 12-piece German brass band, danced old German folk dances, ate bratwurst and sauerbraten, and drank German beer.

It was the annual harvest festival of the Cannstatter Volksfest Verein, a German-American organization.

Nearly 15,000 persons, including many of the more than 4,000 society members, attended the festival on the organization's grounds at Academy and Willits Roads.

COME FROM STUTTGART

The Germans who felt right at home came a long distance to attend.

They are public officers, business and professional men who live near Stuttgart in Wuerttemberg, a State in West Germany. Philadelphia is their first stop on a tour of 12 American cities.

The visitors and the society members belong to the Federation of Schwabian Societies, an international organization with many local groups in the United States.

The picnickers yesterday ate their lunches in view of a 40-foot-high tower made of a variety of vegetables and fruits and 20,000 nails used to attach them to a wooden structure.

BUTCHER, FARMER, AND BAKER

Depicted on the tower were der metzer, der bauer, and der becker, the butcher, the farmer, and the maker, the three principal trades in old Wuerttemberg.

The tower also noted the fact that the organization is celebrating its 90th year in Philadelphia.

One of the attractions was Alt Weiber Muehle, the old lady's mill.

Grotesque dummies were tossed into the top of the mill. Through a door and down a sliding board came a number of attractive young ladies.

The brass band of Rottenburg, which is making the tour, provided some oldtime German music, including the drinking song, "Ein Prosit."

FIRST TRIP TO THE UNITED STATES

For most of the visitors it was their first trip here.

"President Kennedy has asked Europeans to visit the United States, and so we came, to see the country and our German-American relatives and friends," said Miss Anna Liese Sehuhholz, a travel writer for German newspapers.

Walter Baerlin, mayor of a town near Stuttgart, said he was "enjoying himself immensely" talking with Philadelphians.

"This festival is much like the one we have in Stuttgart," said Joseph Handgretinger, a businessman. "But there is some difference in the people. Here everbody is so friendly to us. In Germany people are more reserved."

QUESTIONED ABOUT WALL

Several of the visitors were asked what effect construction of the Berlin wall by the Communists had on their lives.

They said they sympathized with the people of Berlin but it is their hope that a peaceful settlement can be reached that is agreeable to all parties.

Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate, spoke to the picknickers yesterday afternoon.

The German visitors will see Washington, D.C., next and will go to 10 other U.S. cities before returning to Germany in 3 weeks.

The money raised in yesterday's festival, a spokesman said, will go to provide food and fuel for the needy and to assist in other charitable works.

The Power of Monopoly Is Not a Phantom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement presented to the Joint Economic Committee on August 21, 1962, by Dr. Walter Adams, professor of economics at Michigan State University:

STATEMENT OF DR. WALTER ADAMS, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS

It is reported that when Galileo made his telescope and discovered the satellites of Jupiter, his findings were disputed by the head professor of philosophy at the University of Padua. "We know," he said, "that there are seven planets and only seven, because there are seven openings in the human head to let in the light and air: two eyes, two ears, two nostrils, and a mouth. And the seven metals and various other examples also show that there have to be seven. Besides, the stars are invisible to the naked eye; therefore they do not influence human events; therefore, they are useless; therefore they do not exist. (Quod erat demonstrandum.)"—(Quoted in Frank H. Knight, "Intelligence and Democratic Action," p. 57.) The event occurred in 1610—long after man had supposedly emerged from the darkness of the Middle Ages to the light of the Renaissance.

That type of reasoning has not yet disappeared. It has survived in fields other than astronomy, in lands other than Italy, and times even more enlightened than the 17th century. Today, for example, one can still find economists who argue as follows: (1) monopoly power exists in theory but is rare in practice. (2) It cannot be measured with elegant precision. (3) Being unmeasurable, it cannot possibly be widespread. (4) Even if it were widespread, it would be held in check by interindustry competition, the corporate soul, the gales of creative destruction, countervailing power, congressional investigations, and presidential admonition. (5) In any event, there is no urgency for public action until further research has unearthed the "final answers."

I do not happen to share this Panglos view of things. Conceding the fact that monopoly power is never absolute—that no system of price administration is ever foolproof—I submit that concentrated economic power is a fact of American life. It exists; it is pervasive; it is dangerous. It poses what I consider the No. 1 domestic problem of our time—the prevalence of private socialism in what we like to think of as a free enterprise economy.

Let me explain the different types of market power—conglomerate, vertical, and horizontal—by using the General Motors Corp. and the auto industry as an example.

1. Conglomerate power: This means that a firm's operations are so widely diversified that its survival no longer depends on success in any given product market or any given geographical area. Its absolute size, its sheer bigness, is so impressive that it can discipline or destroy its more specialized competitors.

General Motors, of course, possesses conglomerate power. Until recently part of the giant Du Pont empire, this corporation is not only the largest automobile company in the world, but also a significant factor in diesel locomotives, buses, trucks, refrigerators, electric ranges, auto financing, batteries, earth-moving machinery, etc. This corporation could decide to enter the ice cream industry—intent on capturing 20 or 40 or 100 percent of the sales—and succeed in this endeavor. It would matter little whether G.M. was indeed an efficient ice cream manufacturer or whether its ice cream was indeed tastier than more established brands. By discreet price concessions, saturation advertising and attractive promotional deals, it could commit its gargantuan financial power to the battle until only so much competition as G.M. was prepared to tolerate would be left in the industry. Remember that, in good years, the annual profits of General Motors are roughly as big as the combined assets of Borden and National Dairy.

Put differently, in a poker game with unlimited stakes, the player who commands disproportionately large funds is likely to emerge victorious—regardless of ability, virtue, or luck. He has the one asset the others lack, viz, the power to bankrupt his rivals. Given the laws of probability, his power alone tends to be decisive.

2. Vertical power: This means that a firm engaged in successive stages of production and distribution can squeeze its suppliers by denial of access, or its distributors by denial of supplies, or both by manipulation of price. In the case of General Motors, congressional committees have received ample evidence of the corporation's power over automobile parts manufacturers and automobile dealers. The record on this score requires no elaboration here.

3. Horizontal power: This is market control in its pristine, classical form. It consists of dominance over an industry (in relative, percentage terms), and is manifested in entry controls, price leadership and followership, and other assorted forms of oligopolistic cooperation.

General Motors, with its more than 50 percent control over the automobile industry, is a prize example of horizontal power. Its decisions what to produce, where to produce, how to produce—what price to charge, what target profit to aim at, what means of raising capital to employ—these and similar decisions have a profound impact not only on its fellow oligopolists, but the whole automobile industry, the American businessman, the American consumer, the American worker, and the American economy. These are decisions which affect the general public, but they are made by a private government—subject to only the loosest public control and involving only the remotest participation of our democratic citizenry.

(a) Pricing: General Motors sets its prices so that—over the long run and assuming "standard volume" (operation at roughly 80 percent of capacity)—they will yield an average profit (after Reuther and after taxes) of 15 to 20 percent on invested capital. This is called target-rate-of-return pricing. It is the same cost-plus system of pricing used in the regulated industries—with this difference: the rate of return allowed a public utility is determined by a Government regulatory commission, whereas the General Motors rate is determined by the company itself. It is not imposed by the autonomous forces of the marketplace as in a competitive industry; it is not imposed by a public regulatory commission; it is the private exercise of discretionary power by a corporation with dominant control of the market. Not only does General Motors possess this market control, but as the Kefauver committee hearings showed, it has been amazingly successful since World War II in exercising such control and achieving its self-determined and predetermined target rate of profit.

That it was able to do so is partly due to the slavish pliability of its major rivals. The latter have simply not chosen to challenge GM's price leadership and contented themselves to follow, within rather narrow limits, the lead of the industry's giant. One dramatic illustration revealed by the Kefauver hearings involved the pricing of the 1957 models: Ford had announced an average 2.9-percent price increase—"no more than our actual costs for materials and labor have gone up;" "General Motors 2 weeks later announced an average 6.1-percent increase on comparable models; whereupon Ford quickly revised its price list upward—no doubt to "meet the higher price of a competitor." When Chrysler later fell in line,

the traditional pattern in the "low price" field was maintained. The deleterious effects of such conduct, I trust, will become apparent later in my presentation.

(b) Product design: While the automobile industry in the days of Henry Ford I was an arena of price competition—with companies reaching out for "the other 95 percent of the market" by competitive price reductions, the rise of General Motors ushered in a diversion of the industry's competitive energies into nonprice rivalry. Whereas Henry Ford told his customers that they could choose any color automobile as long as it was black, the industry by 1960 was offering more than 300 different passenger models and the manager of GM's Chevrolet division boasted that his factories were turning out a custom-made car for almost every buyer. Chevrolet, he said, offers the buyer so many combinations and permutations of body style, color, trim, and equipment options that (without counting accessories) Chevrolet could have produced its entire 1960 output of 1,850,000 passenger cars without making any two of them exactly alike. Price cutting to tap new layers of domestic or foreign demand had become an anachronism, only to be replaced by advertising outlays, annual model changes, and the horsepower race. The automobile, no longer a mere vehicle for transportation, was made a complex and luxurious amalgam of superengines, tailfins, quadruple headlights, and a cornucopia of chrome. Inevitably, its cost of production and price increased steadily and alarmingly.

For the Big Three, according to the Kefauver committee, depreciation and obsolescence costs rose from $183.2 million in 1950 to $679.8 million in 1957; selling and administrative expenses from roughly $450 million to $1,200 million; and the annual cost of special tools from $182.3 million to $762 million. (It should be noted that production volume in 1950 and 1957 was 7 million cars which makes these comparisons especially relevant.) At Ford, the dollar cost of major model changeovers increased more than 6½ times between 1948 and 1957, and at an increasing rate: in 1957 these costs were more than three times as high as in 1953. Since sales increased at a much slower rate, the ratio of styling costs to sales (and production costs) increased significantly—doubling between 1948 and 1957. In economic terms, the effect of this nonprice rivalry was to raise overhead costs and exert an upward pressure on price; this in turn, given the elastic demand for automobiles, tended to depress volume and raise unit fixed costs even further. The consequences, as we shall see presently, were far from gratifying.

(c) Export policy: How should American automobile companies supply their oversea markets? Should they utilize and expand their domestic facilities or rely on their foreign subsidiaries? Should General Motors supply its oversea markets from Detroit, Flint, and Lansing, or from the Opel factory in Germany, the Vauxhall factory in Great Britain, or the Holden factory in Australia? Should Ford turn to River Rouge or to Dagenham, England, and Cologne, Germany? The choice that is made has an obvious impact on the volume of private investment at home, on employment, on purchasing power, on economic growth—and even on Government tax receipts.

Shortly after World War II, according to press reports, General Motors was contemplating the marketing of a new "small" car to be produced at a new plant built somewhere in the United States. This was the Holden, and its production facility was eventually located in Australia. This decision apparently became a policy trend in the industry. In 1958, J. Wilner Sundelson, manager of facilities and operations planning, Ford International Division, openly said: "* * * in our planning, we have taken the view that vehicle exports from the United States, which are playing a declining role in Europe, will virtually vanish. * * * Given the geographic penalty of the U.S. exporters in the European market * * * it will readily be understood why we do not anticipate selling many U.S.-made cars in 1970 in the Common Market. Not only vehicles and vehicle components but parts and accessories will be exported from the United States in limited quantities."

In 1961, Frederic G. Donner, chairman of the board of General Motors, echoed these sentiments: "* * * we will build cars and trucks in the United States for the home market and for those markets that want American-type cars, and we will continue our longtime policy of building cars abroad for sale in our oversea markets."

No wonder that American automobile exports between 1950 and 1959 declined from 120,000 to 104,000 while GM's Opel exports from Germany increased from 25,000 to 169,000, the German Ford exports rose from 8,000 to 65,000, and Chrysler's Simca exports from France rose from 7,000 to 121,000. No wonder that the percentage share of American automobile exports declined radically not only in Europe and the world at large but also (and significantly) in the Latin American market at our back door.

Again I say that the effect of these decisions by American companies had an obvious effect on domestic production, employment, payrolls, growth, tax receipts, and the U.S. balance of payments.

(d) Market results: What then are the effects of these corporate decisions with respect to pricing, product design, and exports on the economic performance of the automobile industry—and, indirectly, the levels of production and employment in the American economy? To approach an answer, let us first examine the domestic automobile market, and then the world market.

In the domestic market, European imports became a significant factor between 1955 and 1959. Their number increased from 57,000 to 668,000, and their relative share of the American market rose from less than 1 percent in 1955 to more than 10 percent in 1959. The reasons, according to a survey of the National Automobile Dealers Association, was that the imports were cheaper to operate and gave better gas mileage; that the original purchase price was lower; that they were easier to park; and that they were easier to handle in traffic. In other words, the American consumer was in open revolt against the Big Three's price policy and product design. While the price of the standard 6-cylinder 2-door Ford increased from $1,707 in 1955 to $2,261 in 1961, the comparable Plymouth from $1,738 to $2,260, and the comparable Chevrolet from $1,685 to $2,230, the European makes effectivly held the line. The Volkswagen went up from $1,495 in 1955 to $1,565 in 1961; the Fiat "600" from $1,298 in 1957 to $1,398 in 1961; and the Renault Dauphine actually reduced its price from $1,645 in 1957 to $1,385 in 1961. (These are all delivered prices in the United States, after payment of transport costs and import duties.)

The reason for the success of the European imports obviously was not that American producers were incapable of turning out a competitive model, but rather that they had chosen not to do so. They had become sufficiently insensitive to consumer desires—persuaded by their own propaganda that they could foist ever larger gas-guzzling monsters at ever higher prices on the hapless American public. Once the oligopolists were brought back to reality by the marginal competition of the European imports, they proceeded to bring out the compact cars which quickly terminated the import threat. Since 1959, both the number of imported cars and their percentage share of the American market has decreased steadily. A different price and product policy by the Big Three—forced on them by "outside" competition—had obviously turned the trick.

In the international arena, too, there is dramatic evidence that the Big Three's price, product, and export policies have caused the United States to lose out in world markets. In motor vehicle exports to the world at large (excluding the United States), according to the Department of Commerce, the U.S. share has declined from 41 percent in 1954 to 26 percent in 1960. At the same time, Germany's share rose from 16 to 24 percent, and that of the other OEEC countries from 15 to 25 percent. Even in Latin America, an area in which we enjoy massive advantages and which by geography and tradition is so closely tied to the United States, the U.S. market share declined from 81 percent in 1954 to 65 percent in 1960, while the United Kingdom's share increased from 5 to 7 percent, Germany's share from 8 to 15 percent, and the other OEEC countries' share from 7 to 12 percent. Put differently, the shortfall in U.S. automobile exports between 1954 and 1960 amounted to some $656 million—i.e., if American exporters had been able to command the same share of world markets in 1960 as they held in 1954, the United States would have earned an additional $656 million through automobile sales abroad. (This, incidentally, is the largest shortfall of any manufactured commodity group—followed by a $395 million shortfall in iron and steel, a $335 million shortfall in industrial machinery, and a $108 million shortfall in agricultural machinery and tractors.)

Clearly, the Big Three have priced and designed themselves out of world markets, on the one hand, and have made a conscious decision to supply overseas markets from their foreign subsidiaries, on the other. The impact of these private corporate decisions on domestic production, employment, and growth require no elaboration.

By using General Motors and the Big Three in the auto industry as an example—and no more than an example—I have tried to illustrate the existence of the vast discretionary power in the hands of some large corporations. "That power," as Justice Douglas once said, "can be used with lightning speed. It can be benign or it can be dangerous." In a democracy, dedicated to free competitive enterprise, such power should not exist. It should be decentralized. "It should be scattered into many hands so that the fortunes of the people will not be dependent on the whim or caprice, the political prejudices, the emotional stability of a few self-appointed men." The fact that they are not rapacious robber barons, but respectable and social minded is irrelevant. The fact that they are imbued with the "corporate soul"—a sense of social responsibility—may qualify them to decide what is good for General Motors; it does not entitle them to determine what is good for Detroit or for the United States. Such decisions, in a democratic economy, are the function of the competitive marketplace. And, when a corporation or group of corporations become so big that they are immune from the regulation of competition—so big that they constitute what amounts to a private government—then those corporations are too big for their own good and certainly too big for society's good. They then become an instrument of private socialism which is incompatible with both free enterprise economics and political democracy.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Bottum, Joe H., *S. Dak*
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind* — The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex* — 2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Engle, Clair, *Calif*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Goldwater, Barry, *Ariz*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hickey, J. J., *Wyo* — Room 1251, New Senate Ofc. Bldg.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N.Y* — 1233 31st St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn* — 4929 Hillbrook La.
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn* — 7426 Hampden La., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, Maurice J., Jr., *N.H.*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Benjamin A., *Mass*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis* — 2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Kerr (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Wiley, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case, Hickenlooper, and Capehart.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan of North Carolina, Young of Ohio, Hart, McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Cooper, and Boggs.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Humphrey, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and Javits.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Bush, Beall, Goldwater, and Case.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Tower, and Murphy.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Butler, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Keating, and Prouty.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Hartke, Smith of Massachusetts, Beall, Prouty, and Miller.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Jackson, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Burdick, Metcalf, Hickey, Kuchel, Allott, Miller, Pearson, Bottum, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, Fong, and Scott.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Burdick, Smith of Massachusetts, Pell, Goldwater, Javits, Prouty, Tower, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan of North Carolina, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Smith of Massachusetts, Metcalf, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Miller, Murphy, and Pearson.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Mansfield (chairman), Hayden, Jordan of North Carolina, Cannon, Hickey, Pell, Curtis, Dirksen, and Bottum.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Padre Island National Seashore

SPEECH
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 776 provides for the consideration of S. 4, a bill which provides for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore. This is an open rule, and provides for 1 hour of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, S. 4 is the third of a series of three such bills which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has considered in detail during the 87th Congress. The others, both of which have passed the House, provided for the creation of the Cape Cod National Seashore, Mass., and the Point Reyes National Seashore, Calif.

Padre Island is a barrier reef lying off the coast of Texas with the Gulf of Mexico to its east and Laguna Madre to its west. Its northern end is about opposite Corpus Christi, its other end is 113 miles to the south and almost at the Mexican border. The Intracoastal Waterway, which was proposed for its western boundary, runs parallel to the island in Laguna Madre.

In width, Padre Island varies about 3 miles to a quarter mile or less. It is practically pure sand and fragmented shell. There are few trees on it, and such vegetation as is visible to the layman is low beach grass and similar species. Its climate at the northern end is similar to that of St. Petersburg, Fla., and at the southern end to that of Fort Lauderdale.

As is evident from its description and as was pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUTHERFORD], the chairman of the subcommittee which handled this bill, when he appeared before the Committee on Rules to request a rule, Padre Island is distinctively different from Cape Cod and Point Reyes, the former of which is for the most part a fairly closely settled area with centuries of history behind it, and the latter primarily a lush cattle area with mountains and forests in addition. As is pointed out in the committee report, both the location of Padre Island and its present comparative lack of development will make it an admirable complement to these two areas. Its establishment as a national seashore will also help to overcome a serious deficiency in our national life and that is the need for adequate access to our shorelines for public recreation.

Padre Island is well located to serve a very substantial portion of the Nation's population. With proper development, its easy accessibility and year-round usability will make it attractive to millions every year for swimming, boating, fishing, hiking, camping, picnicking, the observation of its birdlife, and the study of nature. It is, at the same time, sufficiently large to afford those who prefer solitude to find it within its confines.

The committee has recommended that S. 4 be amended to include a length of about 80 miles. The national seashore will encompass about 47,000 acres of firm land, with additional adjacent water areas both on the gulf side of the island and in the northern part of the Laguna Madre.

The committee has also recommended an authorization of $5 million for the acquisition of this land.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the resolution and I urge its adoption in order that the House may consider this very worthy legislation.

Congress and the Nation's Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Honorable WALTER ROGERS, chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, presented an excellent speech before the American Bar Association in San Francisco on the longstanding problem of the Federal Government versus State governments with respect to the control and jurisdiction of water rights. Mr. ROGERS discussed the history of Federal jurisdiction in the field of water resources, explained how conflicts developed between the Federal Government and the States, and discussed the congressional attempts which have been made to resolve the problem. He concluded his speech by requesting the legal profession to join with the Congress in finding a solution to the Federal-State conflict over water.

Mr. ROGERS' speech follows:

CONGRESS AND THE NATION'S WATER RESOURCES

(Speech of the Honorable WALTER ROGERS, Member of Congress from the 18th District of Texas, before the Section of Mineral and Natural Resources Law of the American Bar Association, Wednesday, August 8, 1962, in San Francisco, Calif.)

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Bar Association, and your distinguished visitors and guests, unlike the others who will appear before your several sections with good counsel and advice in the solutions of your problems, I come before you in search of help and would beg your indulgence while I attempt to lay before you the problem at hand. It is probably the most refractory conflict in the whole field of law, and will no doubt tax the abilities of the legal profession to the utmost if and when it is solved within the framework of the Constitution as written. The problem, in short, is the Federal Government versus the State governments with reference to the control and jurisdiction of water rights.

As a predicate to a discussion of the conflicts that have arisen in recent years, a discussion of the history of Federal jurisdiction is in order.

I. HISTORY OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION

Congressional responsibility in the field of water resources stems directly from constitutional provisions establishing the right of the Congress "to regulate commerce * * * among the several States," "provide for the common defense and general welfare," and "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." The constitutional power of the President to make treaties, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, has been a further foundation for Federal activity affecting water resources. A long line of court decisions has upheld the right of Congress to legislate in matters pertaining to these fields, and the right of the executive branch of the Federal Government to take such actions as it believes to be needed to carry out its constitutional and statutory authority.

For more than a century and a half the Congress of the United States has taken an affirmative interest in the development of water resources. It is interesting, in retrospect, to note that the early congressional efforts to legislate in this field were made against frequent and long-sustained objections of the executive branch of the Government. In the early period, between 1800 and 1840, the Congress, under the leadership of such statesmen as Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun, and others just as well known, recognized the desirability of establishing the policy of using Federal funds for the improvement of waterways for navigation. The first legislative efforts met with varying degrees of opposition from the administrations of Presidents Madison through Pierce. The opposition generally was based on the theory of strict construction of the Constitution. It was not until 1824 that Chief Justice Marshall, in the famous case of *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1, U.S. 1824), gave the Congress judicial support, by his finding that "the power of Congress comprehended navigation within the limits of every State in the Union insofar as that navigation was connected with commerce."

Funds were appropriated as early as 1820 for a navigation survey of tributaries of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. Further surveys were authorized in 1824, and by 1826 the Congress had adopted the general policy of appropriating Federal funds to carry out improvement of rivers and harbors, work which had previously been considered to be the responsibility of the States. However, several of the early river and harbor bills were vetoed, based on the strict construction

theory of constitutional interpretation, until, in 1865, the Supreme Court reaffirmed, in *Gilman* v. *Philadelphia* (3 Wall. 713, U.S. 1865), the power of the Congress to regulate commerce and have control of navigable waters. Since that case there has been no opposition from the executive branch with regard to the constitutionality of legislation in the area of navigation.

Federal activity in the field of water resources next expanded to take in flood control. Flood control had long been considered a local problem and was not regarded as a proper concern for action by the Congress. Therefore, early efforts to appropriate Federal funds for the building of levees along the Mississippi River were frequently camouflaged with an argument about the right and duty of the Federal Government to build levees to improve navigation. The foundation for national flood control policies was begun in 1874 when a commission of engineers was appointed to investigate and report to the Congress a permanent plan for reclamation and prevention of inundation in the Mississippi Basin. Their report led to the creation of the Mississippi River Commission in 1879.

The interests of flood control continued to be served in the name of navigation improvement until, in 1917, Federal works for flood control along the Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers were authorized. However, it was not until passage of the Flood Control Act of 1936, only 26 years ago, that Congress moved to establish a national flood control policy, under which the present massive program of multiple-purpose river basin development has evolved.

Multiple-purpose water resources development in the Western States had been initiated much earlier under the Federal Reclamation Act of 1902, as amended from time to time. Through this act, the Congress exercised its authority under the property clause of the Constitution to provide for the expenditure of funds derived from the sale of public lands for building irrigation works, with the provision that the costs were to be repaid by the water users. The program was expanded beginning in 1906 to include domestic water supply and hydroelectric power in connection with irrigation projects. Over the years many large multiple-purpose projects have been authorized under the Federal reclamation laws.

In the field of hydroelectric power, aside from a few early developments under the Reclamation Act, congressional action was limited for years to the granting of licenses to non-Federal entities to develop power in such a way as not to impede navigation. By the Federal Power Act of 1920, Congress authorized the licensing of sites on the public domain and on navigable rivers to non-Federal interests for the development of hydroelectric power in the circumstances when the proposed development was found to be best adapted to a comprehensive plan for development of the river.

In 1928, Congress authorized the building of Boulder Dam, the first of the massive multiple-purpose water development projects that have characterized the more recent development of the West. It was followed by the Bonneville, Grand Coulee, Central Valley, and other great projects. The great depression of the decade of the 1930's gave impetus to the movement toward multiple-purpose development, and saw congressional authorization of the Tennessee Valley Authority to develop the water resources of a whole river basin. This development grew out of a long struggle in Congress over the use of the great powerplant that had been built at Muscle Shoals during World War I under the war powers clause of the Constitution.

In the years since World War II, Congress has expanded Federal activity in the field of water resources into many fields. The 1944 Flood Control Act included provisions authorizing recreational developments at reservoirs built by the Corps of Army Engineers. 1946 the Wildlife Coordination Act authorized Federal expenditures for the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife in connection with water resources developments for other purposes.

The Water Pollution Control Act in 1948 authorized a Federal program in that field which was limited at first to planning, research, and assisting the States. This was expanded in 1956 to include grants to States and municipalities for construction of sewage treatment works, and the program was further extended in 1961.

While municipal and industrial water supplies had been provided under the Federal reclamation and flood control laws for many years, in the Water Supply Act of 1958 the Congress explicitly declared the Federal policy to cooperate and participate with States and local interests in developing domestic, municipal, and industrial water supplies in connection with existing and proposed Federal water resources projects.

In addition to the programs I have mentioned, there are many other Federal water resources activities, such as the small watershed development program, research and basic data collection programs, international development programs on the Rio Grande and St. Lawrence, and others too numerous to mention in this brief review.

Thus, over the years, Federal activity has expanded to encompass almost every phase of water resources development, with annual expenditures of about $1⅓ billion in recent years. With programs of this magnitude, and always increasing, conflicts brought about by the dual Federal-State sovereignty over water have been on the increase. Let me discuss briefly the nature of these conflicts.

II. CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE STATES

Potential conflicts between Federal and State sovereignty over water rights in the Western States have been the subject of concern to water users and their lawyers for many decades. In recent years the conflicts have grown more frequent and more serious. Let us say a few words as to the background for the conflicts.

On the one hand, several Federal statutes enacted in the latter half of the 19th century, in connection with the disposition of portions of public lands, made it appear that the United States had permanently transferred control over water rights to the States. I refer particularly to the act of July 26, 1866, where the Congress specifically provided for upholding existing water rights, and that all patents to the public lands were to be subject to vested water rights; and to the Desert Land Act of March 3, 1877, which provided that water rights were to depend on prior appropriation, and that surplus waters of the public lands were to be free for appropriation and use by the public, subject to existing rights.

Furthermore, in legislation admitting certain States to the Union, the Congress accepted the State constitutions, which included provisions recognizing and confirming existing water rights, setting up procedures for acquiring water rights under State law, and in some instances specifically declaring State ownership or control of waters arising or flowing within the States concerned. Also, section 8 of the Federal Reclamation Act of 1902 includes express provision that Federal activity in the field of reclamation was not to interfere with State laws relating to the control, appropriation, use or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Secretary of the Interior was directed to proceed in conformity with State laws in carrying out the provisions of the Reclamation Act, thus implying, according to some students of the problem, a recognition of State sovereignty over the use of water for irrigation in the Western States.

Again, section 27 of the Federal Power Act, enacted by the Congress in 1920, states that that act was not to be construed as affecting or intending to affect or in any way to interfere with the laws of the respective States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation or for municipal or other uses, or any vested right acquired therein. Furthermore, the law required the applicant for license to furnish satisfactory evidence that he had complied with the requirements of the State or States within which the proposed project was to be located.

Thus, the use of water in the West developed, and there seemed to be a good basis for believing that water rights acquired under State laws were secure.

On the other hand, none of the legislative enactments I have just mentioned made any effort to change Federal responsibilities in the field of commerce, nor was any reference made to their effect on Federal responsibilities in the fields of national defense and general welfare, or on the treaty-making powers of the President. To the contrary, the Congress on several occasions, going back to the latter years of the 19th century, has reaffirmed by statute the Federal sovereignty with respect to navigation.

Likewise, certain cases, particularly *United States* v. *Rio Grande Dam and Irrigation Co.* (174 U.S. 690) in 1899, and *Winters* v. *United States* (207 U.S. 564) in 1908, made it clear that the sovereignty of the United States over waters needed under the commerce and the treaty-making clauses of the Constitution had not been broadly relinquished by any statutory enactments.

Several other cases and statutory enactments are worthy of mention in this necessarily brief discussion of the emerging conflicts between Federal and State sovereignty.

In one case, *United States* v. *Appalachian Power Co.* (311 U.S. 377), sometimes called the New River case, decided in 1940, the broad definition of navigable waters stated by Congress in section 3 of the Federal Power Act was broadened further by the Court's dictum that the tributaries of navigable streams also come under the Commerce power. This had the effect of broadening greatly the navigation servitude.

As mentioned earlier, Federal activity in the field of water resources had also been greatly expanded in 1936, by the congressional declaration of policy on flood control, in which that function was stated to be a proper activity of the Federal Government because of the adverse effects of floods on commerce between the States and on the National welfare.

Potential conflicts between Federal flood control activity in the Western States and State laws having become very apparent and very widespread in the first few years of operation under the 1936 Flood Control Act, Congress, in the 1944 Flood Control Act, declared its policy to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders, and provided, in section 1(b) of the act, that the use of works authorized for navigation shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use of water in the 17 Western States.

These provisions have been reiterated in each successive rivers and harbors and flood control authorization act since that date, thus seeming to indicate a continuing willingness on the part of the Congress to relinquish the sovereignty of the United States over navigable waters in specific cases. The constitutional issue has not been finally settled in connection with these projects, however, because it is a fact that one Congress

cannot bind future Congresses; thus, the waiver of navigation rights could be repealed at some future date.

Two other cases have tended to increase concern among western lawyers. The first was a 1946 decision by the Supreme Court, in the case of *First Iowa Electric Cooperative* v. *Federal Power Commission* (328 U.S. 152), which made it clear that State laws governing the use or control of water of navigable streams were not applicable when they trespassed in a field also covered by Federal law.

The second case, and the one which has greatly intensified the Western States concern over potential conflicts between Federal and State laws over water rights, is *Federal Power Commission* v. *Oregon* (349 U.S. 435). In this case, usually referred to as the Pelton case, which was decided in 1955, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the supremacy of Federal jurisdiction over unappropriated, nonnavigable waters arising from or flowing over reserved lands. Soon after the Pelton case was decided, the fears of western water users were heightened by certain pleadings made by the Department of Justice in various lawsuits pending in the West over the water of certain streams, particularly the Blue River case in Colorado, and the Hawthorne case in Nevada. Pleadings made by the Government in these cases, asserting paramount rights to water under the so-called reservation doctrine of the Pelton decision, led many westerners to fear that the United States proposed to take away, without compensation, existing water rights acquired under State law. This has been denied by the Department of Justice, although questions remain as to which water rights have been acquired under State law in such manner that there is no future question as to the existence of a valid property right.

Even before the Pelton case was decided, attempts were made to have the Congress decide the issue in favor of the States through enactment of legislation assuring the supremacy of State water laws.

III. CONGRESSIONAL ATTEMPTS TO RESOLVE THE PROBLEM

Numerous bills have been introduced in Congress seeking to resolve the problem by Federal legislation. The parade of bills started in the 82d Congress, several years before the Pelton case was decided, and has extended right down to the present time. There are about a half dozen bills now pending before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member.

The bills have taken many forms, ranging from a blanket directive for all Federal activities in the water resources field to be carried out in accordance with State laws, to a compromise bill which would have been limited to repealing, in effect, the reservation doctrine of Federal water rights expressed by the Supreme Court in the Pelton decision. Hearings have been held in the 84th and each successive Congress on one or another of these bills. The bill which received the greatest amount of consideration was S. 863, which was introduced in the 84th and again in the 85th Congress under the same number. This bill would have provided that (1) Federal agencies or employees could not interfere with rights to the use of water acquired under State law unless authorized by Federal law and upon payment of just compensation; (2) all unappropriated navigable and nonnavigable ground and surface waters were reserved for appropriation and use under State law; (3) the Federal Government, and its licensees or permittees, must acquire rights to water under State law, except for flood control; (4) the use of water for navigation in the Western States shall be only such use as does not conflict with beneficial uses for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes; and (5) all withdrawals of public lands were to be deemed as having no effect on rights, acquired under State laws, to the use of water originating in or flowing across such lands. Lengthy hearings were held on this bill in March and June of 1956. The bill was vigorously opposed by the executive branch of the Government, led by the Department of Justice. The Federal Power Commission and the Department of Defense also objected to the legislation. The Departments of Interior and Agriculture, however, indicated a willingness to go along with the general purposes of the bill. After lengthy consideration the bill was amended and reported to the Senate by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, but no further action was taken.

The opposition to the bill by Justice, Defense, and the Federal Power Commission appeared to be based on legal and constitutional grounds, whereas the favorable position taken by Interior and Agriculture Departments appeared to be based on policy grounds.

This reflected the fact that the latter agencies have found it desirable to work in conformity with State laws, since the projects they undertake are generally for the benefit of individuals and groups within the State.

When the Barrett bill, as it was called, came up again in the 85th Congress, the agencies of the executive branch were able to agree on a draft of a short substitute bill which if enacted would have the effect of repealing the "reservation doctrine" of the Pelton case. The draft was transmitted to the Congress in May 1958, in connection with departmental reports on S. 863 and companion House bills. However, the draft bill failed to receive support from the West, as it appeared that acceptance of this simple bill, correcting only one of the causes of the Federal-State water right conflict, would make it difficult to complete action to clarify the other aspects of the water right situation. As a result, no action was taken in the 85th Congress.

In 1959 the draft submitted by the executive branch of the Government was modified by the addition of a clause which would have affirmed the right of States to exercise jurisdiction over water rights conferred by the act admitting such States to the Union. Bills including this modification were introduced by four Members of the House of Representatives. I introduced, as H.R. 5555, a bill to recognize the authority of the States over the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water within their boundaries, and to require Federal agencies and their employees to abide by State water laws in connection with Federal projects or activities for the conservation, development, and use of land and water resources. The Barrett bill was also reintroduced, and several other bills, so that there were, in total, 11 bills in the House of Representatives, some of which were also introduced in the Senate.

The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, which I have the honor of serving as chairman, held hearings from July 20 to August 10, 1959. There must have been 50 witnesses presenting testimony and filing statements. In addition to hearing witnesses representing the western point of view, representatives of the Department of Justice and other Federal agencies were interrogated at length. To make a long story short, let me say only that the Justice Department was unwilling to accept even the minor modification proposed to the reservation doctrine bills, and of course, remained adamant in its opposition to the more comprehensive bills. Therefore, no action was taken on any of the bills in the 86th Congress. However, one favorable thing came out of the hearings.

Counsel to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs made a careful analysis of the situation, and prepared a bill which he thought would clarify the situation within the constitutional framework expressed by the Department of Justice. His analysis, together with the draft bill, was issued by the committee as Committee Print 19, 86th Congress, which also included papers by former Under Secretary of the Interior Hatfield Chilson and the Assistant Attorney General Perry Morton discussing the issue from the viewpoint respectively of western water interests and the Justice Department. I commend this committee print to the attention of those of you who are seeking background on the issues I am discussing today, even though I don't think it contains an acceptable solution to the whole problem.

A number of bills proposing solutions to Federal-State water rights problems have been introduced in the 87th Congress. I have introduced two bills myself, to serve as a basis for consideration of the problem. On January 3, 1961, I reintroduced the bill calling for recognition by the Federal Government of the authority of the States over the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their boundaries. This is numbered H.R. 151 of the 87th Congress, and has the same objectives as H.R. 5555, the bill I introduced in the 86th Congress. Specifically, it would call for Federal agencies and their employees to be bound by water rights acquired under State laws and recognized by decisions of State courts, and for the Federal Government to acquire water rights in the same manner as an individual citizen of the State. Furthermore, the bill would require that the Federal Government could not acquire or interfere with the exercise of any water rights acquired under State laws and recognized by the decisions of the State courts, except upon the payment of just compensation.

Subsequently, consideration was given to the draft of a bill prepared by the counsel to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and published in the committee print. This draft, with some modifications, was introduced by me on March 6, 1961, as H.R. 5224, of the 87th Congress, a companion bill to H.R. 5078, H.R. 5100, and H.R. 5207, introduced by some of my colleagues on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

These bills have the title "To promote harmony between the United States and the States of the Union with respect to the administration of water, to strengthen rights to the use of water acquired under State law, and for other purposes." In essence, the bills would: (1) Repeal the reservation doctrine of the Pelton case; (2) prevent the United States from taking water rights existing prior to the authorization of the Federal project for which they are needed without just compensation; (3) provide that water rights for Federal projects be acquired under State law, either by the Federal agency proposing the project or loaning money for a project, or by the beneficiary of such a project; (4) provide for every department or agency of the United States to file a complete list of its claims of rights to the use of water for any Federal project with the Secretary of the Interior, and for the Secretary to maintain and keep such list up-to-date; (5) grant the consent of the United States to the continued storage and diversion of water for consumptive use for any project which had obtained a water right under State law at least 10 years before the date of the enactment of the bill providing the right had been exercised during the said 10 years and was presently being exercised, and was not in conflict with (a) any rights of the United States other than for navigation or (b) any international obligation of the United States; (6) provide that those water users not included in the aforementioned grant of consent could obtain rights to store or divert water for consumptive use from navigable streams for limited periods by applying to the Secretary of the Army for a

license, such license to be issued only when the storage or diversion of water did not interfere with probable navigation requirements; and (7) revise the portion of the Desert Land Act of March 3, 1877, restricting it to nonnavigable streams. The bill would also repeal a portion of section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902, so that future projects would come under the new legislation. We have asked for views of the Justice Department and the other executive agencies on these bills, and have not yet received them. As I said before, this does not represent my idea of a final solution to the problems, but it has been introduced as a starting point for further congressional consideration. However, with the pressure of other work on our committee, I do not see how we are going to be able to do anything further in this session of Congress.

Just to complete the story, let me mention also the bills under consideration by the Senate during the 87th Congress. Only two bills have been introduced. The first, S. 211, was introduced by the Senators from Nebraska, Colorado, and South Dakota, and has the purpose of affirming and recognizing State water laws in the Western States. It follows generally the form of the former Barrett bill. More recently, S. 2636 was introduced by the senior Senator from California. The latter bill, introduced after the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had held hearings on Federal-State water rights problems, would repeal the reservation doctrine, would extend the provisions of section 1(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 to all works constructed in the future by or under the authority of the United States in the Western States, and would provide that any right to the use of water claimed by the United States, under the laws of any State, should be initiated and perfected in accordance with the procedures established by the laws of that State. Also, the bill would provide that no vested rights to the beneficial consumptive use of any waters, as recognized by the laws of the States in which such use is made, could be taken by the United States without just compensation. No action has been taken by the Senate on either of these bills.

IV. CONCLUSION

As advocates, many of us have taken a position on one side or the other of this great issue. This is the traditional rule of the lawyer. As chairman of one of the subcommittees having jurisdiction in the matter, I can tell you that the position of the western water lawyer has been strongly and most persuasively presented to the Congress. I personally happen to agree with that position. But on the other side, attorneys for the Department of Justice have made a good case. As a Member of Congress I have respect for that position. And let us not forget for a moment that it is backed up by the veto power of the President.

In recent years, eastern lawyers are becoming more concerned with the problem. I am sure that with the background they have, and the interests they represent, they could propose a solution that they felt would solve emerging problems of dual sovereignty over water in the humid States. But would it be a solution that could be agreed to by either lawyers representing western interests or the Justice Department? I doubt it. It would merely present another facet of the problem, and add to the magnitude of the impasse at which we now find ourselves.

Therefore, as I said at the beginning, we in Congress who know that a solution to these problems must be reached are asking for help. The plea which I make today is for the legal profession to abandon the traditional role of advocate of a position on this great issue, to study it objectively, and to join with the Congress in finding a solution to the Federal-State conflict over water.

Make no mistake about it, a solution must be found, and must be found promptly, if the dual sovereignty of our Federal and State Governments is to be preserved in this and other fields.

Department of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Sunday, September 9 edition of the New York Times relating to the post of Commissioner of Education which will be vacated by Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin at the end of a years service, should be read by all Members because of its reflection on the problem of filling high posts, particularly in the most important field of education.

The writer says that the greatest deterrent keeping men of action out of many top educational jobs is that the positions offer too little power to justify the titles. The prestige of the office of Commissioner of Education is expected to enable him to raise the sights of all American learning, but his rank in the governmental structure is so low that he is largely reduced to pleading rather than leading. The scarce leadership talent is not likely to be attracted by a vague promise that a weak position may eventually be given some new powers.

I have introduced a bill to establish a Department of Education—H.R. 12883. It was referred to the Committee on Government Operations on August 13, 1962. The establishment of such a Department on Cabinet level will provide the necessary change to attract outstanding leadership talent and emphasize the importance of education to the welfare of our country.

The article follows:

ROOM AT THE TOP: DIFFICULTY IN FILLING HIGH POSTS INDICATES LEADERSHIP CRISIS

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

Last week, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin delivered his farewell address to the staff of the U.S. Office of Education before leaving Washington at the end of a year's service as Commissioner of Education. His is not the only post in education leadership where a search is under way for a new man. In New York State alone, three top-level positions display the "Help wanted" sign: The State University's presidency will be vacant by the end of the year; the New York City University's chancellorship is unfilled, and the search for a New York City school superintendent continues.

Committees are frantically at work, considering the few acceptable names and even fewer available ones. An adviser on education matters, who went to Washington last week to offer counsel and suggestions to those concerned with the selection of Dr. McMurrin's successor, said: "It's shocking how few names come to mind."

Education suffers from a crisis of leadership. But there are increasing signs that, in addition to the chronic shortage of men of stature for the key posts, a perhaps even more serious crisis is created by flaws in the jobs themselves.

THE PROBLEMS LISTED

Dr. McMurrin, in an exceptionally frank farewell speech, pointed to some of the trouble by describing the weaknesses of the post he was leaving as being due to a spirit of conservatism among most people in the educational field and at the institutions of learning themselves; the character of the slow-moving bureaucratic structure, and the failure of Congress to supply resources. This offers a basis for analysis of the considerations which keep good men out of important educational jobs. These are some of the problems:

1. The status quo: "The more urgently a situation requires resolute action, the greater the inherent challenge to an able leader. Both the New York City school system and the New York State University network are perfect examples. Each has been beset by problems and shown in need of either drastic changes or dramatic expansion.

Yet both are anchored to established procedures, strongly entrenched interests and in large measure to provincial self-satisfaction.

A new man coming into the State University presidency, for example, appears to be faced with the established tradition of a university system without a central campus and a presidency whose headquarters is not on a campus but in an Albany office, closer to politicians than to professors.

A new man coming into the city school superintendency, unless he is chosen from the local hierarchy, has already been served notice by several important teacher-administrator organizations that he will be opposed as an outsider whose unfamiliarity with the local scene makes him suspect.

CANDIDATE HANDICAPPED

Another problem, perhaps an insoluble one, faces all newly appointed administrators in public education: to be asked to provide dynamic new leadership without a chance to pick their lieutenants. Since maximum job security, known as tenure and essentially a laudable instrument of stability and humane conditions, prevails in the schools, obstinate resistance to the new ideas of a new boss requires little courage.

2. Fiscal dependence: Dr. McMurrin's complaint that Congress failed to supply the funds to do the job properly has its counterpart in most public education jobs. The new State University president would be foolhardy to overestimate the legislature's readiness to translate academic proposals into active programs. The New York City superintendent of schools, must keep in mind that, although many schools are on double sessions and some on triple sessions, the capital budget is in the process of being cut at this moment.

Unlike a new chief executive recruited by a corporation, neither the new superintendent nor his trustees (the board of education) have any real power over their institution's financial destiny. The chief executive of an independent school or university does have at least the chance to raise funds to support his plans.

3. Power Failure: Perhaps the greatest deterrent keeping men of action out of many top educational jobs is that, as a result of blurred chains of command, jealous empires and bureaucratic anachronisms, the jobs offer too little power to justify the titles.

POORLY DEFINED JOB

The city university chancellor's authority was quietly opposed by the presidents of the municipal colleges, even before the first chancellor was found. To pour oil on troubled waters, the fiction was created that the chancellor and the presidents were to be equal in all but name. The inevitable result is that the real powers and functions of the office are now inadequately defined.

In much the same way, the relationship between the State university president and the presidents on each of the many local campuses, on the one hand, and the board of regents, the university trustees, the State commissioner of education and even the Governor, on the other hand, is so tangled that it would seem a nightmare to any corporation president.

As for the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the prestige of his office is expected to enable him to raise the sights of all American learning, but his rank in the governmental hierarchy is so low that he is largely reduced to pleading rather than leading. The scarce leadership talent is not likely to be attracted by a vague promise that a weak position may eventually be given some new powers.

These appear to have been some of the problems Dr. McMurrin had in mind. He charged that the country has wasted its talent "in a most disgraceful manner" and asked education to lead to a cultural renaissance. The question is how education can so reorganize itself to bring about a rebirth of its own leadership.

Attorney William P. Brewster: 1877–1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the illustrious citizens of the Wyoming Valley, Hon. William P. Brewster, left a great heritage to his adopted clime. He left knowledge. His three most widely known books on history are: "History of Certified Township of Kingston," "The Pennsylvania and New York Frontier," and "The 14th Commonwealth."

Mr. Brewster was born in that portion of the Hopbottom settlements in Susquehanna County, Pa., known as Brooklyn, and it is more than coincidental, perhaps providential, that the three most outstanding historians of Wyoming Valley migrated to the valley from the Hopbottom settlements of Susquehanna County. They were Isaac Abel Chapman, who wrote the first history of Wyoming Valley and who was one of the first railroad men in the United States; Charles Miner, a Wilkes-Barre news publisher, who wrote the second history of Wyoming Valley. Miner served as a Representative in the U.S. Congress from the district encompassing West Chester, Pa., between 1825 and 1829. He coined the phrase: 'That man has an ax to grind."

The third historian of monumental stature to write on Wyoming Valley was William Brewster. Mr. Brewster was a man of modest manner. He was a good neighbor and was ever ready to lend a hand to those in need. He was very considerate of young lawyers and was most helpful to scholars interested in history. In this regard he made his valuable library collection of books on American history available to those who sought his counsel on this subject.

This treasury of our Nation's history, which Mr. Brewster accumulated over the past 60 years, has been bequeathed to the Hoyt Public Library of Kingston Borough. He also left sufficient funds for the construction of a building adjacent to the Hoyt Library building to house these books—the addition to be known as the William Brewster Reference Library.

Learned in the law, Mr. Brewster was regarded as an authority on the Constitution of the United States. His knowledge of school law and property law made him a lawyer's lawyer who was sought out for advice and whose opinions were highly respected.

Mr. Brewster was the last of his family and as part of my remarks today I wish to quote the text of the detailed obituary which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News on Wednesday evening, August 29, 1962, which marked his passing.

The article follows:

WROTE SEVERAL BOOKS: ATTORNEY W. P. BREWSTER, HISTORIAN, DIES AT 85

Attorney William P. Brewster, 85, a nationally known authority on and author of several books on northeastern Pennsylvania and American history, died this afternoon at 1:05 at his home, 252 North Sprague Avenue, Kingston.

Attorney Brewster served Kingston Borough School District for 4 years as school director and 50 years as Kingston School District solicitor until his retirement in 1956. He served as president of Hoyt Library, Kingston, an office he held for a number of years. He also was an honorary member of the board of directors of Wyoming Historical and Geological Society.

For more than a half century he had been a leading figure at the annual exercises of the Wyoming Commemorative Association at the Wyoming Monument, memorializing the battle and massacre of Wyoming in July, 1778.

FUNERAL SATURDAY

The funeral will be held from the family home on Saturday afternoon at 1 with Rev. Dr. George M. Bell, retired Methodist minister, officiating. Interment will be in Brooklyn Cemetery, Brooklyn.

Friends may call after 7 p.m. on Friday.

The prominent Kingston barrister was descended from Elder William Brewster who came to America on the *Mayflower*. On his mother's side, he was descended from Orlando Bagley, one of the minutemen who fought at the battles of Bunker Hill and Saratoga.

Attorney Brewster was born at Brooklyn, Susquehanna County, on June 23, 1877, an only child. His father was Charles Miner Brewster, a descendant of William Brewster, who organized the Pilgrim Church at his home, the Scrooby Manor House, Scrooby, England, in 1606 and of which he became ruling elder of the congregation, which he led in their flight to Holland and voyage on the *Mayflower* to Plymouth, Mass., in 1620. There he served as the first minister for many years. The latter's uncle, Rev. Henry Brewster became vicar of St. Wilfrid's Church, Scrooby, in 1565, and his father, William Brewster, became bailiff of the Archibishop of York in the county of Nottingham, succeeding Thomas Wentworth in 1575. The latter's daughter, Mary Wentworth, was the wife of Elder Brewster of the *Mayflower*.

Attorney Brewster was the 10th generation of that family in this country. His mother, Mary Adelaide Bagley Brewster, was the daughter of Washington Bagley and Lydia Williams Bagley, a descendant of Roger Williams. The father of Mrs. Bagley, Washington Bagley, was a son of Orlando Bagley, one of the Minute Men of Amesbury, Mass., where he was born. He took part in the Battle of Lexington and with the minutemen pursued the British troops in their retreat to Boston. He also participated in the Battles of Bunker Hill and Saratoga. He was a descendant of Orlando Bagley who was born in England and who was one of the original proprietors of Amesbury, Mass., in 1655.

FORMER NEWSPAPERMAN

Attorney Brewster graduated from Brooklyn, Pa., High School and from East Stroudsburg Teachers College, in 1895, after which he was employed as a reporter and news editor of the Stroudsburg Daily Times. In the fall of the same year he came to Kingston as west side representative of the Wilkes-Barre Times until 1898 when he became employed in a similar capacity for the Wilkes-Barre Record, succeeding the late Thomas F. Heffernan.

While employed on the Wilkes-Barre newspapers, Mr. Brewster studied law, being registered in the office of the late Judge Daniel A. Fell and B. W. Davis. Later he attended the University of Pennsylvania Law School. He was admitted to the Luzerne County bar in July 1900, and subsequently was admitted to practice in the superior and Supreme Courts of Pennsylvania and in the U.S district court of appeals.

In politics he had always been a Republican and was for several years successively secretary and chairman of the Third Legislative District Republican Committee. Attorney Brewster was a delegate to the last Republican State convention just prior to the enactment of the State primary system. He was sheriff's attorney during the first administration of the late John MacLuskie. In 1933 he was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as a member of the commission which sat in Philadelphia and conducted the adjudication of all World War I veterans' claims in the district comprising eastern Pennsylvania and Delaware.

In February 1902, Attorney Brewster was elected a member of the Kingston Borough School Board for an unexpired term and the following year was reelected for a full term of 3 years. At the expiration of the second term he was chosen solicitor of the school district and was annually reelected without opposition for 50 years, declining reelection in 1956 owing to the state of his health. He also served for many years as solicitor for the school district of Wyoming Borough and Franklin Township.

PROSECUTED PROPRIETORS CASE

During his tenure as solicitor of Kingston School District Attorney Brewster prosecuted what was widely known as the Proprietors case, which resulted in the distribution of nearly 200,000 to the various school districts into which Kingston Township had been divided, and which was the proceeds from the public lands set aside for the support of the schools by the Connecticut Proprietors in 1786. For nearly 30 years he had been counsel for the Trustees of the Proprietors of the Certified Township of Kingston, the organization having control of these public funds.

For about 30 years the deceased had been a member of the board of trustees of the Hoyt Library, Kingston, and had been president of the board the past 20 years.

Always interested in history, Attorney Brewster devoted considerable of his time to its study. In 1926 he began writing his widely known "History of the Certified Township of Kingston," including all the subdivisions of the original township and containing nearly 600 pages. This fine work was published in 1930. He also was author of a second book, a history of the "New York and Pennsylvania Frontier" from 1720 to the close of the Revolutionary War, published in 1954 under that title. A third book of Mr.

Brewster's, "The 14th Commonwealth—Vermont and the States That Failed," was published in 1960.

During the last 40 years Mr. Brewster delivered numerous addresses on historical and kindred subjects before historical societies, sevrice clubs and patriotic and other organizations. "Origin and Influence of the Pilgrims" he read before the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the arrival of the *Mayflower*, and published in the report of the society. "The Connecticut Claim," an address delivered by him at Wyoming Monument at annual exercises of the Wyoming Commemorative Association on July 3, 1939, also was published by the society. He also gave an address on the history of the anthracite mining industry before a convention of the Mine Inspectors' Association of the United States and Canada, later published in a report of that convention.

Mr. Brewster was a member of the Luzerne County Bar Association, a member and officer for many years of Wyoming Historical and Geological Society, and also a member and officer of Wyoming Commemorative Association.

Waterfront Communists Threat to Merchant Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert S. Burns:

WATERFRONT COMMUNIST THREAT TO MERCHANT FLEET

(By Robert S. Burns)

The National Research Council of the National Academy of Scientists says that merchant ships are very likely to be the least damaged during a nuclear attack. Since railway and highway systems are the most vulnerable, ships would provide the main source of transportation in the early stages of recovery—the ships are not sabotaged. Coast Guard officials are worried because they are prevented by law from keeping suspected security risks off merchant ships. A bill is now before Congress that helps remove this danger.

Communists and other suspected security risks have had easy access to the Nation's merchant ships and waterfront facilities since the Federal courts outlawed the Coast Guard's screening program in 1955.

The Coast Guard has been forced to issue seamen's documents and waterfront passes to over 300 suspected security risks. At least 1,500 declared security risks are eligible to have their papers returned.

Now that nuclear war is a threat. Communists in the maritime industry are a danger to civilians at home as well as to soldiers overseas. The National Academy of Scientists has found that, in the event of a nuclear attack, merchant ships are the least likely to be put out of commission. Railway and highway systems are the most vulnerable. Experts have testified that, after an attack, our chief means of transportation, at least in the early stages of recovery, will be on merchant ships.

Top officials in the Coast Guard, maritime unions, and maritime industry have testified that the billions of dollars the United States is spending for defense still leave us "woefully unprepared" until Communists are barred from the waterfront.

THE DANGERS

They told the House Un-American Activities Committee that a single skilled man can sabotage a great ship. Today there are hundreds of potential saboteurs legally eligible to ship out. They could block the Panama Canal by sinking or blowing up ships. They could also smuggle Communist agents aboard passenger ships and stop the flow of war material by inciting seamen and longshoremen to strike.

For example, Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, told the House committee that in the event of a war in the Far East, he would do all in his power as head of the union to impede shipments of supplies going from the United States to our allies.

His west coast union, which was expelled from the CIO for being Communist dominated, is one of the few unions opposing a House approved bill designed to keep Communists out of the maritime industry.

The Communists have proclaimed their intention of regaining the foothold they held in the maritime unions throughout World War II and up until 1955. Fortunately, they did not show their true colors after Hitler declared war on Russia.

A 1960 STATEMENT

A member of the Communist waterfront section declared in 1960: "Some of us who have carried this fight over a period of years have learned not to stand in the way of history. We expect to get ourselves back into the industry * * * and in the long run I think that the maritime industry is meant to be one of the militant sparkplugs of the labor movement as it was in time gone by."

The speaker was one of the security risks who had his seamen's papers returned by the Coast Guard. His speech before the Seamen's Defense Committee is on file with the House Un-American Activities Committee.

A gala anti-HUAC social was scheduled here last night by this same committee. Frank Wilkinson, an identified Communist and one of the alleged leaders in the anti-HUAC riots in San Francisco, was listed as the guest of honor. The committee is fighting to prevent the enactment of the bill to keep Communists off merchant ships.

As written, the bill (H.R. 4469) would compel persons subpoened by any Federal agency or congressional committee to tell about their membership or activity in the Communist Party, Fascist Party, or any other subversive party. Those who refused, or invoked the fifth amendment or perjured themselves while testifying would be denied seamen's papers and waterfront passes by the Coast Guard.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

The bill was introduced by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee. It was passed unanimously by the House in March. It is one of the measures held up in the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee by the long wrangle over the tax reform bill.

Mr. WALTER said yesterday that his bill has a good chance of being approved by the subcommittee and passed by the Senate once it gets on the floor.

The law was proposed after a 1955 Supreme Court decision outlawed the Coast Guard's screening program because, among other reasons, the service could not allow its informants to be identified and cross-examined. As a result, about 1,800 of the 500,000 men checked lost their seamen's documents.

Although they were considered security risks by the Coast Guard, the law required that their papers be returned. So far, 361 of this group have had their papers returned. The Coast Guard said yesterday that about 83 other security risks have been issued court validated documents.

OPTIMISTIC

Mr. WALTER is fairly optimistic that his bill will be passed because of a 1960 Supreme Court decision. It is patterned after a California statute held valid by the Court. The law provides for the discharge of any State employee who refuses to give information concerning Communists and their activities or who invoke the fifth amendment.

The Supreme Court ruled that a State may legitimately discharge a public employee who refuses to give information on the field of security.

In two later cases the Court said that a State may deny licenses to practice law to applicants who refuse to answer such questions. In one case the Court said: "Where * * * a State may withhold privilege available only to those possessing the requisite qualifications, it is of no constitutional significance whether the State's interrogation of an applicant on matters relevant to these qualifications—in this case Communist Party membership—is prompted by information which it already has * * * or merely from a good faith belief in the need * * * for questioning the applicant."

The Coast Guard is the Federal agency charged by law to pass on applications for seamen's papers, certificates, and officers' licenses.

The Youth of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the youth of today will be the leaders of tomorrow and many of our youngsters are demonstrating such abilities that we need have no fear of what tomorrow will bring.

As an illustration, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD two poems by a young girl in my district, Bettie A. LaVeck.

The first poem describes the typical antics of third graders.

The second poem shows that the youth of America followed the launchings and landings of our astronauts with great concern and they are very proud indeed of the achievements that we have made to date. Regardless of the Russian boasts, we Americans are voluntarily behind our space programs and know that we will always forge ahead, for it is the ready support of free people that paves the way for progress.

The poems follow:

THE THIRD GRADE

(By Bettie A. LaVeck)

We are little children in the third grade that is true,
Every little trick we pull, it isn't very new.
Our teacher said to study about Abraham Lincoln,
And John, he just sits there, thinkin.

Paul puts his pencil in his mouth and chews,

While Susie's tellin Sally all the latest news.
Jack has got Linda by her pony tail
Richard has a ship that's ready to sail.

Our teacher catches us and says we better quit,
And I can see she's headin for that old yard stick.
So we buckle down and study hard, but yet
We are in the third grade, don't you dare forget.
We are intelligent our teacher tells us so,
But there's an awful lot, we just gotta know.
No grade like the third grade, our teacher says so,
And she knows everything there is to know.

ASTRONAUT MALCOLM SCOTT CARPENTER

The space ship is all set,
The countdown has begun,
And you, Carpenter,
You're the selected one.

The buttons have just been pushed,
Your journey has begun,
History in the making,
U.S.A. has won.

You're the master of your ship,
Your gadgets all intact,
And now you know it's much too late,
There's no turning back.

You pluck a washer
From the air,
So it doesn't get stuck—
Anywhere.

You suck your food
From a straw
It crumbles and floats off—
Last you saw.

Inflate your balloon,
It trails your ship
With every minute,
It turns a dip.

The heat in your suit
Gets a little hot,
Adjust it a minute
And then it's not.

You talk to all countries
From out in space,
Your name is splattered
All over the place.

You've circled once
And then again
Another time,
Well, if and when.

For now your fuel
Is running low,
But yes,
One more time you shall go.

Your reentry is now,
The time is here,
No contact,
You fill us all with fear.

Forty-five minutes we waited,
Prayed and waited more;
A signal—and we know that you
Had hit the floor.

So our ships began to steam up,
Our planes flew loud and fast,
And then we had found you,
At last.

It seems that you had landed,
Cleared your ship and all,
Setting in your liferaft,
You looked 10 feet tall.

Man made by God
Enstowed here upon the earth,
We are proud
That you were given birth.

Sent to be our astronaut
In this our U.S.A.
With brave men such as you
America great will stay.

—BETTIE A. LAVECK.

On the Plus Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Blytheville Courier News, published in Mississippi County, Ark., understandably devotes a great deal of its editorial comment to agriculture, for that rapidly expanding area is one of the most productive farming localities in the world. Mississippi County, Ark., leads in rain-grown cotton production; is No. 1, I understand in soybeans, and rapidly is gaining a position of leadership in other branches of agriculture.

Mr. H. A. Haines, associate publisher and editor, is carrying on the fine tradition of community responsibility that has endeared his father, Mr. H. W. Haines, to all who know him. In the August 27 issue of the Courier News "Hank" has written a most thoughtful editorial on agriculture and some of the problems of this basic endeavor to our economy. The editorial will be of interest to farmers and consumers alike; certainly to all taxpayers, and, I know, to the Members of the Congress:

ON THE PLUS SIDE

Of all agencies of the Government, the Department of Agriculture probably comes under the heaviest fire.

Chief reason for this, of course, is that the bill for subsidizing crops, paying farmers for nongrowing of crops, and storing of excess crops keeps getting bigger. This is a problem neither party has been able to solve.

Agriculture Department expenditures ($9.9 billion in fiscal 1962) rank second only to those for defense and are felt by many to be about as worth while as the billions eaten up by paying the interest on the national debt.

Scandals like the Billie Sol Estes case and the yearly hassles between Congress and the President over farm legislation have also served to give the public the impression that the whole situation is just one big boondoggle.

Thus a look at some of the Department's positive accomplishments may help put a better perspective on its operations. Rather than trying to kill off the small, independent farmer, as some critics charge, the Department has actually done much to insure the prosperity of farms and farm communities.

Since it is technology that has brought the farmer to his present pass by enabling him to raise far more on far less land than his father, it is only fitting that technology be utilized to provide new outlets for his abundance.

For instance, a few years ago cotton was seriously threatened by synthetic fabrics. Thanks to the Agriculture Research Service, new markets were developed for cotton by making it flame and water resistant and by aiding the development of wash-and-wear fabrics. The latter use alone consumes a billion bales of cotton a year.

In 1945, Florida was close to overproduction of oranges with no new markets in sight. ARS helped develop a frozen orange juice concentrate. Today, more oranges go into cans alone than were grown in 1945.

As a result of new potato products ARS has devised, 12 potato dehydrating plants are now in operation in potatogrowing areas around the country. Their yearly consumption of $6.3 million worth of potatoes has reversed the downward trend in per capita use of this staple.

Research into improved frozen poultry has helped bring about a 2.5-billion-pound increase in the consumption of turkeys and chickens in the past 5 years. Even waste feathers that once cost processors money to get rid of are now made into fertilizers, feeds and plastics.

The list of such examples could be extended. Unfortunately, the good men do oft lies interred with the bones of contention concerning other issues.

Mr. Speaker, this fine article properly points out the role of our Department of Agriculture in its service both to farmers and to consumers. In its two decades of operation, the utilization research and development efforts of our Department have added over $2,500 million of value to farm commodities at a cost of less than $200 million—representing a benefit-to-cost ratio of 15 to 1. Pretty good return for our money, I would think. It has been stated that in the most recent 5 years, utilization research enhanced agricultural commodities $1,750 million, which is 70 percent of the total gain made in the 20 years of this program. This increased rate of return is expected to continue.

It is only just that mention be made of the Senators who served on the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and who participated in the writing of a report—Report No. 1908. Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, is chairman. With him are Senators CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona; LISTER HILL, of Alabama; A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia; SPESSARD HOLLAND, of Florida; JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi; GAIL MCGEE, of Wyoming; HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; MILTON R. YOUNG, of North Dakota; KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota; ROMAN HRUSKA, of Nebraska; CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey; and JACOB JAVITS, of New York. In addition, the committee has the advantage of the three top Senators of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as ex officio members; Senators ALLEN J. ELLENDER, OLIN JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, and GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont.

From the tenor of the editorial written by Mr. Hank Haines for one of the leading newspapers in the agricultural delta, it is evident to me that these Senators have touched on a phase of the agricultural problem close to the hearts of our farmers and to all interested in and knowledgeable of the farm situation.

Higher Interest Rates on Foreign Time Deposits

SPEECH
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], pending which I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 780 provides for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12080) to permit domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors. The resolution is an open rule, and provides for 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 12080 exempts from interest ceilings now imposed by regulation under the Federal Reserve Act and the Federal Deposit Insurance Act the time deposits of foreign governments, their central banks or other monetary authorities, and international financial institutions of which the United States is a member.

According to the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who appeared on behalf of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the objective of the bill is to encourage foreign governments to maintain dollar accounts in this country rather than convert these dollar accounts into gold or transfer these funds to other financial centers whereby they could be acquired by financial institutions of other countries and be converted into gold.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule.

The Hidden Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to read excerpts from an address delivered on January 3, 1962, before the Professional Engineers of Oregon by Col. Sterling K. Eisiminger, district engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District, Portland.

Presented as it is by a Federal official whose primary responsibility is to the national economy, I consider this the most objective statement and at the same time the strongest justification I have yet seen for the proposed widening and deepening of the navigation channel of the Columbia River—a project now before the House Public Works Committee to be considered for inclusion in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

Colonel Eisiminger titled his address, "The Hidden Project."

Mr. Chairman, members of the professional engineers of Oregon, and guests, I am honored to have been invited to speak to you today.

You may know that the Army Corps of Engineers strongly encourages all civilian and military engineers in its employ to seek professional registration, and to participate actively in the activities of their professional societies. Our experience has indicated that such registration encourages the highest standards of preparation, ethics, and responsibility, with resulting benefits to the general public, the Corps, and the professional man himself. I take pride in being a registered professional engineer and proudly display my shingle on my office wall.

Recently I forwarded a review report on the proposed widening and deepening of the navigation channel in the Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers between Portland-Vancouver and the sea. Studies leading to that report, the actual writing, and local review of the document, have been in progress for roughly 4 years. This report is now being further scrutinized by the Office of the Chief of Engineers and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in Washington, D.C.

These navigation review reports are prepared primarily for the use of Congress. They use them in making decisions as to where the limited amount of funds available may be spent with the maximum benefit to the national economy.

The method employed in these reports, very briefly, is to summarize the value of the anticipated benefits and the estimated costs, and use the ratio of benefits to costs as a guide to the relative merit of the project as compared with other projects throughout the Nation.

I shall say very little today of the economic aspects of the study, although they were a major portion of the enterprise. As professional engineers, I thought you would be more interested in the physical problems encountered and evaluated in the report.

The title of my remarks, "The Hidden Project," derives from the fact that most of the physical evidence of navigation channel work is hidden beneath the water, where it arouses far less interest, as a rule, than does our work with dams, jetties, and other prominently exposed structures.

The physical problem in expanding the navigation channel of the Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers may be regarded as primarily a huge earthmoving project. The project we have recommended would involve removal and disposition of some 45 million cubic yards of materials, ranging from fine silt to basalt. Normally this material is excavated from beneath the water and deposited, for the most part beneath the water, so that the general public remains unaware of the volumes involved. If all this spoil were to be deposited in the main business district of Portland, between Burnside and Jefferson Streets and the river and the stadium on 18th, an area of 210 square blocks, only those buildings over eight stories in height would rise above this enormous fill. (I might add that currently our annual maintenance dredging of roughly 10 million yards would represent a layer some 18½ feet thick over the same area.)

Now, of course, this material is not excavated from a concentrated area, nor disposed of in any such concentration as described above. We're working with over a 100 miles of river in the Columbia and lower Willamette, extending from Portland and Vancouver downstream to river mile 3.

Because this downstream limit of the project is a purely arbitrary one, perhaps I should explain that point briefly. A separate and distinct Federal project exists, authorizing an entrance channel from river mile 3, off jetty A, to deep water in the Pacific Ocean. Navigation and channel maintenance in the mouth of the Columbia River are completely different problems from those encountered upsteam. Today we will discuss only the channel from mile 3 to Portland and Vancouver. The present channel dimension of 35 by 500 feet were authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1930. The largest vessels seeking to call at Columbia River ports at that time approximated 10,000 deadweight tons, and the average deadweight tonnage of vessels transiting the river was in the order of 7,000 to 8,000.

Vessel sizes and drafts

Deadweight tonnage	Length	Beam	Loaded draft	Example
	Feet	*Feet*	*Feet*	
8,000	400–450	50–55	24	
10,000	450–470	55–60	27–29	Victory.
12,000	500	65–70	28–30	C–3.
15,000	525	70–75	30–33	C–4.
20,000	575	75	31–33	T–2–J.
28,000	625	85	33–35	
35,000	700	90–95	34–36	
46,000	750	100	37–39	

This table sets forth some of the vessel sizes and drafts, as well as lengths and beams, together with vessel types which you many recognize. The Victory-class vessels are typical of the 10,000-deadweight-ton class. The C–4 is typical of the finest modern berth liners and converted troop transports. The T–2–J is an enlarged version of the oil tankers which were built at Swan Island in Portland in such numbers during World War II. The T–2 was originally about a 16,000-deadweight-ton vessel. The T–2–J, or jumbo, is a version of this vessel to which an enlarged new midship cargo section has been added, bringing the capacity up about 25 percent from the original. The 28,000-, 35,000- and 46,000-ton vessels are typical classes of modern tankers or bulk carriers. Of course many tankers are presently fitted out to handle dry bulk cargo as well as petroleum products.

Before we leave this table, I would like to call your attention to the column headed "loaded draft." Note that while the 10,000-deadweight-ton veseels which were roughly the largest transiting the river prior to World War II drew only 27 to 29 feet, vessels of the 46,000-deadweight-ton class, such as the *Transeastern* which loaded grain here last year, have loaded drafts of 37 to 39 feet, or about 10 feet more than the 10,000-ton class drew. Also I call your attention to the horizontal line between the 20,000- and 28,000-ton vessels. The next table refers only to those vessels below this line.

Larger vessels in world fleet—Composition of world tanker [1] fleet

Year	Number of vessels over 25,000 deadweight tons	Percentage of fleet 25,000 or more deadweight tons
1953	119	4.8
1954	177	6.8
1955	221	8.7
1956	285	10.3
1957	394	13.3
1958	522	16.6
1959	666	20.3

[1] Many tankers also haul bulk grain.

Let's look at the rising importance of these large vessels in the world fleet. As recently as 1953, less than 5 percent of the world's tankers were over 25,000 deadweight tons. Note the rapid rise, from year to year, in the number of vessels of these large sizes, until 1959, over 20 percent of the fleet were in these so-called supertankers. A somewhat comparable, but less dramatic increase in average tonnage is taking place in dry-bulk and general cargo vessels.

The relation between the channel depth required and the salt-water loaded draft is another factor not understood by everyone. The loaded drafts we examined in the table of vessel sizes and drafts refer to the vessels amidships draft when carrying a full load, at rest, in sea water. A number of factors operate to increase the channel depth

requirements over the salt-water loaded draft of the vessel.

Required channel depth, typical 28,000-deadweight-ton tanker or bulk carrier

	Feet	Inches
Salt water loaded draft	33	5
Added draft in fresh water		8
"Drag" (trim down at stern)	1	8
Open water "squat" at 10 knots		7
Added "bottom effect squat"	1	8
Total	38	0
Minimum safe bottom clearance	2	0
Total channel depth required	40	0

The first item in the above table is the salt water loaded draft of 33 feet 5 inches for a typical 28,000 deadweight tons tanker. This vessel, carrying that load, will sink approximately one-quarter inch additional as she enters fresh water for every foot of draft in salt water, or about 8 additional inches. To improve the vessel's steering characteristics, she is normally loaded so as to set her down at the stern perhaps three inches or a trifle less for each hundred feet of vessel length, or for this vessel about 1 foot 8 inches. The next two items concern squat and I will discuss them later. I will also explain the added 2 feet for minimum safe bottom clearance. Note, however, that in total, our 33½-foot draft, 28,000-ton vessel, requires a 40-foot channel to safely navigate in our fresh water channels.

I will now discuss the matter of squat. Ignoring for the moment any outside disturbance of the water, the vessel sits at a depth determined by the relation between her average density and the density of the water which she displaces. When the vessel begins to move forward, however, water is piled up by the pressure of her bow, and a bow wave starts moving away from the vessel. The vessel itself steadily moves forward into the space from which this bow wave has departed. We can see how the vessel underway typically moves in an artificial wave trough created by her own bow, so that she rides lower than she did when at rest. This effect is greatly exaggerated when the vessel cross-section is a considerable fraction of the channel cross section. When this is the case, the vessel tends to push all the water in the channel ahead of it up or down the stream. Of course this is literally impossible, but in such situations, the water velocities alongside and under the vessel are greatly accelerated with respect to the vessel. These increased velocities, and the flow lines which they follow, interact with the channel bottom and cause a marked increased in squat which we refer to as bottom effect.

There are other effects which add to channel requirements, none of which are considered important once vessels are inside the entrance proper. One of these effects, which indirectly we do take into consideration, is that of roll, or heeling in a sharp turn. A vessel riding level in the water requires less channel depth than the same vessel when rolled or heeled over even as little as 5 degrees. We have acheived a channel alignment on the Columbia and lower Willamette which reduces heeling to a negligible amount.

The 2-foot minimum bottom clearance is needed to avoid damage to ships' screws from every sunken log or other debris which may be carried into the channel, and to minimize displacement of bottom sand by the ships' screws, which might easily scoop out a foot or two of sand and pile it up a short distance away to ground the next passing vessel.

It should be remembered that grounding on the solid sands of the Columbia River is quite a different matter from touching the soft flocculated colloidal muds which make up the bottom of tidal estuaries in many parts of the country. Touching bottom there may be no cause for concern at all, but nearly every grounding, however slight, in the Columbia calls for a vessel inspection. This is costly even when no repairs whatever are needed.

Safe navigation of large vessels requires that channel width as well as depth be engineered to adequate standards. Vessels passing close to the bank of the channel tend to yaw toward a collision course due to what is commonly called bank suction. Of course this is just another way of expressing the forces exerted by the lines of hydraulic flow around the vessel as they react with the nearby bank.

The bow has water piled up alongside it on the crest of the bow wave and the vessel tends to sheer away from the bank while at the same time the stern is traveling in a trough, which attracts the bank, from which the term bank suction derived. These lines of flow interact as the vessels meet and pass each other. As the bows meet, they repel each other, while when the sterns pass each other, they are mutually attracted.

The formula we and other authorities have adopted for calculating the required width allows the beam of one vessel, or a minimum of 100 feet, between vessel and bank and between vessels. In addition, we allow 180 percent of the vessel beam for each vessel traffic lane, much as the highway engineer allows a 14-foot traffic lane for an 8-foot truck or a 6-foot car.

Totaling these allowances, we come up with a 600-foot channel for two 26,000-ton vessels, or a comparable combination of one larger and one smaller one, which we considered the most demanding situation occurring often enough to be economically justified as a design assumption.

I mentioned at the beginning that this channel improvement is largely an enormous earthmoving job. What I did not say then is that it would be a much greater earthmoving job had we not learned, to at least some degree, to make the river do as much of our earthmoving as possible. Our men have studied sedimentation, measured the particle sizes in the water, and made studies of current velocity and direction.

Authorities on open channel hydraulics of erodible channels generally agree that the tractive force imposed by the stream on the particles varies approximately with the square of the velocity. It can be appreciated, therefore, that even rather minor differences in velocity will markedly affect the erosion and deposition of bottom particles. Although experimental studies and field observations have not yet given engineers any generally accepted correlation between precise particle sizes and the bottom velocities necessary to start them in motion or keep them moving, we have learned quite a bit about helping the river scour itself clean.

I do not want to imply that we have all the answers to sediment transport. Quite the contrary. This is still a relatively new branch of engineering. Design of erodible channels is still as much an art as a science. Men like Bob Hickson, who have spent a lifetime studying this river, have been able to give us some measure of control over the natural processes, but we still have a great deal to learn.

We are placing more emphasis on research. We have under construction at the Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station at Vicksburg, Miss., a complex model of the estuary reach of the Columbia River, up to about river mile 52. Tide generators are included and we hope to learn a good deal about the many baffling habits of the river from this model. It will make it possible for us to try out experimental control measures whose cost would prohibit gambling on their success in the river itself. We expect this model to save many times its cost over future years.

We have prepared an information bulletin to summarize for the general public the principal points covered in our report as it was submitted to Washington for approval. Copies are available from the Portland district office.

I would like to leave these thoughts with you: An estimated 45 million yards of excavation will need to be completed to make this proposed channel a reality. After it is completed, an estimated 14 million yards per year will have to be dredged to maintain it. Even small percentage improvements in our techniques will save large sums of money for the taxpayers. Only extremely low unit costs and sound engineering keep total costs low enough to make feasible such projects as a 40-foot channel from Portland and Vancouver to the sea.

The Cuban Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned with the Cuban situation. None of us want communism or Communists on our doorstep. At the same time, we do not want war, if we can avoid it.

We have heard many proposals and solutions to the Cuban problem. We have heard many accusations, but neither the proposals nor the accusations have produced to date.

In my district I am privileged to have many fine ministers and priests. One in particular has given me suggestions, from time to time, of great value, and he has written to me a letter about the Cuban situation. I have looked the letter over carefully and I thoroughly subscribe to the reasoning contained. I have written to this fine citizen and told him of my intention to bring this to the attention of everyone I could contact, and under leave previously granted me, I include his letter and commend it to the thinking of our leaders and our people as a whole.

The letter is as follows:

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF OUR SAVIOUR.
Rock Hill, S.C., September 7, 1962.

The Honorable ROBERT HEMPHILL,
The House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I am writing to the Senator and congressional Representative whom I count as my friends on a matter that to my mind as a Christian American, and as an officer in the Naval Reserve is of momentous importance.

There is to my mind no doubt but that Soviet Russia is engaged in the process of making Red Cuba into a military base, developing an offensive potential which will be directly aimed at our Nation. There is also in my mind no doubt that the Monroe Doctrine has for some time been violated by this move on Russia's part.

It appears to me that the whole matter has reached a sharply urgent and critical point.

Therefore I, as a citizen, offer a proposal which I have been turning over in my mind for some months—a proposal short of actual invasion of war—and yet, I believe, one as effective under the circumstances.

In international law the phrase "pacific blockade" is used, I understand, which describes the sort of maneuver which I have in mind.

I propose a "pacific blockade" with certain variations which I feel will make such an action work, and keep it also within the bounds of the international morality which characterizes the United States' relationships with other sovereignties.

Therefore, let a complete air-sea blockade be thrown around and over Red Cuba, as a unilateral action undertaken by the United States in implementation of the Monroe Doctrine. Let it be sternly and clearly stated to the whole world that we do this out of moral necessity to defend our freedom, and to keep the peace.

Let it be stated with equal clarity and sternness that no ship on or under the sea will be permitted through the blockade either Cuba-bound or outbound; and that no aircraft will be permitted to fly in or out of that country; and that any attempt to run the blockade either by air or sea will result in the ship being sunk or the aircraft shot down; but that no shooting or harassment will be done by our Armed Forces otherwise.

Let it be stated that by airlift and parachute drop we will bring in to Cuba such food and medical supplies as will prevent starvation and epidemic disease on the part of the people of Cuba, oppressed as they are.

Finally, let it be stated that the blockade will continue indefinitely and will be discontinued only at the pleasure of the United States.

As I say, I write this to you with a sense of great urgency, and leave you to implement the idea—or tell me it cannot be done—as you see best.

Most sincerely,

WILLIAM W. LUMPKIN,
Rector.

P.S.—This letter is also being sent to Senator STROM THURMOND.

Speaker Won Pat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an article from the Morning Star of Okinawa on the Honorable A. B. Won Pat, speaker of the Legislature of Guam whose frequent visits to Washington when his own legislature is not in session has made him almost one of us. Speaker Won Pat presides over the most farflung legislative body under the Stars and Stripes. The article follows:

DEDICATED SOLON GUIDES GUAM PROGRESS

(By Richard R. Williams)

About 1,200 miles southeast of Okinawa lies a relatively small island that in recent years has come to be known as the "gem of the Pacific."

Back in 1898 the United States accepted the island of Guam, principal island in the Marianas chain, as the spoils of war following the Spanish-American War. At the signing of the Treaty of Paris, U.S. officials shrugged their shoulders and said, "we'll take the island, but we don't know what we'll do with it."

The U.S. Navy was given the responsibility of administering the island and the some 20,000 Guamanians. The Navy acted with foresight. The first thing the Navy did was move the well known "little American red schoolhouse" to Guam.

So, for more than half a century the Guamanians have been English speaking, American thinking, and probably our most sincere Americans.

Guam has come a long way in a relatively short period of time—50 years. The population is now about 70,000. For most of that 50 years the Guamanians have and had some semblance of a government by and for the people, thanks to the Navy's foresight.

And this brings us to the subject of this story, for this is not a story about Guam. It is a story about a man who has been an integral part of Guam's progress for the past 30 years.

Antonio B. Won Pat, better known as Pat, has been more than an integral part, he has been the hub on the wheel of progress for the newest American citizens.

Pat, speaker of the Guam Legislature, has never been a successful businessman. He has never had time for himself. He has been working for his people since he became a schoolteacher in 1928 at the age of 20.

But he did find time to father eight children with the former Ana Perez, who has encouraged her politician husband through many periods of heartbreaks and victories alike.

The congenial political leader was born in the southern village of Sumay, which was destroyed during World War II. Just 2 days before his 33d birthday Japanese bombers destroyed Pat's home village.

He has been so affirmative for his people that he sometime becomes negative.

Two years after World War II ended one political element started a campaign for a territorial status to get out from under a military government. With a fellow congressman, Eduardo T. Calvo, Pat fought vigorously against such a move. He believed that for the sake of the Guamanian people, the navy government should remain until the island was rehabilitated and the island economy fully recovered.

Debunking harsh criticism brought about by American columnists and bids by other U.S. Government departments for control of the island, all of which brought Guam to the fore in world news, the Guam congress on September 7, 1947, unanimously passed a resolution urging continuation of the naval government.

But, almost immediately Pat took a 380° turn. He started working for a territorial status. He knew it would be a long, hard fight and time was important. By the time Washington could be convinced, Guam would be in a position to handle the new status.

Three years later there was a new era for Guam. The organic act, which Pat helped draft, made Guam a territory of the United States and the Guamanians American citizens.

During that 3 years Pat gained invaluable friends in the U.S. Congress. Through his efforts the organic act provided a free port, the only free port under the American flag today. Anything that is the growth of or manufacture of Guam leaves there duty free and enters any other American ports duty free. In addition, there is not one red penny in export or import duties levied in Guam. One may import or export anything and in any quantity without the burden of duty charges.

Guam was also given a nice deal for the territorial treasury. All U.S. income taxes due the U.S. Government by residents of Guam, U.S. civil service employees, and American servicemen stationed on the island does not go to the National Treasury. It goes to the Guam treasury. This is in lieu of U.S. Government appropriations to run the territorial government. The more earnings, the more money in the local coffers.

The organic act also provides for a 21-seat, single house legislature, and the legislators are elected at large by the people. The legislature is empowered to enact laws for the territory not inconsistent with national laws. And there are provisions by which the legislature may override the veto power of the Governor.

Since the first Governor was appointed in 1950, Guam has had six Governors. Speaker Won Pat has never been a yes man for any of them. He has fought them with all his resources when it became necessary for the welfare of the people. Under Pat's leadership the Guamanian people have developed a stirring pride in the right and ability to govern themselves.

One of the Governors, Ford Q. Elvidge, of Seattle, left Guam in a huff when he learned the island was not a sleepy little Pacific island without problems. He later wrote a story for a national magazine entitled, "I Ruled Uncle Sam's Problem Child."

Guamanians took a bitter exception to the story. But not the reference to being a problem child. They objected to the inference that Elvidge ruled them. "No one rules us," retorted Won Pat, "we rule ourselves."

But the legislator has also joined forces with the Governors, and even has caused resolutions to be passed commending Governors—when he thought it was deserved or for the welfare of the people.

After more than 50 years under a military government the Guamanians, with the leadership such as that of Pat, it seemed it was time the islanders and their political leaders should be satisfied and feel as though a long, hard battle had been won.

True, it was a big victory, and Guam was jubilant. But Won Pat believes in exploiting your successes. The stabilizing influence of the dedicated Congressman was again felt at home and in Washington.

"This is not the time to relax," he said. "On the contrary, the fight has just begun. There is much yet to be done and there will be much to be done from now until eternity. We are on our own and we must make good, not only for ourselves but for our country. Guam is a picture window facing the Bamboo Curtain. We are the closest Americans to that curtain. We must make good under a democratic form of government and at the same time create a favorable atmosphere for our military forces."

Pat has always gotten along with the military commanders better than he has with the Governors. At his instigation a resolution was passed commending the late Rear Admiral William H. Erdmann, commander, naval forces, Marianas. At the time the resolution was passed the Governor and the admiral were not on speaking terms.

Since the Organic Act was passed, Guam has received several Government grants with which to improve medical and educational programs of the island. These and other "favors" were given to Guam through the efforts of Pat's lobbying in Washington.

While the legislature is not in session the speaker is in Washington working for Guam. He receives expense money from the legislature, but this money does not fully cover his expenses in the Nation's Capital. He is continuously digging into his personal funds to make up the difference.

Probably the greatest and most valuable political victory since the passage of the Organic Act was won only recently. Until a year ago there had been an economic stranglehold on Guam in the form of a security clearance required for all persons, including American citizens, entering Guam.

A tourist industry has long been desired there and foreign investments are needed.

But the security clearance requirement scared away potential investors. A year ago the Navy suspended that part of the Presidential Executive order that pertained to American citizens. But aliens still could not enter and the Navy could at any time put the clamps back on for American citizens. As far as enticing investments were concerned, the island was not much better off.

Won Pat joined with Gov. Bill Daniel in lobbying where it would do the most good—in Washington. Last week their efforts paid off. President Kennedy lifted the entire Executive order, throwing Guam open to the world.

The modest lawmaker does not take full credit for concessions that have been gained from the "big brothers" in Washington. "No one man can take credit for anything like that," he says. "My fellow Congressmen, the Governor, and our Navy friends have all had a hand in mapping Guam's future, and they always will have."

"I have been extremely fortunate in finding U.S. Congressmen who are sympathetic with our desires and who have an open mind to problems outside the continental United States."

Pat has been not only a political leader, but active in civic affairs as well. He is a member of the Guam Junior Chamber of Commerce and, in 1947, represented the Guam Junior Chamber of Commerce at the international conclave in Dallas, Tex. He was the first president of the Guam Lions Club and Fraternal Order of Eagles.

He frequently participates in committee hearings in Washington. At home he is constantly being called upon to speak before civic and professional clubs.

The veteran politician was elected speaker of the first Guam Legislature and has held that post ever since, except during the third legislature (1954–56) when there was a revolt on the floor of the legislature by a minority group of independents who failed to abide by an agreement reached during the caucus.

As busy as he is, Pat always has time for his constituents, regardless of their social position. At receptions, which he attends because it is politically neecssary, he invariably talks business and listens to complaints and suggestions. He never takes them lightly. Every complaint or suggestion is taken seriously and he always provides an answer to querries.

When Congressman Won Pat visited Okinawa last summer as a guest of the Morning Star his first request was an opportunity to meet with Guamanian servicemen stationed here. He, as all Guamanians are, is proud of the record of Guamanians who have entered the Armed Forces. He never misses an opportunity to pass on words of encouragement and appreciation to Guamanians in uniform.

One of the probabilities in the future for Guamanians is the election of their own Governor. There has been much speculation that Won Pat would throw his hat in the ring. But he scotches these speculations. There is still another probability for Guam's future—a delegate to Congress such as Alaska, Hawaii, and the Philippines at one time enjoyed and such as that now enjoyed by Puerto Rico.

Pat is mum on the subject but it is believed that he is interested in this job. "This is the area in which I can best help my people," he once said. "It would mean leaving my home to live in Washington, but I'm away from home so much now that it would not be much different."

Guam is on the threshold of another new era, and it would be a safe bet that the 54-year-old popular politician will be in there fighting even more vigorously. It's the new eras that prompt Pat to fight harder for his people.

The Menace of Communist Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States cannot permit the establishment of a Communist slave-state in Cuba.

Mr. William S. White, one of Washington's most knowledgeable writers, has written an article which appeared recently in the Washington Star. Entitled "The Menace of Communist Cuba," the article states the problem and makes certain suggestions for a solution to the matter. Since earliest solution to the problem is demanded, Members will be particularly interested in the proposals Mr. White makes:

THE PASSING SCENE: THE MENACE OF COMMUNIST CUBA

(By William S. White)

The Soviet Union's publicly boasted military penetration of the Western Hemisphere in Castro Cuba is many things, apart from the most insolent menace to the New World that the United States has ever tolerated.

It destroys forever the airy assurances of pseudoliberals that "revolutionary movements" are fine things, indeed—so long as they involve leftwingers and not rightwingers.

It places a terrible responsibility before history upon all those Americans who cheered Fidel Castro on in Cuba long past the point where it was plain that he was transplanting the evil fungus of armed international communism to within 90 miles of our Florida coastline.

UNMASKS COMMUNISM

It bankrupts the whole evangelistic theory, parroted with religious fervor, that communism results from capitalistic injustice, et cetera, and will vanish at once, given the spreading of sufficient welfarism among the masses. Cuba, before Castro, was never half so underprivileged as dozens of other lands which have nevertheless never sought the lethal embrace of Moscow.

It fully supports what has long been fully obvious—that communism, like Hitlerism before it, is a movement of bandit ferocity and cannot be explained by old-lady minds as simply springing from too little milk for the kiddies and too little free land for the workers and peasants.

It brings into the gravest question the practicality of the vast effort being made by the United States through the Alliance for Progress to cure all the ills of Latin America with economic aid. Foreign aid is a sound and splendid thing—when it is given to nations willing and able to use it for freedom's strength and openly and unashamedly against communism.

But the bulk of the more powerful Latin American nations, while avidly ready for our economic aid, repeatedly have refused to follow us in any total quarantine of Castro Cuba. It is fashionable to say that we, the United States, should never force our views upon the recipients of our aid. This is the line even when precisely our views are essential to maintain that freedom from "foreign domination" for which the Latins so endlessly clamor—especially those who have snuggled up closest to international communism.

And brought into question, too, is the very validity of the Organization of American States. This association of the nations of this hemisphere was created to prevent just the kind of foreign penetration which is and long has been so openly involved in Castro Cuba.

But an effective majority of the OAS has thus far been unwilling to take any fully rational step against Castro Cuba. The most ironic of all excuses is given by the nation closest in geography to us, Mexico. She has said that while she would like to help, she just can't find any precedent for it in international practice. There is a sour jest in this—for Mexico, of course, is famous for its scrupulous respect for both law and justice.

COURSE FOR UNITED STATES

So what is now left to the United States? We should try one more time to persuade the Organization of American States to act in honesty and honor against the Soviet cancer in the Caribbean.

Failing this, we should raise a new collective military organization from among the minority who are our real friends in Latin America. Much the same was done in 1949, when we created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from within the United Nations when it became clear that the U.N. would do nothing about Soviet aggression in Europe.

And failing this, the United States should act alone to clear the Soviet military apparatus from Castro Cuba, come what might.

Knowles Stockholders To Vote on Liquidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, those who have suggested that American industry is safe under the provisions of the new foreign trade bill just recently passed by the House of Representatives should have cause to fear.

Recently in my district, the Edwin M. Knowles China Co., which had been in business in this Nation for 63 years, announced it was closing its doors and liquidating. By this decision, 500 employees have no place to go.

The reason for this decision was that under present tariff policies, wherein imports of foreign made pottery are encouraged, a company could not operate profitably.

Mr. Speaker, if this is so under existing trade policies, I hesitate to think what will be the fate of many like industries after the new foreign trade bill becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article from the East Liverpool (Ohio) Review which covers the announcement that this company will cease to do business:

KNOWLES STOCKHOLDERS TO VOTE ON LIQUIDATION

Stockholders of the Edwin M. Knowles China Co. have received notice of a special meeting Thursday, September 13 at 2 p.m. in the company's office at Newell to vote on accepting or rejecting a plan for liquidating the corporation.

The letter revealed that the shareholders at their annual meeting on March 20 authorized the board of directors to sell the corporation. Unable to secure a purchaser, the board voted unanimously August 21 to recommend to the stockholders that the corporation be dissolved and its assets be liquidated, the letter said.

CONTINUING LOSSES CITED

Continuing operating losses made the action appear desirable because it seems unlikely the operation will become profitable in the foreseeable future, the letter to the stockholders said. It was signed by Roger A. Hall, as secretary of the corporation.

"This action is deemed desirable and necessary by the board of directors because of the continuing operating losses being suffered by the corporation," the letter said.

"Due to the present tariff policies which encourage increasing imports of foreign pottery produced with low labor costs, it does not seem possible for the operation of the company to become profitable in the foreseeable future."

The 63-year-old company employes approximately 400 to 500. It was established at Chester about 1900 by Edwin M. Knowles, a son of Isaac Watt Knowles, founder of the Knowles, Taylor & Knowles Co.

PRODUCT OF QUALITY

He erected a six-kiln plant in Chester, which he named the Edwin M. Knowles China Co., and "soon won fame for the quality of his product," according to contemporary newspaper accounts.

In 1913, Knowles erected a 15-kiln factory at Newell. The Chester plant was sold about 1930 to the Harker Pottery Co.

Here's the text of the letter sent to the stockholders:

"You are hereby notified that a special meeting of the shareholders of the Edwin M. Knowles China Co. will be held at the office of the corporation at Newell on September 13, 1962, at 2 p.m. to consider and approve or disapprove a plan of liquidation of the corporation and the subsequent dissolution of the corporation. A copy of the proposed plan of liquidation is enclosed herewith.

SALE IS AUTHORIZED

"At the annual meeting of the shareholders on March 20, 1962, the Board of Directors was authorized and directed to sell the corporation. The Board of Directors and officers have been unable to secure a purchaser for the corporation, and at a special meeting of the Board of Directors held on Tuesday, Aug. 21, 1962, the board unanimously decided to recommend to the shareholders that the corporation be liquidated and dissolved.

"This action is deemed desirable and necessary by the Board of Directors because of the continuing operating losses being suffered by the corporation. Due to the present tariff policies, which encourage increasing imports of foreign dinnerware produced with low labor costs, it does not seem possible for the operation of the company to become profitable in the foreseeable future.

SIXTY-PERCENT VOTE REQUIRED

"For the plan of liquidation and the dissolution of the corporation to become effective, a favorable vote of at least 60 percent of the outstanding shares of the corporation is required. If you cannot attend the meeting in person, you are urged to promptly sign and return the enclosed proxy in the enclosed envelope.

"An executed proxy, upon which no approval or disapproval is noted, will be voted by the proxies named therein for approval of the plan of liquidation and in favor of the dissolution of the corporation. Any proxy may be revoked by a shareholder at any time prior to the meeting upon notice in writing delivered to the secretary of the corporation."

FOUR STEPS PROVIDED

The proposed plan of liquidation sets forth four steps. It would authorize the corporation's officers, if they deem it advisable, to seek the advice of consultants "knowledgable in such matters" concerning the various steps to be followed in the liquidation.

It would authorize the officers to take necessary action to (1) dispose of the present inventories in a manner most advantageous to the corporation; (2) terminate all manufacturing operations as rapidly as possible consistent with the greatest possible realization of cash from the inventories and (3) collect the accounts receivable.

DISPOSE OF ASSETS

Upon liquidation of the current assets, the plan would authorize the board to dispose of the fixed assets in the manner which would be most beneficial to the corporation, either by a negotiated sale or sales or by the employment of a professional liquidator.

The plan would authorize the board to satisfy all debts and liabilities of the corporation and distribute the remaining assets to the shareholders.

The Spurious Trade Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, as action on the trade bill, H.R. 11970, approaches in the other body, we in this body should not forget that the tariff and trade question is still a very live issue.

It is true that this body passed the bill late in June; but the bill came up under a closed rule and the House membership was not able to work its will on amendments, important amendments, that might have been adopted had the opportunity presented itself.

The trade bill as passed by this body was therefore the bill as it came out of committee. Numerous bills under an open rule are amended on the floor. This is not regarded as a reflection on the committee that reported such legislation but a reflection of the will of the House.

It is therefore not too much to say that had the trade bill been open to amendment on the floor some much-needed amendments might have been adopted. The escape clause, instead of being weakened by gutting it, might have been strengthened. The peril point, instead of being thrown overboard, might have been reinstated. Other important changes might have been made.

The bill has some very objectionable features and much of the endless propaganda that was poured out in its support by the White House, various governmental departments, and numerous other Government officials was misleading. No other bill has perhaps been more thoroughly oversold than this one. The public is beginning to sense this and questions are being asked that must be most embarrassing to the official propagandists.

A searching analysis of the bill and what has been claimed for it in the form of larger exports of both industrial and farm products, was recently made by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, whose intimate familiarity with the trade program and the legislation relating to it needs no affirmation by me.

I would hope that those who disagree with Mr. Strackbein's conclusions would show, not by simple assertion, but by a factual presentation, where he is wrong if they so regard his statement, in whole or in part. There has been no reply. I feel that the absence of a refutation in so controversial a field, itself is strong evidence that none can be made.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer the analysis made by Mr. Strackbein and presented over TV channel 5 on August 22:

THE SPURIOUS TRADE BILL

(By O. R. Strackbein)

A few weeks ago I spoke on the subject of the trade bill that will shortly come before the Senate.

This legislation has been described on numerous occasions as the most important to come before the Congress during this session. I would say that its importance extends beyond that, and believe that you will agree as we go along.

The original Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1934, or 28 years ago. Under it the President was authorized to enter into foreign trade agreements with the purpose of reducing our tariffs and other trade barriers in return for similar action by other countries.

The first act was for a 3-year period and there have been 11 extensions of it since 1934, usually for a 1-, 2-, or 3-year period. The last extension, passed in 1958, was for 4 years.

Previously the tariff was written by the Congress itself, as provided in our Constitution. However, this became a laborious and highly technical process. The new system of changing tariff rates through trade agreements was substituted by a limited delegation of authority to the President in 1934. Today a much broader authority is sought.

Since 1934 we have negotiated many trade agreements and have brought down the protection afforded by our tariff from an average of a little over 50 percent on dutiable items to about 11 percent. This represented a decline of 80 percent. Beyond that, well over a third of our imports are admitted free of duty. If these are included in the calculation, the average tariff on our total imports would be equivalent to only about 6 percent.

The upshot is that the United States is now one of the low-tariff countries of the world. Moreover, we impose fewer other import restrictions, such as import quotas, import licenses, special taxes, etc., than most others of the leading trading nations.

This is the record and I do not think that anyone will gainsay it.

Why then the vastly overdrawn campaign to strip away nearly all of what is left of the tariff? It has all the earmarks of a diversionary campaign.

Consider that few other countries have matched us in this type of economic disarmament; that few have gone as far as we, and that therefore few have as liberal a form of trade as we; consider that we are four-fifths of the way to free trade and that we have no import quotas on any industrial product and have only two on mineral products and a few on farm products: keep in

mind another basic fact; namely, the small stature of exports in relation to our total economy; namely, 3.8 percent of our total national product; consider all this, and the vastness of the illusion about the importance of increasing our exports become apparent.

This is not to say that the trade bill and what has been said about it is much ado about nothing. Indeed, it has implications that extend far beyond the amount of trade involved, as we shall see. Low-cost imports in competition with our producers may cause more damage than a similar increase in exports helps the economy; and this is an important consideration.

Passage of the trade bill, specifically, would not buoy our economy by raising our export levels. To repeat, the handle and the leverage are too small, only about 1 out of 27 workers being employed in export and related activities. Moreover, in order to increase exports it would be necessary to increase imports, and this might, and indeed could be expected to, cause retardation of domestic expansion.

All this is to say that the trade bill is indeed important; but for reasons quite different from those advanced by official statements and by the bill's other proponents.

The bill is not important, for example, for any contribution that it would make to our industrial expansion and employment. The favorable effects in this respect, in any case, as already said, would be offset and probably much more than offset by the increased import competition that further tariff reductions would generate. Even if exports could be increased 10 percent in a year only some 250,000 workers would be added to our payrolls, assuming that none would be displaced by rising imports, as they surely would be. Every year about a million workers are added to our work force and a similar number is estimated as the toll of automation. This adds up to 2 million or more new jobs that have to be found in this country each year, and 250,000 would be a little over 10 percent of this number. Beyond that we still have some 4 million already unemployed workers.

The trade bill would help little in that direction and, if anything, would aggravate our economic difficulty by confronting scores of our industries with job-shrinking import competition. Companies simply do not expand and put additional people to work when the market outlook for their products is discouraging; and rising import competition will supply the discouragement in heavy doses. More and more of this could be expected with further tariff reductions; and the discouragement would reach into industries not previously affected. If this discouragement is not lifted, we will look in vain for the industrial growth and expansion that we need.

That saying this does not represent a gospel of doom and gloom, as is sometimes charged, may be gathered from what has already happened as a result of our past tariff reductions and the consistent failure of other countries to lower their trade barriers in proportion.

The U.S. share of world trade has shrunk from 33 percent in 1950 to 27 percent in 1960. A part of this shrinkage was, of course, accounted for by European and Japanese recovery of prewar markets. Nevertheless, our portion has receded in the face of the trade program that was to boost our exports by removing foreign barriers against them.

There should be nothing surprising about any of these trends. Anyone who has kept abreast of economic developments here and abroad and has taken note of our foreign and technical aid, should have expected what did in fact take place. That the public is not aware of the trends is the fault of official propaganda and failure of the press to puncture it or to give the other side.

Some very simple and understandable facts have either been ignored, concealed, or brushed aside.

It is an indisputable fact that wages in this country were and are the highest in the world and that because of the high purchasing power thus generated, hand in hand with productivity, we have the highest per capita consumption of most consumer goods. It is also a fact that our labor, because of vast machinery installations, which were formerly lacking in other countries, was the most productive in the world. We were therefore able formerly to compete readily in world markets in numerous products, such as automobiles, typewriters, sewing machines, steel, petroleum, etc., despite our higher wages. Mass production was our special magic. Our high wages were offset by high productivity; and we came out with relatively low unit costs.

This was before we had shipped some $50 billion worth of modern machinery overseas, much of it under foreign aid. It was also before the other industrial countries adopted our production methods, including the moving production line and mass production. Once industrial production was modernized in Europe and Japan the lower wages prevailing there conferred a rising competitive advantage on them. We had not lost our magic; we merely gave it freely to other countries.

To be sure, wages are going up in those countries; but wages have not stood still here either, and the gap is still very wide, and can be expected to remain so unless American labor should decide henceforth to say "No, thank you," to wage increases.

Another fact that has been hidden is that more and more we have come to import what are called labor-intensive goods, i.e., manufactured goods, where labor is applied through all the stages of production, and export more and more of the labor-sparse goods, i.e., raw materials and agricultural products, where labor has been applied only through one or two stages. This is precisely what would be expected under the circumstances. It is a trend, however, that hits at employment in this country. It means that dollar for dollar we import many more manhours of work than we export.

Another result, the effects of which are being felt in terms of relative stagnation in this country, has been the flow of our capital into Europe and Japan, to be invested there in manufacturing. This is not said in condemnation of the movement but rather in explanation of it. Money goes where its owners think it will beget the highest returns.

This movement, again, has had the inevitable effect of producing less employment here than would have been the case if the owners of the money had thought that the returns on the dollar would be higher if invested here rather than overseas. Obviously the business judgment has been the other way to such a degree that over a thousand of our companies have invested billions of dollars overseas since 1958. They have bought into foreign manufacturing enterprises, built new branches overseas, expanded existing ones, set up subsidiaries, or they have licensed foreign companies to use American patents, processes and formulas.

Because there has been neither pressure to produce this outflow of capital nor any restraints against it, its movement overseas was an eloquent commentary on the gloomy competitive situation caused by imports in this country and the brighter outlook abroad.

To date the indications are that the decisions were economically well founded. European countries and Japan have enjoyed an unprecedented boom in the past few years; but please note that this lively boom was not at all confined to the Common Market countries but included most of the European countries and Japan. Their productivity per man-hour has increased faster than in this country.

Again, none of this is surprising if we keep in mind the energy, skill, and enterprise of the Europeans and the Japanese. Having seen what our industry and agriculture accomplished during the war and afterward, they concluded that it was the most productive and effective in the world and welcomed the system with open arms and adapted their own economy to it.

Their prosperity lagged about 10 years behind ours but it gained momentum once it got underway. It too may be expected to falter and to slow down when the producers catch up with the pentup demand, even as we did. They will then become more hungry for export markets than they are now; and we will be at the receiving end.

Within Europe the acceptance of our economic system has been so complete that it has led to extraordinary efforts to create mass markets where they did not exist before. The modern technology, including highly intensive and expensive machinery, made the smaller national markets obsolete just as expensive farm machinery in this country has made the small farm economically obsolete. As a result the Europeans have launched Common Market and free trade areas by knocking down or beginning to knock down the tariffs on the inside. They hope in this way to gain the economic advantages of a mass market such as we have enjoyed since our population grew to the proper proportions.

For Europe this trend is to be applauded; but it confronts this country with a difficult problem in several directions.

For one thing, our agriculture has become so efficient in point of output per acre that we have accumulated great surpluses. We look to exports to absorb an increasing part of these surpluses; and Europe has been an important market.

When we adopted our farm price supports we placed heavy restrictions on imports of wheat, wheat flour, raw cotton, butter, cheese, etc., to avoid a flood of imports that would have broken down this system; and they are still in effect.

Now European agriculture is also becoming more productive and these countries will become more self-sufficient in some of the farm products that we wish to continue to sell them. The Common Market, however, once more taking a leaf from our example, has adopted a common agricultural policy. In order to avoid its breakdown from imports they will levy import fees or duties to bring import prices up to the supported prices in the six countries. Thus they will be doing what we did and the outlook is not good for an increase in our exports of farm products to that area.

It is therefore suggested that we reduce our duties on industrial products, in some important cases removing them completely, to induce the Common Market countries to let in more of our farm products.

This assumes that our industries could withstand more European competition than they face even now. Our general surplus of $5 billion in exports in 1961 is often cited as evidence that we are indeed competitive; but it is not explained that this surplus is spurious since it includes foreign aid shipments, exports of heavily subsidized farm products, such as cotton and wheat, and sales for foreign currencies and outright gifts.

It is true that we are still exporting more to Europe, in dollars, than we are importing from there; but a great part of our exports consist of industrial machinery and equipment. This, in turn, will increase European productivity. Once Europe is fully equipped and caught up at home, the balance of trade will shift rapidly unless we defend ourselves. European wages will not move

upward fast enough to bring production costs up to ours.

It would therefore be an act of economic folly or stupidity to reduce our industrial tariffs in order to sell more farm products to Europe that Europe will not accept for the same reason that we refuse to accept Canadian wheat, Danish butter, French cheese, Egyptian cotton, etc., in sufficient volume to upset our farm program.

It is also said that we must reduce our industrial duties to gain duty reductions from the Common Market on industrial products so that we will be able to enjoy a vast outlet for consumer goods such as refrigerators, dishwashers, washing machines, TV sets, etc., in Europe. The per capita consumption in Europe is still far below ours. Therefore a vast internal market may develop within these countries.

Yet, the same was and still is true of automobiles. Does that mean that we have a vast market in Europe for our cars? It does not. To be sure Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler have a good share of the European market, but with a difference: Their participation is through plants within those countries, not through exports from here. Why then should anyone believe that the Common Market would open a vast market to our exports of these other products? There is no longer any question about our companies going over there. They have already gone; and they will sell in those markets from within, rather than shipping there from three or four thousand miles away.

If the trade bill will not accomplish what it has been so feverishly advertised to do, what then is its purpose?

Four sources of support have their confluence in the bill.

One consists of those who believe that freer trade will help pacify the world. These are good people who take their cue from noncompetitive trade, such as our imports of coffee and bananas, but who overlook the international rivalry and bitterness caused by highly competitive trade.

Another element consists of export and import interests who have a dollar interest or jobs at stake. Their support is natural and readily understood.

A third element is found in the academic and doctrinaire free-trade adherents who take a long-range view that may some day prevail when the world disarms and the world stands on a nearly even economic level.

The fourth element consists really of two groups. One consists of those in Government and out who look upon the Communist menace as requiring economic sacrifices in behalf of free world political and economic unity and the other, those whose political philosophy quite apart from the Communist menace leads them to seek a somewhat different system of government from the traditional one in this country. They seek a government of heavily concentrated Federal power, with ascendancy of the executive within that government. This again means subordination of the economic to political considerations.

Of these groups the latter is today most vocal and feverishly in cry behind the trade bill. In the field of international economic affairs, including trade, it seeks ascendancy of the State Department over Congress. Essentially this means subordination of the well-being of domestic industry to diplomacy and the submerging of U.S. sovereignty in an international trade organization in which we would have one vote.

Since the end of World War II our State Department has dedicated itself to this goal. Until now they have not fully succeeded because Congress has kept its hands on the reins, even if the reins have been loosely held.

Passage of the present bill would for a 5-year period hand the reins to the executive branch and the State Department in particular. The Department's views would be imbedded in international agreements and thereafter Congress would be helpless, short of an upheaval, to recapture its constitutional power.

The trade bill confronts Congress with the choice of not passing legislation that contains many objectionable features or indeed passing a bill that will not accomplish what is so vociferously claimed for it, namely, stimulation of industrial growth and expansion in this country through rising exports, opening of foreign markets for our farm products and consumer goods, and pacification of the world; for these things it will not do; and at the same time accepting what it would accomplish, namely, greater concentration of power in the hands of the White House and the State Department, relegation of Congress to the status of a debating society, so far as regulation of foreign commerce is concerned, and submerging the United States in an international economic organization wherein this country would be leveled downward to meet other countries on a halting and very uneven movement upward.

Do we want a system under which one group in many, because of its size or strategic political position in terms of votes in Congress, may enjoy accommodation and favors while others, no less entitled under law will be turned aside? Shall we, in other words, substitute political patronage for rights under law? That is what vast enlargement of the presidential discretion, as provided in the trade bill, would accomplish.

That is the choice. It should not be difficult to make.

Our American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an address delivered in my district before the Rotary Club of Ridgewood, Ridgewood, N.J., by Mrs. Geraldine Earlin of West Englewood, N. J. This same address, it should be pointed out, earned Mrs. Earlin a national award from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, announced on George Washington's Birthday, February 22, 1962.

Her subject is that of "Our American Heritage," and the necessity for and means of preserving it, particularly among our youth. Although delivered on July 3, the eve of Independence Day, it is just as timely today as then. I know it will be a source of inspiration and a stimulant to thoughtful review of America's position in today's world to all that read it.

The address follows:

LET'S CHERISH OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

(By Geraldine Earlin before the Rotary Club of Ridgewood, N.J., at Ridgewood, N.J., July 3, 1962)

Thank you Mr. Hollestelle. It is indeed, a great honor and privilege to address this audience, The Rotary Club of Ridgewood, N.J., on such a vital subject as cherishing our American heritage, especially since a great deal of the success of the American Revolutionary War hinged on this very section of our country.

Tomorrow, July 4th, we celebrate our country's most sacred patriotic holiday, Independence Day, the day our independence as a new and free Nation was proclaimed throughout the world. Let us never becloud this day with other issues.

Recently, one of our great generals, Gen. Mark Clark, said that he believes most of our people would be better Americans if they were more demonstrative and more sentimental and emotional in the performance of their patriotic duties. Suggesting that there should be more frequent and more enthusiastic occasions for patriotic demonstration in America, he noted that the observance of such days in the United States gives all our people higher concepts of loyalty.

The fundamentals of good Americanism, said General Clark, are faith in our country, its Constitution, its laws and history, and its spiritual and religious dedication. Teach these fundamentals to young Americans, and they in their turn and time will keep America great.

It is not old fashioned, he said, but the duty and challenge of Americans in all generations, to give youth faith, to teach youth conviction and courage, to inspire youth with religious and moral guidance and to make youth worthy of its American heritage.

Today, as never before, we as Americans must realize that there is this extreme and urgent necessity for teaching our youth love of God, love and loyalty to family, and to our country and its Constitution as written by our Founding Fathers, if we are to survive as the great Nation which is by right our heritage.

To show these needs I have taken further statements made by prominent people in various walks of life, the first being from a sermon which I was recently privileged to hear: It is love, not the vaunting of authority, that can make a happy home. The happiest home is the home in which father and mother and children are one in love of God, and of one another. Riches do not make happy homes. When husband and wife truly love each other, they have treasures which no wealth can give, and no poverty can take away. Loving God, they abide by His holy will. Their home is a sanctuary built for God's glory, a haven of refuge wherein love and peace are ever found, a nursery from which good citizens are given to the State and saints to heaven.

We need homes like these for the support of honesty and decency and truth in this Nation. No country is stronger than its homes. They are the foundation upon which ultimately, under God, all hope for sound and solid progress must rest. No nation, whatever its wealth and influence and power in the world may be, has ever been able to tear the Almighty out of the hearts and homes of its people without witnessing the forboding of approaching disaster.

In a statement, March 28, 1955, by the New York State Board of Regents on "America's Moral and Spiritual Heritage," which will be hailed by all who believe in God, the moral law and the principles laid down by our Founding Fathers, they reiterate the principle that "Belief in and dependence on God is the very cornerstone upon which our Founding Fathers builded" and they cite the Declaration of Independence, the pronouncements of Washington, Franklin, Lincoln, Jefferson, and Dwight Eisenhower as proofs.

The regents call on schools to stress spiritual heritage; to have the children inspired by the example of their ancestors;

to be guided by the faith and love of their parents; to be encouraged by their spiritually sensitive teachers, so that there will be renewed in their daily lives America's moral and spiritual heritages: "Liberty under God—respect for the dignity and rights of each individual—devotion to freedom."

Throughout our entire history as a nation, these fundamental beliefs have been our guiding star and compass in time of storm and troubles.

In my original address on which I won the award from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., which your program chairman asked me to give today, I was warning of the test case before our U.S. Supreme Court to take prayer out of our public schools. You all are aware, now, of the shocking decision of the Supreme Court.

Our Founding Fathers never meant that freedom of religion would be misinterpreted as freedom from religion.

As one U.S. Congressman has said, this decision is only one of many strange and shocking decisions by our Supreme Court and another Congressman has stated that this shocking decision by our Supreme Court places America just about 40 years behind godless Russia. It should make Americans pause to consider that perhaps those persons who have been criticizing the Supreme Court were not, after all, too far wrong.

The impact of this decision will not be felt for some time to come but it should make us realize that some day we might wake up and find that we have even lost our independence through some decision of the Supreme Court, or through an Executive agreement by our President, or through a treaty passed by our Senate, whereby we find ourselves in some sort of world government under which we no longer would control our own destiny. Americans must awaken to the dangers which surround us.

In the words of the chancellor of the New York Board of Regents, "Freedom is not free—it must constantly be defended and cared for lest we lose it. This is the price we pay for it. We must root deeply in our hearts faith in the unimpeachable dignity of the individual and in the unquenchable spirit of freeman. We must reinterpret for our children the initiative, the courage, and faith of the Founding Fathers."

Dr. Arthur A. Schuck, chief Scout executive of the National Council, Boy Scouts of America (now retired), wrote an article entitled "Our Answer to Brainwashing," in the September 1956 issue of Scouting magazine, in which he discussed the Scouts' 4-year program, "Onward for God and My Country," and in which he also discussed how the Chinese Communists in Korea were able to break many of our American boys, taken prisoner, because in his words:

"Too many of them proved woefully lacking in basic knowledge of American history, institutions, and ideals and quite unable to produce reasons for their belief in democracy."

In discussing the study made by the committee appointed by the Secretary of Defense, he said it found: "There was often a failure to know about or appreciate the hardships endured by our forefathers in building a free nation, or to accept the need for similar sacrifices today to keep our Nation strong. On the other hand there were those who found that their faith in and loyalty to family, country, religion, and comrades were shallow and weak under stress."

"The committee * * * concluded that the weakness of the men who broke involved traits that cannot be imparted in a few months of military indoctrination but are the product of years of training in home, school, church, and community. Our whole system of education, formal and informal, needs to make sure that our young people are thoroughly grounded in moral and religious principles. Our children as they grow up must not merely take American values for granted. They must be so familiar with the fundamental facts of American history, American Government, American economic and social life that they know why they believe in our way of life and need not be confused and embarrased when critics challenge these beliefs."

From an editorial of May 20, 1956, New York Journal American, we read that Joseph B. Cavallaro, chairman of New York City's Board of Higher Education suggested that American history courses should be compulsory in every tax-supported educational institution. This editorial said that from surveys made in 1950 it was learned that 76 percent of institutions of higher learning did not include American history as a required course for enrollment and 66 percent did not make American history a required course in their own classrooms. Reportedly there has been some improvement but not enough for in 1955 a specimen college inquiry in Ohio revealed that a surprising number of freshmen did not know when or how the United States began.

Mr. Cavallaro emphasized that American history must be taught rightly—that our youth must know what is meant by American heritage and American ideals.

The editorial asks: "How is any American to be a good citizen if he has little or no knowledge of the proud and aspiring origin of his country, its magnificent traditions and ideals?"

Both the paper and Cavallaro are in agreement that the antidote for communism lies in the full and proper study of American history. The best way to defeat subversion is for Americans to know what the subverters are trying to subvert.

Since it seems to be agreed by divergent opinions that belief in God and belief in loyalty to our country is the recipe for molding our children's character, what better way is there to instill this belief than in teaching our children the real meaning of our patriotic and traditional holidays?

We should teach them that September 17 is Constitution Day, the Constitution of the United States of America having been adopted by the Continental Convention and signed on September 17, 1787. Only because of the Constitution do we have the right of citizenship. This year marks the 175th anniversary of the U.S. Constitution and our Government is, through a national commission, sponsoring Constitution Year. The celebration is taking place in Philadelphia, Pa., where the Constitution was adopted and the flag of each State is to fly from Independence Hall for 1 week, in the order in which they were admitted to the Union, and, adopted the Constitution. Our week is over, for New Jersey was the third State to ratify and the celebration started January 2. Since we have 50 States there are 2 extra weeks and 1 week will be known as Freedom Week from June 27 to July 4 when all the State flags will fly and then, again, the week of September 17 to 25 which is always celebrated as Constitution Week all the State flags will again fly.

I do hope your organization will plan an appropriate program commemorating Constitution Day, September 17, and Constitution Week, September 17 to 25. Remember, the Constitution of the United States of America is the blueprint for your freedom.

October 12 is Columbus Day and was so proclaimed by Benjamin Harrison, when he was President of the United States, "as a general holiday," commemorating the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus.

In February we observe the birthdays of three great Americans, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Thomas Edison, who symbolize in their divergent achievements America's immortal heritage, and are representative of the great men who toiled and died to develop our resources and to win and maintain the freedom necessary for the pursuit of happiness. We all must realize that we enjoy the blessings of this free land due to the hardships endured by the Father of Our Country, George Washington, and those men who felt that personal liberty was to be placed above all their worldly possessions. We know that when the hour arrived that someone must rise up to preserve this Union that the weight of that burden lay on the shoulders of Abraham Lincoln. We should also realize, and you businessmen in particular, that the life of Thomas A. Edison exemplifies what can be accomplished under our "capitalistic" or "free enterprise system" which is truly American; for where else in the world could a poor boy like Edison have risen to be the wealthy man that he was? Of course, we also realize that this was before the Government restrictions on business that we have today.

June 14 is Flag Day, our own Continental Congress having designated June 14, 1777, as the first birthday of the Stars and Stripes as our national emblem with the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the flag of the United States be 13 stripes alternate red and white, that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

July 4 is Independence Day, and I repeat, our most sacred patriotic holiday and we must never allow it to be beclouded by other issues. We must ever be watchful that we retain our own independence as a free nation. No other flag but the U.S. flag should fly, in our country, on Independence Day.

Properly observing our American patriotic holidays gives us the opportunity, as adults, to rededicate our belief in our American form of government as it was intended by those patriots who suffered so much in order to hand us this great country; and it most certainly can be a constructive move toward strengthening the loyalty and background in basic American principles of our youth. This great need was evidenced by General Dean, upon his return as a prisoner after the Korean war. You will remember that all the press agreed that there was something lacking in the background of those soldiers who refused to come back and in those who collaborated with the Red captors. General Dean said we had failed these soldiers.

Americans have forgotten the meaning of July 4, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution; they have forgotten the warnings of George Washington about foreign entanglements. Failure to recognize this danger and failure to combat it will bring about the loss of all that has been accomplished for the freedom of men in 2,000 years.

Let us use our patriotic holidays to instill knowledge and pride in young folks of the great heritage that is theirs.

Let us reevaluate all that the United States has stood for—for only this knowledge and the determination to fight for it will halt the advance of foreign ideologies in our country.

The Emancipation Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the significant features of the commem-

oration of the Civil War Centennial in Maryland was the exhibition of Abraham Lincoln's handwritten draft of the original Emancipation Proclamation in Hagerstown. This priceless document was loaned by the New York State Library through the courtesy of the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York.

The proclamation was exhibited in the Nicodemus National Bank at Hagerstown, Md. The bank distributed an interesting history of the relic, which is appended because of the unusual worldwide interest in the proclamation in this centennial year.

The history follows:

THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION: A GREAT WORLD DOCUMENT

The Emancipation Proclamation is a precious document in President Lincoln's own handwriting which the Library of the State of New York has the honor of safeguarding as a public trust. The proclamation is part of the heritage of the American people, and is to all of the people of the world one of our noblest symbols of the American dream.

In 1862 Abraham Lincoln began the completion of the unfinished work the Founding Fathers had so well begun with the Declaration of Independence. Although the sounding prose of Thomas Jefferson made no specific exceptions to the phrase "all men," certainly at least a part of the assemblage which cheered its reading assumed that for "all men," "all white men" should be read. It took 85 years and a War Between the States to provide a proper setting for the document which spelled out specifically the fact that all men regardless of color should be "then, henceforth and forever free."

Physically the proclamation is actually two proclamations. The first was proclaimed on September 22, 1862.

This is the document which Lincoln worked over all summer long, after the heartbreaking defeat of General McClellan in the Seven Days Battles in June of 1862. Much of it was probably composed in the Cipher Room of the War Department, while awaiting the arrival of the latest intelligence from the Army.

On July 22, 1862, at a regular Cabinet meeting, Lincoln announced that he had determined upon a course of emancipation and informed the Cabinet of the substance of the proclamation he was drafting. New York's William H. Seward, of Auburn, the Secretary of State, agreed in principle with Mr. Lincoln but urged him to delay the publication of the proclamation until a victory for the Union Armies should provide a more suitable setting. It was not until qualified success of Union Arms at Antietam was achieved that such a moment came to hand. On Sunday the 21st of September Lincoln stayed at the Soldiers Home and prepared a new copy of the proclamation.

The following Monday, September 22, Lincoln met with his Cabinet, having first consulted with his Vice President, Mr. Hamlin, and presented the memorable document which is the subject of this essay. He had, on Sunday at Soldiers Home, smoothed it out a little and, as he thought, made it a more acceptable document for his Cabinet to consider.

Although Lincoln had most seriously considered all of the phraseology of his document, the distinguished New Yorker, Secretary Seward, had some suggestions to make to strengthen the text. Mr. Seward said, "The general question having been decided, nothing can be said further about that. Would it not, however, make the proclamation more clear and decided, to leave out all reference to the act being sustained during the incumbency of the present President, and not merely say that the Government 'recognize' but that it will maintain the freedom it proclaims?"

The Cabinet, agreeing with Seward, convinced the President of the wisdom of his suggestions. These were incorporated into the document which was then corrected and prepared that afternoon for publication. It is this manuscript, in Lincoln's own hand, on which he lavished such loving care, that is now the cherished possession of the people of the State of New York.

The text declares that all slaves in the States presently in rebellion against the United States, which were still found to be in a state of rebellion in 100 days, would be declared to be freed by chance, according to Lincoln, the 100th day fell on the first day of the year 1863. Despite the fears and trepidations of some of the more devoted of the abolitionists that he might fail to do so, Lincoln, true to his word, issued on January 1, 1963 a second proclamation activating the promise of the first. This was the document which carried out the plan of freeing the slaves so carefully prepared for in the first Emancipation Proclamation. Taken together these two are actually instruments of equal importance since neither has any meannig or effect without the other. President Lincoln prepared the final Proclamation on December 29, 1862. Manuscript copies in the handwriting of secretaries were distributed to members of the Cabinet at a meeting on the morning of December 30 for their comment. At a meeting on the following day a new closing sentence was added, and on the following day the Proclamation was published. Some delay in the actual publication was caused by the necessity for determining those parts of Louisiana and Virginia which were not in rebellion.

The two proclamations have been severally styled "first" and "second"; "preliminary" and "final"; "Emancipation Proclamation" and "Proclamation of Freedom"; but the fact remains that both are really part and parcel of the same act and that the various arguments which had been indulged in by pedantic scholars as to their relative importance are doomed to sterility.

The manuscript text of the Second Proclamation, which would compare with the New York State Library's copy of the first was, unfortunately destroyed in the Chicago Fire. The New York State Library was fortunate enough to acquire from Benjamin Lossing what is probably the only photograph of this text and what is undoubtedly the best facsimile of the original.

How the people of New York State became the owners of this milestone of freedom is a fascinating tale. The U.S. Sanitary Commission, which has been described as "Mr. Lincoln's fifth wheel," sponsored a relief bazaar, one of a series conducted for the benefit of sick and wounded soldiers, in Albany in February 1864. Mr. Lincoln asked Mr. Seward to forward to this bazaar the now famous manuscript of his First Proclamation for sale, the proceeds to go to this worthy cause. It was determined that the manuscript should be raffled off. Some 1,200 tickets were sold and the bazaar reaped a profit of $1,100 on this item alone.

The bazaar was a highly colorful affair, and really deserves an extensive description which would not be appropriate here. The drawing for the proclamation resulted in its being won by Gerrit Smith, whose fame as a New York abolitionist is probably second only to that of John Brown. The assembled multitude cheered so appropriate a result of the drawing. Mr. Smith gave it to the Sanitary Commission, where it reposed until 1865.

Inspired by Lincoln's funeral services in Albany, the New York State Legislature wisely appropriated $1,000 and purchased it for the collections of the New York State Library, where it survived a fate similar to its companion piece when it came through the Capitol fire undamaged because it was in a fireproof vault. Except for those rare occasions when it is displayed, the document spends its time in an even more effective fireproof vault in the education building in Albany. A suitable shrine is planned for the permanent public display of the document in Albany.

Printed copies, both official and unofficial, of both Proclamations are legion. It is interesting to note that the first printing of Proclamation No. 1 gives on its heading the date for freeing of the slaves as January 1, 1865. Some printer or compositor who has long since gone to his reward must have had difficulty in living that one down.

How important was the Emancipation Proclamation? Perhaps a quotation from Charles Eberstadt, an acknowledged authority on the document, will answer this query.

"The Proclamation has been called by responsible persons one of the three great documents of world history, ranking with the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence. An even more enthusiastic proponent has extolled it as 'the greatest document even penned by mortal man.'"

U.S.S.R. Propaganda Materials in U.S. Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is well recognized that the Veterans of Foreign Wars is one of the leading anti-Communist organizations in this country. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, like many other patriotic organizations, does not believe that our Post Office Department should deliver Communist political propaganda free or at subsidized rates. The position of the VFW on this issue is stated in a resolution adopted at their 63d annual convention, held at Minneapolis, Minn., August 12 through 17, 1962.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 252: U.S.S.R. PROPAGANDA MATERIALS IN U.S. POST OFFICE

Whereas the U.S. Post Office Department annually reports a deficit in excess of $500 million allegedly due to insufficient income; and

Whereas postal rates to oversea areas are in the process of being raised as of July 1, with further raises in domestic rates under consideration upon approval from the U.S. Congress; and

Whereas the U.S.S.R. is mailing to the various citizens of the United States, particularly to schools, colleges, the youth of the Nation and various organizations, tons of propaganda material each and every month; and

Whereas the handling and distribution of the U.S.S.R. material is subsidized to a great extent by the U.S. Post Office, thereby aiding in increasing the annual deficit in the income in Post Office Department; and

Whereas the mailings from the United States to the U.S.S.R. is on a greatly reduced scale, with no definite proof that it ever reached its addressed destination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 63d national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That this matter be brought to the attention of the proper Government agencies to take immediate remedial action to correct the situation.

Cuba Presents New Challenge for Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people, in ever-growing numbers, demand action against Russian intervention in this hemisphere.

The Florida press has been particularly alert to this threat at our southern door—only 90 miles from our own beaches. Our editors and feature writers report from the vantage point of close proximity to the danger, and with the advantage of contacts with Cuban exiles now living in Florida.

Over the past months I have had reprinted here in the RECORD stories and editorials from Florida so that these events would be called to the attention of all Members of Congress and other Government leaders. As a further indication of the feelings of our citizens on these matters, I ask that the following be printed in the RECORD:

[From the Pompano Beach (Fla.) Sun-Sentinel, Sept. 5, 1962]

CUBA PRESENTS NEW CHALLENGE FOR LEADERSHIP

Our foreign policy is based on the idea we must lean over backwards to avoid doing or saying anything that might offend the Russians.

The Soviets, on the other hand, proceed in the confident belief that nothing they do or say will offend or provoke the United States.

So, we had the announcement Sunday that Russia will arm Cuba.

One State Department spokesman appeared little concerned about this. He told newsmen the statement was an attempt to make what the Soviets have been doing sound legitimate.

The prospect is that missile launching sites are being built or have been built to place U.S. targets within range of even relatively short-range weapons.

Certainly all of Florida is "under the gun," so to speak.

The same is true of much of Latin America.

Vast power is in the hands of a ruthless band of cutthroats—Fidel Castro, Raul Castro, Ernesto (Che) Guevara, Aragones Navarro and their ilk.

They have shown no mercy in dealing with their own people. Surely these hate-America fanatics cannot be expected to pull any punches against us if they feel an attack will serve their purposes.

Certainly we have ourselves to blame in part. The Cuban problem has developed over the past 3 years and 9 months because we have been unable or unwilling to cope with it.

The Eisenhower administration, in the first instance, either did not have sound intelligence reports on Castro or it chose to ignore them. January 1959, would have been the proper time to have started checking the Fidel myth.

The Kennedy administration muffed an opportunity in April 1961, when it failed to support the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Along the line, we abandoned entirely a source of America's great strength and security—the Monroe Doctrine.

President James Monroe, in a message to Congress on December 2, 1823, laid down the principle that the United States would not permit any European nation to extend its holdings or use armed force on the two American Continents.

Ironically, that doctrine was set forth because of Russian moves at that time. The then czarist country planned to establish a colony on the Pacific Northwest coast.

Another factor in stating the doctrine was a plan of several European nations to help Spain win back her former colonies in Latin America.

Pertinent to our present situation was the statement of the Monroe Doctrine that any European attempt to control independent American governments would be an unfriendly act to the United States.

The control Russia exerts in Cuba certainly is an unfriendly act today.

Unfortunately, the New Frontier holds of little value that which served our Nation well in the past. So, it is a lot to expect that we would use the principles of the Monroe Doctrine to save the situation at this late date.

Our choices are not at all appealing in any event.

We could assert ourselves along the lines of the Monroe Doctrine, but to be sure of success, we would have to be prepared to back up our words with arms, if necessary. That, of course, could mean war.

Other than that, we can let things drift as they have for 45 months. Sooner or later, the screwballs of the Castro regime can be expected to attack or brazenly kill Americans under circumstances which may force us into war.

Naively, we have sat back during the past 2 years in the belief Castro would collapse. That has not happened and there is little chance it will happen.

All of this directs our thoughts back to the presidential campaign of 1960. At that time, Candidate John F. Kennedy told us time and again that America had slipped to a second-rate power.

We did not accept that at the time.

But now, we are looking and beginning to feel like a second-rate power.

What is needed desperately at this time is some first-rate leadership from Washington. It must be leadership founded in wisdom, stiffened by courage, and activated by a conviction that right makes might.

It is possible that such leadership might avoid fighting over Cuba, but without it, it seems inevitable that we will have to fight—on our terms or the enemy's.

The Immorality of President Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the August 28, 1962, issue of Near East Report.

Is there no limit to the lengths the Egyptian dictator will go to provide his ragtag army with war materiel?

The article follows:

THE IMMORALITY OF PRESIDENT NASSER

Thousands of Egyptian children, between the ages of 6 and 9, are paying the price for the bombers and fighters which Nasser gets from the Soviet bloc. They are giving up their schooling to grow the cotton Nasser uses to trade for Soviet weapons.

The low state of education in Egypt is revealed in Egypte by the French journalist Simone Lacouture, recently published in Paris:

"The regime will soon have to make its crucial decision: whether to abandon the method of cultivating Egypt's cottonfields with the aid of hundreds and thousands of school-age children or have these children miss school the bulk of the scholastic year. * * * Only in dead seasons do children attend classes. What are the dead seasons? If there is no cotton, there are the donkeys and the oxen to pasture and the thousand other daily chores to do. For these children, going to school is a holiday, a sort of vacation and joy."

According to Mme. Lacouture, higher education also has its problems:

"The Egyptians are affected by the low standard of their universities. Hardly any students are permitted to leave abroad for studies. * * * The Egyptian university student does not read, does not debate, does not struggle. A special police force has even been created to watch him closely and if there is the slightest suspicion of something wrong, the university doors are shut forever in his face."

House Resolution 211: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a com-

mittee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts are sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HOUSTON, TEX.,
July 2, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We fully support your House Resolution 211 establishing a permanent Committee on Captive Nations.

We will lose the struggle against communism as long as we are on the defensive. One of the best ways to take the offensive is to expose the colonialism of Russia and let the people of the captive nations know that we support their desire for freedom.

Yours truly,
Mrs. JOSEPH J. LOVING, Jr.
JOSEPH J. LOVING, Jr.

SOUTH ST. PAUL, MINN.,
July 2, 1962.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I note you are the sponsor of House Resolution 211. On this you are to be congratulated. And, please, by all means, do all you can to establish a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

I thank you for your efforts on behalf of this resolution.

Sincerely yours,
ELIZABETH KURTZMAN.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your proposal, House Resolution 211, is the best weapon at the present time against colonial Moscow.

Sincerely yours,
MYKOLA OTRUN.
CHICAGO, ILL., *June 12, 1962.*

SYRACUSE, N.Y.,
July 1, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I wish to offer you encouragement for your efforts to have a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations established in the House.

It would certainly be appropriate if this measure were voted on in the coming Captive Nations Week.

I have written to Congressman SMITH, Rules Committee, and my own Representative asking that they support your House Resolution 211.

I can't understand why the White House and State Department oppose your bill. Perhaps they don't wish to annoy Mr. Khrushchev.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM A. BURNS.

FREEHOLD, N.J.,
July 5, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As an American citizen of Cossack descent, I would like to ask you to support House Resolution 211 introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, for the establishment of a special Committee on Captive Nations.

I am very glad to see that the resolution included, among the various nations submerged by Moscow, the Cossack nation and my old homeland, Cossackia.

With best wishes for your work,
Very truly yours,
GEORGE MOROZOFF.

Supreme Court Prayer Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, confusion reigned in the minds of many American citizens with respect to the Supreme Court decision relative to its ruling on prayer. Now that the schoolrooms have been opened to hundreds of thousands of American children and teenagers, we should soberly review this decision and ask ourselves what, if any, damage has been done to our great American heritage of religious liberty?

I submit for my colleagues' reading an editorial that I think will pinpoint the problem from the church's point of view, as well as from a legal point of view. This is done in an editorial by the Reverend Professor Robert K. Menzel, Concordia College, Portland, Oreg., entitled, "The Supreme Court Ruling on Prayer."

The editorial follows:

THE SUPREME COURT RULING ON PRAYER

More than a month has gone by since the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that a 22-word prayer used in many schools in New York State violates the first amendment to the Constitution. By this time some of the sound and fury has quieted down, and reasonable Americans can begin to look at the controversial decision in a more sane and objective way.

Sound and fury there was during the June week following the ruling by the Supreme Court: One Congressman called the decision "ridiculous, blasphemous, anti-Christian, almost atheistic." Another labeled it "asinine," adding that American schools would now "resemble those in Russia, where the mention of the Supreme Being is not permitted." A third charged that the Court had "dealt a deathblow to the faith of every believer in a Supreme Being." Several hastily authored bills called for a constitutional amendment making religious exercises in public schools permissible.

One religious leader said he was "shocked and frightened," another was "shocked and disappointed." A Roman Catholic newspaper called June 25, 1962, "The Blackest Day" in the Nation's history and compared the Supreme Court judges to enemies who declared war against the United States in 1776, 1917, and 1941.

On the other hand, a prominent religious leader felt that "many Christians will welcome this decision," while many Congressmen and educators also expressed their approval. The independent Protestant journal Christian Century editorialized: "The Supreme Court has rendered a service of the greatest importance to true religion as well as to the integrity of a democratic state."

A PRAYER TO PLEASE EVERYONE

The prayer at the center of the storm and strife reads "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

The New York State Board of Regents, which oversees the schools of the State, composed the prayer in 1961 and recommended its use in public schools. The prayer was suggested as one way of fostering "moral and spiritual values" in the public school. The regents had taken what they thought to be every precaution to see than no child would be forced to say the prayer, and that any child could be excused from the room while the prayer was read or recited. Many Protestant and Catholic leaders hailed it enthusiastically.

Although the regents thought the nondenominational prayer ought not offend, many did find it unacceptable. Jewish groups protested its use. Officers of a Lutheran congregation in New York called the prayer an abomination because the name of Jesus Christ had been omitted.

RULING APPEALED

In 1959 5 parents of 11 children in the public schools of New Hyde Park brought suit in the State courts to stop the use of the prayer on the ground that it violated their beliefs. When the highest court in New York upheld the use of the regents' prayer, the parents appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

On June 25 the Court, in a 6-to-1 decision, reversed the action of the State court, which found nothing unconstitutional in the prayer. Justice Hugo L. Black wrote the majority opinion, four other justices concurring, in which he declared that the regents' prayer "breaches the constitutional wall of separation of church and state." Justice William O. Douglas agreed with the ruling in a separate opinion, in which he suggests that all religious practices for which public funds are expended violate the first amendment of the Constitution.

Only Justice Potter Stewart dissented. "I think this decision is wrong," he stated, because "to deny the wish of these schoolchildren to join in reciting this prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our Nation."

Justice Felix Frankfurter, who was ill, and Justice Byron R. White, who was appointed after the New Hyde Park case was argued before the Court, did not participate in the decision.

NO OFFICIAL PRAYERS

It is evident that many spokesmen responded to the questions of reporters with "off the top of the head" judgments before they had read exactly what the Court had ruled—and had not ruled. Time (July 6) reported that a Georgia clergyman called the decision the most terrible thing that's ever happened to us—then admitted that he did not really know what the decision said.

Unlike other recent Court decisions on questions involving the relationship between religion and public education, which have gone into lengthy philosophical and historical detail, the ruling on the regents' prayer confines itself to one main point: "Each separate government in this country should stay out of the business of writing or sanctioning official prayers."

Focusing on the "establishment clause" of the first amendment: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," the majority opinion holds the regents' prayer to be "inconsistent with both the purposes of the establishment clause and with the establishment clause itself." The Court felt that since the prayer was composed by government officials, it tended to promote an official religion. "This very practice of establishing governmentally

composed prayers for religious services was one of the reasons which caused many of our early colonists to leave England and seek religious freedom in America," the opinion points out.

GUARANTEE OF FIRST AMENDMENT

The first amendment, according to the ruling, is "a guarantee that neither the power nor the prestige of the Federal Government would be used to control, support, or influence the kinds of prayer the American people can say." Government "is without power to prescribe by law any particular form of prayer which is to be used as an official prayer in carrying on any program of governmentally sponsored religious activity," the Court concluded. The provision of the first amendment limiting the power of Congress is made applicable to the individual States by the 14th amendment.

The ruling admits that the regents' prayer is far from an actual "establishment of religion," that is, an officially recognized state church. Although many people see no danger to religious freedom in a prayer so brief and so general, Justice Black voiced agreement with President James Madison's warning that "it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties."

Exactly what does the decision mean? In previous Court rulings in the area of religion and public education, one main principle has been enunciated. The Pierce decision (Oregon, 1925) established the right of parents to send their children to parochial and other nonpublic schools. The Everson decision (New Jersey, 1947) held that transporting parochial school pupils in public school buses does not violate constitutional provisions. The McCollum case (Illinois, 1948) ruled out the use of public school properties for religious instruction. However the Zorach opinion (New Jersey, 1952) declared that released-time religious education programs conducted away from public school facilities are permissible.

SINGLE PRINCIPLE ESTABLISHED

What single principle is established in the Engel decision—as the regents' prayer case will probably be called? Simply this, that any and every unit of government is prohibited from prescribing or sanctioning by law any official prayer or act of worship.

That such a limited application of the ruling is the intention of the Court is evident from Justice Black's footnote to the decision: "There is of course nothing in the decision reached here that is inconsistent with the fact that schoolchildren and others are officially encouraged to express love for our country by reciting historical documents such as the Declaration of Independence which contain references to the Deity, or by singing officially espoused anthems which include the composer's professions of faith in a Supreme Being, or with the fact that there are many manifestations in our public life of belief in God."

The footnote has the effect of assuring the Nation that the Court has no intention of interfering with such religious practices as Senate and House chaplaincies, the ritual call of the marshal at the opening of each session of the Supreme Court ("God save the United States and this honorable Court"), the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance, and "In God We Trust" on currency. Justice Black said that these are "patriotic or ceremonial occasions," bearing "no true resemblance to the unquestioned religious exercise" at issue in the Regents' prayer case.

The Hicksville (N.Y.) school district promptly took the cue by deciding to substitute part of the fourth stanza of "The Star-Spangled Banner" for the banned prayer.

TOWARD A VIEWPOINT ON THE DECISION

At the recent Lutheran Laymen's League convention in Portland, Oreg., Prof. John Strietelmeier of Valparaiso University pointed out that equally dedicated Christians often disagree on the proper course to follow in such moral issues as nuclear testing, Federal aid, etc. Undoubtedly among Lutheran Christians there will be different points of view on the debated Court decision. Several observations may be made, however, to point the directions in which thoughtful Christian citizens may move in evaluating this and other related decisions which, we may be sure, will face the Court in the near future.

1. God has not been barred from the classroom, as some have charged. Dr. Oswald Hoffmann, director of public relations of the Missouri Synod, recently stated that "elimination of God and His law from all teaching in the public schools" does not necessarily follow upon the elimination of officially composed prayers from the public school curriculum. Nor can the Court action be termed "anti-Christian," Dr. Hoffmann added, since the Regents' prayer was "not a distinctively Christian prayer, neither conceived nor offered in the name of Christ."

2. The decision reminds the Nation of the positive meaning of "the doctrine of separation of church and state." Far from fostering a doctrine of "absolute separation" of church and state, the decision emphasizes that church and state must each do its own job with its own tools. Speaking for the Court majority, Justice Black said: "It is neither sacrilegious nor antireligious to say that each separate government in this country should stay out of the business of writing or sanctioning official prayers and leave the purely religious function to the people themselves and to those the people choose to look to for religious guidance."

"Prayer is an act of commitment or faith, [which] cannot be imposed by governmental or community fiat," Dr. Hoffman stressed in this connection.

3. Home and church will have to do their jobs better. Louis Cassels, UPI religion columnist, noted: "The Supreme Court ruling means that Protestant parents must face up to * * * the reality that the average Protestant child is not receiving much religious education."

Nothing really beneficial will result from denouncing the Court or from attempting to push through constitutional amendments permitting religious exercises. Rather, Protestant churches should take constructive steps to provide children with the religiously oriented educational experience which the Court action has ruled out of the public schools. Such steps include making radical improvements in the Sunday school, opening Christian day schools, and broadening released-time, Saturday, and weekday schools through employment of personnel trained in religious education.

4. Lutherans should be acutely sensitive to the rights of religious minorities. The church that hails Martin Luther's lonely stand at Worms, where he declared that "to go against conscience is neither right nor safe," should be extremely hesitant about settling matters of faith and conscience by majority vote.

The New Hyde Park parents who protested that the Regents' prayer was contrary to their religious beliefs and practices were vilified and harassed. That these minorities were Jews or Unitarians makes little difference. In some distant tomorrow Lutherans could be such a minority group.

Protestant Americans must face up to the fact that the United States is not now and never has been "a Protestant country," and that a broad religious pluralism which includes many shades of religion and irreligion characterizes our culture today. Spiritual descendants of Luther should be the first to stand behind constitutional principles which protect the rights and conscience of minorities.

5. Whether or not religious observances, school prayers, and other public ceremonial religious exercises have any significant value is currently a subject for lively debate. Justice Stewart probably expressed the conviction of a majority in the Christian community when he wrote in his dissenting opinion that prayers in school, the words "In God We Trust" on our currency, and other religious symbols are meaningful reminders of "highly cherished spiritual traditions of our Nation." In the elimination of all religious symbols some see a surrender of the public school to total secularism and implicit atheism. On the other hand, many would agree with Sterling M. McMurrin, U.S. Commissioner of Education, who holds that "prayer that is essentially a classroom function has not much religious value." He would probably be ready to add there is only slight educational value in such prayers.

Others see an actual threat to genuine religious commitment in these practices and charge that "public school religion is neither Christianity nor Judaism, but something less than either." Public school religious practices, some church leaders point out, are so general and ambiguous that they water down rather than reinforce genuine Christian faith.

6. An evident need exists to explore acceptable ways for public expression of what Time calls "the unique American proposition—that of a government of freedom under God." Such demonstrations of our spiritual heritage should emphasize the voluntary character of religious expression and should be dissociated from governmental sponsorship as much as possible. The amazingly successful Kirchentag movement in Germany, where hundreds of thousands of Christians gather for large-scale religious programs, might be tried in the United States. All churches, for example, could observe national days of prayer before major elections and during significant national events. Other creative suggestions as to how the "unique proposition" can be kept alive and nutured are very much in order.

No external, contrived religious expressions, however, will provide a substitute for a dedicated, witnessing, and serving Christian community. Here one must reckon with the very real possibility, as St. Peter visualizes it, that judgment may already be beginning in the house of God (1 Peter 4: 17). If the salt has lost its "saltiness" and Christianity is weak and ineffectual, then neither acts of Congress nor constitutional amendments nor token religious exercises can keep the United States from being "godless." Such a fate would be the judgment of God on both the church and the state.

7. Christians must work more diligently on the local level to resolve community tensions over religion in the public schools. Often in the past minorities have resorted to the courts only after efforts to work out the problem on the local level have failed.

MORE STORM AND FURY AHEAD

The 1960's will witness further clarification of the "establishment of religion" and "free exercise thereof" clauses of the first amendment, particularly as they pertain to the role of religion in public education. Issues on which Supreme Court rulings can be expected in the near future are Bible reading in schools, free textbooks for parochial school children, Christmas and other religious holiday observances, informal prayers in school (such as grace at meals), baccalaureate services, religious censuses, religious tests for teachers and others. A case that will bear particular watching is one arising from practices of Dade County, Fla., schools, where nine distinct religious practices are being challenged. Other cases have gone through State courts in Pennsylvania (Bible reading) and Oregon (free textbooks).

The decision on the regents' prayer, it would seem, will have bearing only on those exercises which are prescribed by Government; for example, Bible reading. Statutes which call for compulsory daily Bible reading will very likely be declared unconstitutional. If the free-textbook decision comes before the Court, it would appear unlikely that a ruling of the Oregon Supreme Court declaring this practice unconstitutional will be reversed.

Speculation as to the outcome of other issues aside, periodic flurries of storm and fury will accompany each new Supreme Court decision that touches on the controversial religion-in-public-education question. Time (July 6) expresses a reasonable point of view which God-fearing Americans may well adopt: "The United States evolved * * * as a country with 'a godly tradition.' Unless emotions released by the (regents' prayer) decision are strangely perverted, the country will stay that way."

Past tradition, let it be remembered, however, is no guarantee of future faith. Laws, school practices, courts, and even constitutional amendments cannot assure that the Nation's "godly tradition" will be carried on. Whether or not the United States will continue under the "unique American proposition—that of a government of freedom under God"—will remain, under God, with the Nation's churches and Christian homes.

The Escape Clause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, as the other body continues consideration of the foreign trade bill which is H.R. 11970, certain of the membership of the House who voted for that bill have been defending their vote on the basis that the foreign trade bill, as it passed the House, was an improvement over the existing trade laws that are now in effect. Nothing could be further from the truth and any Member of the Congress who defends his vote with this excuse is absolutely misleading the people of his district who work in industries that will, without question, be adversely affected by the foreign trade bill. For instance, it has been suggested that an individual Member of this House voted for the foreign trade bill because it strengthened the escape clause provisions of the law. Nothing could be further from the truth. This is what happened to the escape clause.

The escape clause has had its teeth drawn. Under the old act, the one being replaced by the present foreign trade bill provided that if employment had declined, if output had dropped and if the domestic industry was losing in its share of the market, all these trends were to be considered by the Tariff Commission as evidence of serious injury.

The proposed bill has dropped these yardsticks completely. The escape clause has been weakened seriously as a result.

Also, previously if a part of an industry, such as the flat glass branch of the whole glass industry was injured the tariff on that product could be raised, as it was on flat glass. It was not necessary to prove injury to the whole glass industry.

Under the present bill the definition of industry would be greatly broadened and it would be much more difficult to get relief under the escape clause.

Altogether the value of the escape clause would be virtually destroyed. This is the opinion of leading tariff experts who have had long experience with the escape clause.

So far as the bill as passed by the House is concerned, it would also be more difficult and not easier to override the President if he rejects a Tariff Commission recommendation.

Under the old law, it is true, it required a two-thirds vote of the Congress to override the President, but it was two-thirds of those present and voting.

Under the new bill it would require a constitutional majority of the House membership or a minimum of 218 votes. This might be more difficult to achieve than a two-thirds majority of those present and voting.

Also, under the old law, the motion to override the President was highly privileged. It did not have to go through committee hearings and could not be bottled up. Under the new bill such a motion would have to come through the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee and could easily be bottled up. There would be no way to assure even a hearing. This would make the overriding of the President a most unlikely possibility.

The upshot is that the escape clause would become a dead letter.

Mr. Speaker, any Representative who would defend his vote on the foreign trade bill in this manner is weak indeed. This certainly should lead everyone to the conclusion that that Member of Congress did not take time to personally acquaint himself with the provisions of the bill or that his vote was dictated to him by someone else and he blindly refused to vote in the interest of the working man and woman of his State.

Great Polish-American Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a remarkably well-written letter to the editor of the New York Times by my valued friend, authority on Polish affairs and outstanding Polish-American leader, Mr. K. Stefan Pomierski.

This learned expert on the plight of free peoples enslaved by the Soviet under so-called World War II diplomatic agreements, has keen, well-informed awareness of the very challenging situation confronting the free world as the result of the continued subjugation of Soviet satellites who were once respected, loyal members of the free world community and yearn for their renewed freedom.

Mr. Pomierski has labored tirelessly and intelligently for many years in support of the Polish cause, and for liberation for the distressed Polish nation and other oppressed nations. He has repeatedly, vigorously and ably set forth a sound program for liberation of the pitiful victims of oppression, and it is to be hoped that this Nation and the free world will act resolutely to press such a program in the interests of freedom and justice for those noble souls suffering under abysmal, Communist tyranny.

This is a crucial hour in the disordered affairs of mankind. It is an hour which will test the staying power, the determination and courage of free peoples, and especially of this great Nation born in freedom. It is an hour that will determine the future course of free government and the fate of personal liberty in the world. We will be resolute now, or forever hold our peace, for if we stand by, unprotesting and weak, while Marxist communism overruns the world, in a relatively short time, there will be little, if anything, left of Western civilization as such, and the lamps of freedom, decency, democracy, and justice will be extinguished all over the world.

Let us, therefore, heed this timely message and bring some impelling courage, as well as vigor and intelligent, firm action, to bear upon the great problems of liberation and freedom. That is the very least we can do in the name of those who throughout the centuries, have bled and died bravely and without fear, in order that man may be free of shackles and live in peace, brotherhood, and freedom.

I congratulate our esteemed, patriotic friend, Mr. Pomierski, upon his heart-moving message:

AUGUST 20, 1962.
EDITOR, THE NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR EDITOR: September 1 will mark the 23d anniversary of the outbreak of World War II. The Polish Nation bore the brunt of Hitler's powerful armies and after 19 days of heroic resistance was treacherously stabbed in the back by the armies of Red Russia.

More than 8 million of Poland's people gave their lives in World War II.

The Poles were the first nation to resist aggression, and in spite of warm words of praise and sacred pledges of freedom from responsible allied leaders, Poland was the first European nation to be sacrificed on the altar of appeasement at Yalta in 1945, when she was shamefully turned over to godless communism. Ever since that time, a chilly wind begun to blow in all parts of the world, and we are living in a state of a cold war as a result of our appeasing policy at Yalta. Communism is today in control of almost half of humanity and is continuing to advance in all parts of the globe, including our own hemisphere.

On this 23d anniversary of the outbreak of World War II, let us be mindful of the historical fact that two bitter enemies, France and Germany, have not so long ago entered into a deal with each other in regards to their permanent frontier and for the purpose of jointly opposing communism, the greatest menace to mankind. And on

this anniversary of the brutal attack upon Poland by the Nazis, a strong request should be made by the Governments of the United States, France, and Great Britain addressed to the Government of West Germany toward a rapprochement between the Poles and the Germans by an official recognition on the part of the Bonn Government of the present Oder-Neisse border and by asking the Polish people to forget and gradually forgive the brutal crimes committed by the Nazis.

If we shall be able to achieve such a Polish-West German understanding, underwritten by the Western Allies, it will be a great victory for all God-fearing people in this cold war, and it will bring hope and encouragement to millions of enslaved people.

At the same time, let us rededicate ourselves to the faith that says that only firmness in our dealings with the Communists, preparedness, unity and constant alertness as well as religion and prayers in our houses of worship, in our homes and in our schools are the greatest weapons in our fight against the evil forces of godless communism, which is menacing our own freedom and our great American values.

Faithfully yours,

K. STEFAN POMIERSKI.

Retraining: Massachusetts Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Journal of Commerce in its August 29 issue gave an interesting report in editorial form on a retraining activity in Massachusetts which predates the enactment of Federal legislation to assist in this field. The experience of this program is encouraging and it is to be hoped that with sound planning a return in similar success can cap the Federal efforts. I am placing this editorial in the RECORD to help show the possibilities in retraining as an answer to some of our most critical employment problems:

RETRAINING THE JOBLESS

Far more encouraging as a contribution toward possible solution of some of our unemployment problems than outworn spend-and-spend idea is an arresting first installment of a Massachusetts report on job retraining. It is a survey undertaken jointly by that State's division of employment security and the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and has been issued by the bank.

Retraining of jobless persons soon will be vastly increased by the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, but the whole idea is relatively new and up to now little tried. However, two New England States, Massachusetts and Connecticut, have pioneered in retraining, and their pilot projects anticipated by several years the first Federal plan under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961.

A redevelopment area by definition does not have a normal demand for labor.

The Massachusetts survey is of special interest in connection with technological unemployment, both as respects jobless whose skills no longer are needed and those whose services are required only intermittently. Many of the State's retrainees were those who lived precariously from one layoff to another.

The retraining survey covered 900 persons, 300 of whom had completed their first year in new jobs won through their training. In this first year they increased their annual incomes by 35 percent, some by much more.

They averaged 7 workweeks longer employment, which in part accounted for their higher income. In comparison, a similar group of unemployed who had landed jobs without retraining averaged 10 percent more annual income.

The Bay State's unemployment compensation benefit law, beginning with 1956, provided that anyone out of work taking a vocational training course could be considered "available for work" and therefore eligible to receive benefits, with an 18-week extension of benefits if this was necessary to complete the training.

The unemployed selected their courses, paid the tuition, if any, subject to approval by the appropriate State agency. In Massachusetts it is possible to quit a job to take training, after serving out a 10-week "disqualification period." Some of these persons' records were studied, too.

This "voluntary quit" group, interestingly enough, did better than a "control group" who had not had retraining benefits, but not quite as well as those who lost jobs through "involuntary separation." Maybe the voluntary quits were more ambitious.

The Boston Reserve Bank notes that 77 percent of New England trainees under the Area Redevelopment Act have been placed in jobs, related to the training, with another 5 percent in other jobs, some outside the redevelopment area.

Any plan that accomplishes 82 percent of its objectives normally is considered successful both for the individuals affected and their sponsors. So far, of course, the statistics are not sufficiently comprehensive and cannot yet be.

Incidentally, a crying need is for more exact figures on this technological or "structural" unemployment attributed to automation and what percentage of all unemployment it is, for this segment of the jobless can be aided more efficiently and at less total expense than is involved in new and more grandiose "make work" plans of the pump priming variety.

We would think that trade unions could help materially in plans to gather more useful statistics.

The unemployed are not going to be permanently aided and their problem, which is a national problem, is not going to be solved without intelligent study, of which the latest report from New England on retraining is an example.

Tax reform is going to help, but promiscuous and temporary tax cutting isn't. Nor is there anything more than temporary aid to the jobless in huge "planned deficits" which create inflationary booms that are followed by busts which make unemployment worse.

Statement of George J. Burger in Opposition to H.R. 10518, Which Would Eliminate Set-Asides of Construction Contracts for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement of Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, before Subcommittee No. 2 of the Banking and Currency Committee on September 6, 1962.

Mr. Burger—speaking on behalf of 181,078 members of his organization—opposed the ending of set-asides in the construction industry. There is no question in my mind that if this bill is enacted it will be a serious blow to a program which has provided equal opportunity to small business in the competition for Government contracts.

Mr. Burger's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

I am George J. Burger, vice president and in charge of legislative activities through the Washington office of the National Federation of Independent Business. Our head office is located in San Mateo, Calif., and division offices located in Cincinnati, Ohio, Chicago, Ill., and New York City.

Our membership in the 50 States now totals 181,078, all individual members comprised of independent business in the production and distribution field, and also professional men.

While we have not polled our members directly on the specific bill before your committee, we are committed by membership vote to support all programs which will secure for all smaller, independent businesses a fair chance to compete for Government contracts.

This was one of the reasons why our members committed us to work for the creation of the Small Business Administration in 1953, to steps which strengthened it in the years following, and to the moves made in 1958 which resulted in securing permanent status for the agency.

Since 1953 we have made it our business to maintain an active, not academic, interest in the agency's functioning. Executives of the federation have made regular personal visits with the agency's national headquarters and with its regional and branch offices. Our last visits were made in the fall of 1961. Our inquiries have covered the entire range of the agency's services, including the functioning of its set-aside programs. For that reason, when we speak with you on this phase of the agency's program we do so on the basis of firsthand knowledge.

Our observation is that in line with the duties and authority vested in it by the Congress, and consistent with the responsibility placed on it to render services only to smaller, independent business units, the Small Business Administration has performed an effective job. This holds true on the set-aside program as well as in all other phases of its work.

We would add that, based on firsthand knowledge derived from our own contracts with smaller, independent business people, and from the reading of the countless hearings by committees of the Congress, it has been doing a most necessary service for the small business people of this country if they are to have the opportunities they vitally need, not only in the field of Government contracts but also in all other areas covered by the agency.

Now, we know that the agency has been criticized and is under constant fire. On the one hand, there is a tendency among the smaller independents to say it is too liberal in aiding what they consider as "big" independents. On the other, the larger independents have complained that the cutoff points in its regulations are too restrictive. Just recently, one of our members wrote in to complain that since he had suc-

cessfully competed for sizable subcontracts with a truly large Government prime contractor his volume had grown to a point where he could not benefit by the set-aside program. Quite naturally he resented the fact. However, it occurred to us that if the agency is to be charged with assisting smaller independents, then it must limit assistance to such firms. If this latter be not true, then the agency must become a general help agency. But the Congress has not so created and charged it. For our part, our members have not supported it on such a basis.

We are not arguing here in favor of the status quo in set-aside size limits in the construction contracting or any other fields. Wisely these limits are always open to revision, upward as well as downward, as conditions require. Possibly revisions are in order for greater fairness and more reality in the contract construction field. We understand that proposals are under consideration by the SBA right now to raise the size limits from $5 million volume in 3 years to $7.5 million in 3 years. We hope that the construction contractor associations will counsel with and advise the agency in that connection, for the true welfare of all in their fields, smaller independent contractors as well as the larger independent units. If any changes are needed in the Small Business Administration handling of set-asides for the construction contractor industry we hope they will be suggested.

While we are wholeheartedly in favor of reasonable revision of size standards, and while we cannot take and do not take a position directly on the bills before your committee, we are concerned about their implications which clearly seem to point in the direction of a step by step, but finally complete, breakdown of the set-aside system. Exempt that industry, and precedent is set for exempting all others. In this sense, the bills directly affect not only those in the construction contract industry but also those in the electronics field, the precision industries, the clothing field, in fact, the entire range of industries in which smaller independents have the desire and capability of supplying the needs of government. This must not be overlooked by anyone, especially those of the Congress who are members of this subcommittee.

Frankly, we are convinced that it would be a sorry day for small, independent business people, who are the backbone of our economy and whose continued existence and fair opportunities are so vitally important to the maintenance of our individual liberties, should the Congress consent to any move which would deprive them of any necessary assistance such as is afforded in the set-aside program.

It is our earnest hope that the members of this subcommittee will give long and serious consideration to these facts before reaching decisions on the bill now before you.

Comments About Tax Reduction Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has indicated that in January of next year he will submit to Congress an extensive series of administration recommendations for tax reduction and tax reform.

We all realize that there is considerable difference among our economists about the interrelationship of tax reductions, deficit financing, and increased public spending.

The President has given all of us an opportunity to make preparation for the great debate on this subject next year and with this in mind I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following comments which I consider to be extremely valuable and thought provoking:

[From the National Observer]

ILLUSIONS ABOUT TAXES

There's a good deal of disagreement over who should get the biggest cuts. Labor spokesmen argue the emphasis should be on the lower and middle-income brackets. Business leaders stress the higher income brackets. Businessmen naturally want a cut in the corporate tax rate, too. But despite the obvious squeeze on profits, many labor leaders contend companies have plenty of money ready.

* * * * *

Despite all the dissension, there is broad agreement on the theory behind the tax-cut proposals. If Uncle Sam only takes less in taxes, the reasoning goes, consumers will spend more on autos, appliances and other goods, and businessmen will spend more on capital equipment. If all this comes to pass, the economy will start spiraling upward and fears of a business recession will vanish.

This theory rests on the assumption that additional demand can be created at any time by Government action. Administration economists have been enviously eyeing the swift pace of consumer spending in Western Europe. This demand is pressing against the productive capacity of Europe's factories, keeping its boom spinning.

But Europe-United States comparisons are illusory. There is no assurance at all that the United States by twisting the dials of its tax machinery, could set off a Europe-style boom. For Europe is now at a stage somewhat similar to the United States in the 1920's, with automobiles and many other consumer goods only now beginning to come into common use. America has no comparable backlog of demand to draw on. And there is no reason to think that consumers are going to rush out and buy a lot of things they neither need nor want.

Many people would use the tax-cut cash to pay Junior's college bills or settle up old accounts with the doctor or the dentist. But these are not the things that put more men to work in factories. Many other people probably would salt away much of the extra cash. In fact, the feverish taxcutting atmosphere in Washington these days could frighten people into a real rush to savings.

Taken by itself, this would be no calamity though it's hardly what the planners have in mind. More savings are needed, for savings supply the funds to build new factories, expand old ones—in short, they finance the economic growth the administration is so urgently seeking.

The real danger is the idea that the Government, already spending far more than its taking in, should cut its income by reducing taxes but should go on spending just as freely as ever. Even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is urging Uncle Sam to live it up.

Tax-cut advocates argue that reductions in Federal levies would fuel a boom that would send revenues soaring. But this, they admit, would be true only if the tax cuts touch off the great upsurge in demand that they hope for.

* * * * *

If prices rise on the things our factories produce, businessmen will find it increasingly difficult to sell goods abroad—and foreign companies may find our markets even more tempting. America's dollar would fall still lower in world esteem and our gold would continue to flow into foreign coffers. It is simply not so that a nation can go on forever running deficits at home and abroad and forever inflating its money without dangerous consequences.

Though it's hard to predict the precise results of tax cuts, it's certain the only responsible way to grant them is to tie them to a sharp cut in Federal spending. To argue otherwise is to foster an illusion that could blow up in our faces.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

FOR A TAX CUT NOW

In recent years our rate of economic growth has been declining and at this time the economy is listlessly balanced on a high plateau. A stimulus is required to restore a healthy and vigorous rate of growth, and there is a remarkable unanimity of opinion among businessmen, labor leaders, and economists that the best stimulus available is a tax cut.

The compelling argument for a tax cut rests upon sound principles of economic analysis.

If personal income taxes are cut while the current level of Government expenditure is maintained, the economy will be stimulated by the ensuing increase in the total expenditures for goods and services. It is important to bear in mind that the effects of a tax cut will be multiplied by successive rounds of expenditures so that a $1 tax reduction will, after about 6 months, result in a $2.50 increase in expenditures. In addition to this multiplier effect on the consumption side, there will be a powerful but not readily calculable stimulus to investment as the rising volume of sales presses upon productive capacity.

A token tax cut will not sufficiently stimulate the $550 billion American economy. What is required is a substantial reduction. The tax rates for all income brackets except the highest one should be reduced by 5 percentage points to increase after-tax income by $10 billion. The nearly confiscatory 91-percent rate for the highest bracket should be reduced to 65 percent, thus reducing tax revenues by an additional $650 million. This reduction for the highest income bracket, which has long been recommended by proponents of tax reform, will increase investment and diminish the efforts to establish tax shelters. In addition to the reduction in personal income taxes an across-the-board reduction in corporate income taxes by 2 percentage points would add $1 billion to business income which would be useful in financing the anticipated rise in the volume of investment.

In total these tax cuts would result in an $11.6 billion loss in Treasury revenues, but the personal-income tax reduction alone will increase the volume of total expenditures by $26.5 billion and the dynamic effects of these increases upon the volume of investment should add much more to the gross national product. Thus the fiscal deficit that is incurred will be sharply reduced as a rising level of economic activity generates greater tax revenues.

* * * * *

On countless occasions during the campaign of 1960 President Kennedy reiterated the necessity for "getting America moving again." The time has come for injecting new vigor into the economy. The admin-

istration should advocate, with all the force that it can muster, an immediate tax cut.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

BEYOND A TAX CUT

(By George H. Favre)

Most economists agree that a basic fact behind the sluggishness of the U.S. economy is simply a lack of demand for goods, especially of the high-priced hard-good variety. Having satiated in large part its need for refrigerators, washing machines, etc., after the war, the buying public's demand for these items is back to more normal levels.

Tied to this is the fact that many sectors of industry, geared up to the heavy postwar demand, now find themselves with idle productive capacity as demand diminishes.

In the face of these two factors, it may be reasoned that a 3-percent tax cut is not likely to spur most individuals into heavy new spending. Nor is it likley to cause manufacturers to rush to invest in new equipment.

When tax cuts are put into context with overall tax reform on a permanent basis, they may be expected to accomplish more. This doubtless is why President Kennedy is holding off on a decision about immediate tax cuts. As a matter of overall reform, tax cuts that take into consideration the long-run impact on corporate profitability, on individual incentive to increase earning power, and similar long-range factors will be all to the good.

But on whatever basis tax cuts may be made, they raise the specter of budget deficits, at least in the short run.

* * * * *

Some economists argue that just by cutting taxes and letting all that money flow through the economy business will pick up naturally and the resultant higher profits and higher pay checks will repay the Treasury with interest.

This argument is tenable under conditions where there is demand for goods but insufficient money. But today demand seems to be apathetic even though there is plenty of money. Personal income is at an all-time high. So is personal saving, although in the first quarter of 1962 the saving rate dropped slightly while spending increased.

* * * * *

Whatever the reasoning, all would doubtless agree that a tax cut today will involve a deficit in the budget. The justification for this deficit is the premise that money released by a tax cut must find it way into those sluggish gears in the economy that most need this fiscal lubricant. Only then will it have the desired effect.

For some time now economists have been arguing that if more of the gross national product (GNP) were devoted to the public rather than the private sector, this would help speed up economic growth. This presumes Government spending or "public works."

But tax cuts, as such, tend to divert money into the private rather than the public sector.

* * * * *

Dr. Böhler says that "tax cuts through larger writeoffs or lower income taxes would help business, but they would hardly bring rapid growth as long as there is considerable surplus capacity."

Rather than build Federal deficits in this manner, Dr. Böhler feels the United States should be concentrating on improving education, research, housing, transportation, building schools and hospitals, and so forth. It is in these areas, says the world-famed expert on business cycles, that the most beneficial expansion would take place.

Interestingly, some of the same economists who advocate a tax cut now are those who would argue for a redistribution of the gross national product, with greater emphasis on the public sector. The two are not necessarily incompatible, but it should be clear that once tax cuts (hopefully) have done their work and stoked up the economic engine, there will be fresh demands upon the Government to redistribute these gains from private to the public sector.

* * * * *

Many economists—including the President's Council of Economic Advisers—are convinced that the economy is in a state of sluggishness, that unless tax cuts are made promptly and meaningfully, the economy will falter and slip into a recession, or worse.

These fears reflect the fact that despite continuing advances in the major economic indicators, under the surface there are signs that the economy is sputtering. Also contributing to the uneasiness of many economists has been the agitated state of the stock market of late, which some interpret as a signpost of things to come.

On the other side, opponents of an immediate tax cut—of whom Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, is the outspoken leader—insist that a tax cut now would be fiscally irresponsible.

* * * * *

Senator BYRD cited the current $308 billion debt level as one major argument against tax cuts now. To cut taxes at a time when the Government is already running heavy deficits, he asserted, would stimulate inflation and encourage fiscal irresponsibility.

Were it possible to confine the debate to the question of simply a temporary tax cut that would stimulate the economy into a new superboom, it would not be so difficult. For one thing, any inflationary impetus of such a move would tend to be countered by the fact that consumer goods are in plentiful supply.

More money jingling in the pockets of the American consumer, it could be reasonably argued, would find its way quickly into the cash registers of automobile dealers, furniture and appliance salesmen, home construction and repair firms, and so forth.

But there are larger considerations. Not the least of these is the impact of a tax cut on the psychological value of the dollar overseas.

The dizzy descent of the stock market in recent weeks, and its subsequent queasiness has been felt in stock exchanges around the world. As a result a renewed lack of confidence in the dollar is being felt, signaled by freshened interest in the London market in gold bullion, as well as in diamonds and gold mine stock at home and abroad.

In these ways does world opinion telegraph its punches when it is about to take flight from the dollar.

In recent transatlantic debate over the dollar's stability it has been argued that the European central bankers—who currently hold claims against the United States sufficient to more than wipe out this country's entire gold reserves—are less concerned about a manageable Federal budget deficit then they are about the country's balance of payments and inflation.

It is this larger question of the dollar's integrity which dampens enthusiasm for any sudden tax cut. Any more that has even the appearance of undermining the stability of the dollar is bound to have serious repercussions.

The very fact that European central banks hold the huge pools of dollar assets that they do is one very stern moral reason why the dollar's integrity must not be jeopardized.

To deliberately take any step that might further weaken the dollar would ultimately weaken confidence in even the strongest European currencies as well, for the dollar is kingpin of the whole Western monetary system.

FOR A TAX CUT NOW

(By Walter Lippmann)

Since the Wall Street crash at the end of May there has been a sharp and rapid change of responsible and expert opinion. The crash alerted those who watched the economy, causing them to ask whether the Kennedy recovery of 1961 was going to peter out before it went much further. There had been a very few who had predicted this last January when the administration, using what had proved to be erroneously optimistic estimates, adopted a restrictive and deflationary fiscal policy.

The unfounded optimism ended a few days after the crash. The business reports which have come in during June and the first half of July show that with a few exceptions, automobile sales and residential construction, the recovery is sluggish and is slowing down. Employment and industrial activity, profits, inventory replacement and capital investment are so sluggish that the recovery appears to be nearing its end. It would seem that by the onset of winter there will be a recession.

Professor Samuelson says that the peak of total profits was in fact reached at the end of last year and that the rate of unemployment, which has never gone below 5.4 percent, will from now on be rising.

We are not, let us repeat, as yet in a recession. But, we are on the verge of one. This is the critically important time for the Government to act in order to stimulate the expansion of economic activity. The longer it waits, the stronger will the medicine have to be. It has already waited 6 months too long, and so it will need to use stronger medicine today than it would have needed last January. If it waits until the recession has actually begun, the chances are that the comparatively agreeable medicine of a tax cut will not be enough, and will need to be supplemented by more Government spending.

* * * * *

In 1957, when the coming of the third Eisenhower recession was indicated, President Eisenhower was, so I understand, advised to reduce taxes. He refused, not only because he did not want to enlarge the deficit, but because he was afraid that to talk about preventing a recession would bring it on. So, the President waited. The result was an enormous budgetary deficit, the largest in time of peace, a painful recession, and, we may add, a mighty contribution to the Republican defeat in the election of 1960.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

TAX-CUT FEVER: MOST ECONOMISTS FAVOR REDUCTION, SPLIT ON TECHNIQUE

(By Arlen J. Large)

The uncomplicated appeal of money will certainly fuel much public support for the proposed Federal tax cuts.

* * * * *

Economists still differ, of course, on whose taxes should be cut most and on the significance of the resulting budget deficits. But there is now a remarkable consensus among economic soothsayers on the main point: Uncle Sam's tax burden is throttling economic growth and should be lightened.

* * * * *

It's the investment lag on which most of the tax cut theories now converge, though some of the paths are meandering. Depending on the theorist, it's reasoned that a tax cut will (a) make ordinary consumers so rich that they'll buy more goods, luring company presidents into building and modernizing factories to produce the extra merchandise, or (b) let individuals and companies have more of their money for investment in new factories, which will create more jobs and make wage-earning

consumers rich enough to buy the extra merchandise.

These twin circles of argument lead to the same essential: a reduced Federal tax burden on the economy. But because the two theories disagree on whether wealth trickles up or down, they permit continued side arguments among theoreticians over which taxpayers should get the most relief.

Thus organized labor contends that when tax cuts are passed around, business and rich people should be left out. "Tax cuts for the low and middle income groups," declared AFL–CIO President George Meany last week, "find their way into the spending stream, while tax cuts for upper income recipients usually move into savings." Reduction of the 52-percent corporate tax rate, he added, would be "very unwise" because companies already have plenty of funds for new investment.

Organized business groups base their own arguments for tax reduction on just the opposite line of technical reasoning. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce declares that people in the 60-percent-plus tax brackets want to invest wealth productively, but that they have little left after Uncle Sam takes his share.

* * * * *

Some tax-cut advocates refuse to enter this hoary trickle-up-versus-trickle-down debate, but urge an even-handed distribution of relief.

The Kennedy administration also tries to avoid taking sides, stressing the need to encourage both consumer demand and business incentives for "productive investment." Thus, its tax program is a mixed ideological stew of bigger depreciation allowances, cuts in both high and low individual tax brackets, and a probably small reduction in the corporate rate.

Economists who join the parade of tax-cut advocates have found various technical ways of making their peace with the nagging question of deeper budget deficits. Some boosters of an immediate cut argue the economy would revive so much that when lower tax rates were applied to larger incomes the Government would actually lose little revenue. Another school of theorists contends there would be a deficit, but that it wouldn't be inflationary as long as there's high unemployment and the money supply swells no faster than the economy as a whole.

Of course, the tax-cut army also contains economists who openly contend a budget deficit is positively desirable in today's circumstances. Laced heavily with the doctrines of John Maynard Keynes, the late British economist whose name still sends everyone running for the ideological trenches, their argument runs thus: There has been a basic change in the postwar economy. Consumers aren't so eager as before to go into debt; businessmen have plenty of capacity in existing factories and little incentive to borrow expansion funds. This leaves too much money lying around in savings compared with the demand for borrowed money. A Federal deficit is the way to channel the savings surfeit into more productive debt.

SPENDING CUTS URGED

Still other economists agree with one or the other of the theories supporting a tax cut but are unable to swallow the resulting deficits. Raymond J. Saulnier, the Eisenhower administration's chief economist in its closing years, thinks it would indeed be "enormously helpful" to reduce the total tax load, but he argues it must be accompanied by an attack on lofty Federal spending. "Neither our domestic nor our international affairs will permit us to go for very long on a spree of higher spending, lower taxes, and bigger deficits," Dr. Saulnier declared in a speech last week.

Except for deficit-worriers, though, outright opponents of a tax cut are rare. John Kenneth Galbraith, an economist who advocates channeling more resources into the public sector, divorced himself from Washington's tax-cut talk during a recent trip home from his ambassadorial post in India.

Professor Demos of Harvard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent article by the able reporter for the Boston Globe, Mr. H. Kenny, regarding the career and retirement of the distinguished Prof. Raphael Demos who, for many years, has been an outstanding professor of philosophy at Harvard University.

Professor Demos is a great man. Born in Smyrna, Asia Minor, under the Turkish flag, he worked his way up from humble beginnings to one of the highest posts in American academic life.

Noted scholar and author, known throughout the world for his brilliant intellect, significant writings, and great talents as a lecturer and teacher, Professor Demos has made a very deep imprint upon the times, and particularly upon our educational and intellectual affairs.

Of proud Greek blood, he has always exemplified the finest, most exalted traditions of the noble people from whom he is sprung. Not only a great professor, but a great human being, warmhearted, understanding, and interested in people, particularly the boys who came under his gifted tutelage, Professor Demos has left a very deep impression upon the intellectual life of Harvard University as well as upon the world of scholarship and the students who were fortunate enough to study under him.

His retirement at this time will be regretted by his colleagues of the faculty and the student body. But it has its compensations in that Professor Demos, whose work continues with vigor and intellectual fruitfulness, will now have more time for his own studies, writings, travel, and relaxation that he has denied himself for many years. But perhaps it is a pious hope that this dynamic intellect could ever be relaxed. Chances are that, if anything, he will intensify his work.

In any event, generations of Harvard men as well as the university itself and the world of abstract thinking are greatly indebted to this intellectual genius for his unselfish contributions and untiring labors. His former students and a host of others will want to wish for him and his beloved family at this time, as we congratulate him heartily upon his most constructive career at Harvard, continued good health, success in all his undertakings, and peace of mind and true happiness for many years to come.

Professor Demos will always symbolize for us the innate nobility of a great and memorable philosopher king, radiating reason, hope, and compassion in a world that desperately needs the generous measure of his fellowship of the human spirit.

The article follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Aug. 19, 1962]

HARVARD'S DEMOS TO LEAVE ATHENS OF THE EAST FOR ATHENS OF SOUTH FOR ATHENS PHILOSOPHER TAKES RETIREMENT PHILOSOPHICALLY

(By Herbert A. Kenny)

Question. How does a philosopher accept retirement?

Answer. Philosophically.

So it proves in the case of Raphel Demos, since 1945 Alford professor of philosophy at Harvard University, who will retire this fall. He has taught at Harvard since 1916.

All philosophical questions are complex and so is the matter of retirement. First of all, Professor Demos is presently teaching at the Harvard-Radcliffe summer school and in the fall will go to Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tenn., for a year.

"From the Athens of the East to the Athens of the South," he said with a smile.

"And then?"

"To Athens."

The fountainhead of Western philosophical traditions.

But it is not its ancient tradition of philosophy alone that will take him there. His brother, Stephen, is dean of a school; his sister, a librarian. Five years ago on a trip there, his wife and children fell in love with the country.

He was born in Smyrna in Asia Minor under the Turkish flag. As Raphael Demetracopoulos he became "a poor student at the poorest of colleges, Anatolia."

"We washed at the village fountain. It was very primitive. Even the Christian women covered their faces with a veil. But the students, ah—they all had the fire of learning."

There he read his first book on philosophy and his future was destined. His face darkens with an old grief when he recalls that the teachers at the college were massacred by the Turks in the Greco-Turkish conflict following World War I. His philosophy professor was hanged.

By that time, he was teaching at Harvard he had earned his Ph. D. To earn his keep, he had washed dishes in a boarding house—"I was no good at washing dishes"—and swept out the offices of the Harvard Lampoon—"I was shocked by all the empty beer bottles."

He shortened his name to Demos which was already in his family tree, and went to Cambridge University and Paris for further study. In 1921 he became an American citizen conscious of a great debt.

"I remember, from the first moment I arrived, the friendliness of America and its people. I cannot emphasize that enough.

"Nowhere else could my life have happened. Even when I went to Cambridge University 10 years later there was no one there earning his way.

"There was no thought there of anyone washing dishes and doing chores to pay his way through as I did at Harvard. The chores paid my way; later I taught English to immigrants at night school.

"Those were happy years. At Harvard I found the utmost kindness, the utmost

friendliness. Ralph Barton Perry was chairman of the philosophy department, and I can remember our first meeting.

"'Any Greek,' he said, 'is welcome to my home.'

"And besides the friendliness—the stimulation. Bertrand Russell came to teach. He was like a bomb; he exploded and excited us so. T. S. Eliot was a year ahead of me and president of the Philosophy Club.

"When I went to London on a fellowship later, Russell received me very warmly and took me to musical shows. Eliot gave me his first book of poems. I looked at it and couldn't make anything of it so I threw it away.

"'You'd have made money by keeping it,' he told me later when I confessed. Since then, of course, I have come to appreciate his poetry."

In the post of Alford professor, he succeeded such distinguished figures as Josiah Royce and William Ernest Hocking.

Professor Demos describes himself as a Christian Platonist. He has edited the complete works of Plato and has written his own study of him.

"Although America has no major philosophical figures today like William James," Professor Demos said, "I think her role in the field of philosophy has risen remarkably. When I was in Greece, I had one small fault with them.

"Why do you all go to Germany for philosophic study?" They still do, you know. Although that is changing, too. The German occupation in World War II had something to do with the change, of course. But the intellectual ferment in the United States has much to do with it. We are now in a position to give back to Europe what it gave us for many years.

"The United States, like Harvard, is not dominated by any one philosophical tradition. In England, linguistic analysis is supreme, but it is an ivory tower philosophy; while on the Continent, the existentialists dominate. They differ from the linguistic analysis school by their insistence on engagement in society, with the problems of life and death.

"But the United States has a more diverse ferment. And it needs the philosophic attitude badly. It has accomplished so much; for all major intents and purposes, it has abolished poverty. Now it is facing up to the problem of world peace. This is not so easy. Previously, America solved its problems by tackling them head on. Now they must not expect ready answers and quick solutions.

"We have produced all the material goods we need. We cannot produce the good life so easily. It requires time. That is a growth more than a goal. It must come from within. Peace takes time. We are learning the tragic aspects of greatness. And this struggle for peace may never end.

"Why should we expect it to, nesessarily? The struggle within man against the effects of original sin will not end. Just so this crisis may be permanent. You cannot always have certainties. We must meet the crisis without becoming overoptimistic and without becoming cynical. More college courses in philosophy would help citizens develop the proper state of mind."

Leaving Harvard is "unpleasant," he said, as is the impending fact of leaving his home for the past 21 years, 10 Francis Avenue.

During the past weeks, he has been making all the poignant arrangements with his wife, the former Jean MacMorran, herself a Ph. D., and dean of the graduate school at the New England Conservatory of Music. Their children are John P. and Penelope.

A Voice From the Hinterlands on the Washington Cesspool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I recently spoke of the degree of corruption which now is prevalent in Washington and I hoped out loud that this corruption would not contaminate the country as it has this city. Mr. Ed Delaney, a columnist syndicated in various of the small- and middle-sized California newspapers, recently commented on my remarks. I appreciate Mr. Delaney's interest, and I am placing his column, as it appeared in the Santa Ana, Calif., Register, in the RECORD, to help give fuller exposure to his thoughts:

TRUTH FORUM
(By Ed Delaney)

"Washington, D.C., is becoming a cesspool where rottenness swirls around and no outlet. Today we have to rely more and more on faith rather than reason that this cesspool has not contaminated the entire Nation and that the people of our country still become shocked when they hear of corruption."

Those are not the words of a John Birch Society member or one of those persons whom the leering liberals characterize as an "extremist." They are the words of Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, spoken on the floor of the House in Washington and may be read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 30, 1962. The words are a serious indictment of the present administration in Washington and cannot be brushed off lightly. They should be strongly impressed in the minds of millions of our people.

Among other disgraceful connivings and maneuverings in Washington, Representative CURTIS cited the Billie Sol Estes case and its unprobed ramifications. The Attorney General, the President's brother, appears to be up to his neck in partisan politics, says CURTIS. Not only does he fail to enforce the laws, asserts the Missouri Congressman, but he seems to encourage violations of the laws. He has moved with snail's pace in the Estes case and seems inclined to brush the whole matter under the rug, at least until after the November elections. The reason is obvious. Disclosures to date involve fraud, connivance of Federal officials, corruption and even murder. There undoubtedly would be repercussions of a scandalous nature if the whole affair were made public now for it appears likely some Federal and administration appointees will not be able to absolve themselves of blame. The Estes case is shot through with politics, rotten, disgraceful partisan politics and it is small wonder that Representative CURTIS calls Washington a "cesspool" which threatens to contaminate the entire Nation.

Machiavelli, the cunning conspirator and devil's disciple of the Middle Ages appears to be the patron saint of the juvenile pressure boys whom the White House has employed to importune and cajole Members of Congress into rubberstamping legislative measures or projects which the President deems desirable for the country. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say, measures which his corps of neo-Socialist advisers and the illuminati of the Council on Foreign Relations prescribe for our domestic and foreign ills.

The inordinate pressure that was exerted by the administration for passage of the foreign aid bill and for giving the President discretion in the matter of giving or withholding funds from Communist countries, is a positive example of sinister influences in Washington—the "cesspool" as Mr. CURTIS calls it. Aid to Communist countries does not aid the captive people toward their hoped-for freedom. It only strengthens the power of the oppressor. But of course in the words of Prof. Walter W. Rostow, the President's foreign policy planner, the Communists are mellowing. The building of the wall through Berlin and the imprisonment of some 16 million people behind those barricades across the heart of Europe, shows how the mellowing is being applied.

The one hopeful omen Representative CURTIS sees for our people is, that reporters and commentators in the hinterland of these United States, refuse to be deceived by the propaganda emanating from the White House and kindred sources. The grassroots editors and writers cannot be intimidated nor are they susceptible to the blandishments of the Washington hierarchy. In the last analysis the Government nabobs in Washington are not our masters but are servants of the people. It is just possible that our small town opinion makers, editors and publishers may yet save us, by putting the servants in their proper place.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Bottum, Joe H., *S. Dak*
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind* — The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex* — 2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Engle, Clair, *Calif*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Goldwater, Barry, *Ariz*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hickey, J. J., *Wyo* — Room 1251, New Senate Ofc. Bldg.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N.Y* — 1233 31st St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn* — 4929 Hillbrook La.
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn* — 7426 Hampden La., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, Maurice J., Jr., *N.H.*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Benjamin A., *Mass*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis* — 2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Kerr (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Wiley, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case, Hickenlooper, and Capehart.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan of North Carolina, Young of Ohio, Hart, McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Cooper, and Boggs.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Humphrey, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and Javits.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Bush, Beall, Goldwater, and Case.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Tower, and Murphy.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Butler, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Keating, and Prouty.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Hartke, Smith of Massachusetts, Beall, Prouty, and Miller.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Jackson, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Burdick, Metcalf, Hickey, Kuchel, Allott, Miller, Pearson, Bottum, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, Fong, and Scott.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Burdick, Smith of Massachusetts, Pell, Goldwater, Javits, Prouty, Tower, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan of North Carolina, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Smith of Massachusetts, Metcalf, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Miller, Murphy, and Pearson.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Mansfield (chairman), Hayden, Jordan of North Carolina, Cannon, Hickey, Pell, Curtis, Dirksen, and Bottum.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Tom Storke Receives New Newspaper Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, Tom Storke, the 85-year-old newspaper owner-editor from Santa Barbara, Calif., is a journalist of courage, integrity, skill and patriotism.

He has waged many crusades in his 61 years of putting out newspapers. Most recently he rebuked the John Birch Society in the editorial columns of his Santa Barbara News-Press.

For this attack, he won the Pulitzer Prize for editorial writing for calling attention to what his newspaper said was "a campaign of hate and vilification by the Birch Society."

And he won the Lauterbach Award for "pointing out the dangers to American freedom created by extremists of the radical right." The Lauterbach Award is given each year to a newsman for outstanding work in the field of civil rights.

Now Mr. Storke is about to receive a new honor—the Elijah Parish Lovejoy Award in memory of a newspaper editor who died upholding the freedom of the press. The award cites Mr. Storke for "integrity, craftsmanship and character."

In the following Associated Press dispatch, which appeared in the Fresno Bee August 20, 1962, this latest award to Mr. Storke is reviewed along with some of the more important achievements in his very productive career.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to have the Associated Press dispatch included as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAST PUBLISHER IS HONORED FOR CRUSADE

WATERVILLE, MAINE.—New honor today came to an 85-year-old fighting California newspaperman—already twice honored for distinguished journalism since he challenged, last year, the activities of the John Birch Society, a militantly conservative group.

A committee, including noted newspapermen, now has named Santa Barbara publisher Thomas More Storke to be the 1962 recipient of an award given yearly by Colby College in memory of an alumnus, martyred Editor Elijah Parish Lovejoy. When shot to death in Alton, Ill., November 7, 1837, Lovejoy was defending—against a mob—his newspaper plant and his right to publish truth as he saw it. He has been hailed as America's first martyr to the freedom of the press.

The award, to be presented November 8 at Coldy's observance of the 125th anniversary of Lovejoy's slaying, will recognize Storke as a newspaperman of "integrity, craftsmanship, and character," who has continued the Lovejoy heritage of fearlessness and freedom.

Owner-editor of the Santa Barbara News-Press, Storke is dean of California publishers, having given 61 of his 85 years to running his newspaper.

Today's Colby College announcement notes that Storke last November received the Lauterbach Award given each year to an American newspaperman for outstanding work in the field of civil liberties. He was cited for pointing out the dangers to American freedom created by extremists of the radical right.

In May this year, the Colby announcement also notes, he received the Pulitzer Prize for editorial writing—for calling attention to what his newspaper said was a campaign of hate and vilification by the Birch Society.

The committee that chose him for the Lovejoy Award consists of Herbert Brucker, editor of the editorial page of the Hartford (Conn.) Courant; Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor; Dwight E. Sargent, editor of the editorial page of the New York Herald Tribune; Robert E. L. Strider, president of Colby College; and Reginald Sturtevant, chairman of the Colby College Board of Trustees.

The ruddy-faced Tom Storke includes in his ancestry Spanish Lt. Jose Francisco de Ortega, who discovered San Francisco Bay and the Golden Gate in 1769. Storke went to work as a $6 a week cub reporter in 1898 in his native Seaside City. Three years later, with $2,000 he borrowed from a druggist, he bought the Santa Barbara Daily Independent.

Storke's News-Press, a daily of more than 31,000 circulation, is the lineal descendant of the little Independent and other newspapers Storke acquired.

Still working 6 days a week, he continues his long-held belief that "a newspaper will not be listened to or win respect if it pussyfoots in stating its editorial beliefs."

He used his newspaper for many a crusade—against the Southern Pacific Railroad, which once dominated California; for the Santa Ynez Dam, which guaranteed Santa Barbara's water supply. He strove successfully for the rebuilding of his city in neo-Spanish architecture after a 1925 earthquake. He played a key part in swinging the California Democratic Convention delegation to Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1932, thus assuring Roosevelt his party's nomination.

Among his many honors have been service as a U.S. Senator, as a regent of the University of California, and as a leading citizen in his home city.

Concerned when the influence of the Birch Society began to show itself in Santa Barbara, he took the position that any organization seeking to influence American opinion should be exposed to the judgment of the public.

After Birch Society Leader Robert Welch assailed former President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Storke's close friend, Chief Justice Earl Warren, Storke's newspaper attacked the society in feature articles and editorials.

"How," Storke asked, "can anyone follow a leader absurd enough to call former President Eisenhower 'a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy'?"

His newspaper contended Birchers used Communist-style techniques to fight communism and accused them of "indiscriminate character assassination."

Within a year, Storke reported that disclosure of Birch Society activities was all that was needed and that the temperature of the city's body politic was about back to normal.

His Pulitzer Prize award brought congratulatory messages from all over the country, including one from President John F. Kennedy, praising Storke's "sturdy conviction and judgment."

Tom Storke said "it should not be considered courageous to stand up and defend what God and the Constitution have given us."

Our Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of September 5, 1962:

OUR CONSTITUTION: IS IT JUST A SCRAP OF PAPER?

President Kennedy says that while the U.S. Constitution is a remarkable document we have to remember that it was designed for an agrarian society which feared the power of central government. In the long history of the Presidency there has not been a more casual dismissal of the basic instrument of our system of government and of our freedoms.

Mr. Kennedy's remarks were made off-the-cuff to an assembly of high school students brought to Washington to study the value of Government service. The President of the United States, standing on the lawn before the White House, told them the Constitution was written during a period of isolation, that it does not provide an automatic light to the future in that all we have to do is to follow the very clear precepts it lays down for us, and it will have to be made to work in a different world from the day in which it was written, both at home and abroad.

Was this a careless statement of a harassed and troubled President, one which in retrospect might be regretted? We don't think so. It has been said before by spokesmen for an adminstration that chafes under constitutional restraints and legislative processes. Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in a speech prepared for a conference at Stanford University, said: "The President is hobbled in his task of leading the American people to consensus and concerted action by the restrictions of power imposed on him by a constitutional system designed for an 18th-century agrarian society."

There has been a tendency to separate Mr. Kennedy from the men who surround

him, or even speak for him, as if a President was so indifferent to his office that he chose for personal advisers men whose opinions he would not welcome or accept. More than 30 former members of the ADA, Americans for Democratic Action, sit in policy positions in the White House and executive offices. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., a former ADA chairman, is a Presidential speechwriter. Schlesinger has described the ADA as the non-Communist organization of the American left and once wrote that capitalists are cowards and socialism will come about through a succession of New Deals.

It has been hard, perhaps, to face the reality that Mr. Kennedy came to the White House without real strength of conviction or purpose. He even said he felt uncomfortable in the company of liberals. The White House was a prize. He is still acutely self-conscious in public. During his campaign he tried to proclaim his position in history in the light of Christopher Columbus and George Washington. He asked us to depart from our past and follow him.

While he was vague then, he now listens to what he obviously wants to hear. He speaks of the "cliches of our forebears," of our economic "myths," of the need to adjust ancient prejudices to new realities, and to look ahead to some international "grand design." The ADA has pointed the way for him—left.

In accepting the Presidency, Mr. Kennedy took an oath "to support and defend the Consitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic." A million men have fallen in its name. Are we now going to say it is only a scrap of paper?

International Due Process and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on August 7, 1962, at the Law and Layman Conference in San Francisco, Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., delivered an address entitled "International Due Process and the Law." In it, he discussed the possibility of an international writ of habeas corpus to protect individuals throughout the world from denial of personal liberty without due process of law. Justice Brennan points out that although article IX of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations Charter declares that "no one shall be subject to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile," this guarantee is merely empty rhetoric until some international agreement sets up machinery for its enforcement. He further states that this would not require a world superstate, but could be done by treaty. In the past, the State Department has opposed proposals for world habeas corpus on the grounds that few nations would be willing to enter into the necessary treaty. This address by Justice Brennan, which I view as related to the general movement for a world rule of law, may well justify reexamination of the problem. A New York Times editorial of August 9, 1962, points out that although the world habeas corpus proposal could not be expected to receive immediate and universal acceptance, this task some day will have to be attempted and suggests that the United States should take the lead.

Justice Brennan pays tribute in his speech to Luis Kutner, a Chicago lawyer, who has studied and written widely and worked hard toward the realization of world habeas corpus. I, too, want to pay tribute to Luis Kutner. As a boy, he was wrongfully arrested by a policeman and confined in a basement cell without arraignment for 2 days without food or water. As a result, he has devoted his life to helping and defending those who are wrongfully imprisoned or deprived of personal liberty. It has been estimated that he has won the release of more than 1,000 wrongfully convicted people. He is president of the Commission for International Due Process of Law, which has the support of many leading international lawyers in its endeavors for world habeas corpus. Those who hope for ultimate protection of the dignity and freedom of the individual on an international basis under a world rule of law should applaud the efforts of Mr. Kutner and should carefully consider the address by Justice Brennan.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. Justice Brennan and the New York Times editorial of August 9, 1962, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks of Mr. Justice Brennan and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL DUE PROCESS AND THE LAW

(Remarks of William J. Brennan, Jr., Law and Layman Conference, San Francisco, Calif., August 7, 1962)

Faith in fundamental human rights, and the dignity and worth of the human person, is the inspiration and the guiding spirit of the movement for a world rule of law. We would create a world rule of law, in the words of the consensus of San Jose, "to the end that the rule of law will govern all men and all nations and any man can then walk any place on the face of the earth, or travel through endless space, in freedom, in dignity and in peace."

But our time has known in full measure the tragedy suffered by countless human beings over the face of the globe who, deprived or their liberty without accusation, without trial, upon nothing but the arbitrary fiat of a sovereign government, have been helpless to challenge their detention in a world forum. Yes, the world community has declared in ringing words its moral condemnation of such detentions. It is in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the Charter of the United Nations. Article IX of that declaration, among other things, reads that: "No one shall be subject to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile." But this is and must remain empty rhetoric until implemented by some international structure and procedure for enforcing compliance by an offending signatory state with the great principles it guarantees. Concepts of personal and territorial supremacy—national sovereignty—leave each member state free to grant its nationals only that measure of due process provided by its own laws, however far short that measure is of the standard contemplated by the universal declaration.

Some have conceived that world peace through the rule of law can be achieved only with the creation of a full-fledged superstate in which all nations are merged—a supranational organization that has political and military control over all of its units. My own view accepts Roscoe Pound's premise that "all states need not be merged in a great world state, in which their personality is lost, in order that their conduct may be inquired into and ordered by authority of a world legal order." The all-important—indeed the most important—end of a world rule of law, the securing of individual liberty, can be attained without the creation of a world state.

All that seems necessary is that the United Nations signatories ordain by a simple treaty statute a structure and scheme for securing international due process of the nature of the national due process familiar to every American: a prompt and speedy trial; legal assistance, including assistance for the indigent; prohibition of any kind of undue coercion or influence; freedom to conduct one's defense; the right to a public trial and written proceedings; the presumption of innocence and the burden upon the State to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt; security against cruel and unusual punishments. These standards of due process, and thus of effective justice, only words now in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, have their counterparts in our own U.S. Constitution. The vital difference, however, is that our Nation has vitalized them for our people through a national forum and a national procedure for their enforcement.

We are a Nation of 50 States—each not of course so sovereign as a sovereign nation, but nevertheless sovereign in important respects. But a State which prosecutes and imprisons an individual under procedures which violate the fundamental principles of liberty and justice embodied in the guarantees of due process in the Federal Constitution may be called upon by the individual to answer for its conduct in a Federal forum. Almost a century ago the Congress extended the ancient writ of habeas corpus—that most important writ known to the constitutional law of England, affording as it does a swift and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement—to any person claiming to be held in State custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States. The individual may petition a Federal court to hear his claim that his detention is in violation of Federal constitutional guarantees. It avails the State nothing that the detention does no violence to State law or the State constitution. The guarantees of the Federal Constitution are the higher law. It is true that the Federal court will not hear a State prisoner who has not first exhausted any available State remedies for decision of his Federal claim. For upon the State courts equally with the Federal courts rests the obligation to guard, enforce, and to protect every right granted or secured by the Constitution of the United States. However, the State prisoner is not concluded by any determination of the courts of the State that his Federal claim has no merit. The prisoner may seek review of that holding in the Federal courts including the Supreme Court of the United States. Since he asserts a Federal claim the last word as to its merits is for the decision of Federal and not State tribunals.

Here then in our own country is almost 100 years of experience with the feasibility of a suprastate procedure for realizing the concepts of decency and fairness which are the foundation of our free society. And a most important corollary effect of the existence of this suprastate remedy has been its influence toward keeping the separate States on the path directed to securing those who run afoul of State laws against invasion of the procedural rights guaranteed them by the basic law of the land.

Why should we not internationalize the writ of habeas corpus along these lines to enforce the guarantees of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights? The research of Prof. Luis Kutner and others has demonstrated that it can be done. Professor Kutner has performed an invaluable service for the world in blueprinting a plan for world habeas corpus including a judicial structure and a procedure. He proposes doing this within the present United Nations structure through a treaty statute. It is a concrete program whereby the now only morally binding Universal Declaration of Human Rights would be made, by the voluntary consent of the nations of the world, a legally binding commitment enforcible in an international court of habeas corpus which would function through appropriately accessible regional courts. Regional world attorneys general would either prosecute or resist application for the writ. Of perhaps equal or greater importance, in the reflection of what happens in our States under the regime of Federal habeas corpus, the sovereign nations would commit themselves to enforce the guarantees of the Declaration in their own tribunals, authorizing review of their decisions by the international court of habeas corpus. Thus individuals would have relief in the international tribunal only upon a proper showing either that relief was wrongly denied under available remedies in the courts of the member state, or that that state provided no such remedies.

I do not say that this plan for world habeas corpus following the outlines of the structure of our Federal habeas corpus is the only or the best plan. That's not important for our purposes here this afternoon. What is important is the obvious utility of world habeas corpus as a tool for the avoidance of the dangers of the police state, and its great promise as a contribution toward preserving and furthering world peace by repudiating, through an enforcible international rule of law, systematic and deliberate denial of human rights. The plan requires no surrender of national sovereignty to a supranational state and there is more than a feeble hope that the nations of the world would perceive that this plan would indeed serve their national interests. For as Professor Kutner has said: "If there are any denials of human rights which all nations might in principle agree violate standards of fairness, certainly arbitrary arrest, i.e., a wrongful custody without color of legal justification, is one. If individuals may be arrested or incarcerated without cause, or for causes which clearly violate fundamental human rights, they do not have the most elementary fundamental freedom."

Indeed a beginning has already been made in the creation in 1953 by the 15 countries of the Council of Europe of the European Court of Human Rights, and a Commission of Human Rights which may receive complaints from individuals or groups, or from member nations, of alleged violations of a wide range of human rights established by the convention as a bill of rights. The Conference of Lawyers from the 23 nations of the Americas who convened in San Jose, Costa Rica, last June also made the creation of a world court of human rights a specific goal. No nation should be ahead of our own in furthering the goal. Objections once expressed by the Department of State that "with the many deep-seated political and ideological differences which exist among the various nations, it would not appear to be practical to seek meaningful agreement upon a statute for such a court on the part of most countries," if they still obtain, must surely be subject to reexamination. At all events American lawyers cannot in good conscience fail wholeheartedly and completely to devote themselves to the achievement of the goal. That they feel so is implicit in their joinder in the consensus at San Jose that "the need for a legal, definitive writ through appropirate machinery in order to exercise collective and individual protection of human rights is not only regarded as essential and necessary but as moral and right."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Aug. 9, 1962]

A Court for Human Rights

Speaking with the frankness we are beginning to expect from members of the U.S. Supreme Court, Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., has proposed an international court of habeas corpus. The principle of habeas corpus is that governments may not hold prisoners without due cause. As the Constitution's sixth amendment states, "In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial." The eighth amendment further stipulates that "excessive bail shall not be required."

These rights were won by British citizens from reluctant British monarchs over a long period of time, and with some sacrifice of life and liberty. We took them over with the British law when we declared our independence of the British Government. Manifestly they do not exist in Communist countries or in most other dictatorships, and not in the same form in all so-called democracies. Even the best-intentioned government may sometimes find the practice of preventive detention convenient, so that a man is punished for the crimes he might commit if he were at liberty.

Justice Brennan's proposal would not, therefore, secure immediate and universal acceptance. He recognizes this fact when he cites a passage in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights—"no one 'shall be' subject to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile"—as nothing but "empty rhetoric" so long as it is not enforcible. Something could be done, however, by setting up a new court through treaties among the nations. Such a tribunal, once established, might give the individual citizen in any member country a new appeal to mankind's sense of justice. If the system worked even with a limited number of nations, it might influence countries where individual rights are not now respected.

This task will some day have to be attempted. Why not now under the auspices of the United States?

The Sketchbook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, after reading daily in the newspapers throughout our country stories of the tensions of our time, it is somewhat relaxing and enjoyable to read a newspaper article of homey, down-to-earth, real-life people and matters. Such is the article entitled "The Sketchbook" written by William A. Kealy and appearing a recent edition of the Lowell Sun.

Here is a real-life story of Miss Mary Memos, a comparative newcomer to my home city of Lowell, who has gotten to know and love our people and they in turn have taken her to their hearts. She is performing a very important assignment in the daily business life of our community. I am certain that those reading this article will appreciate it as much as I have:

The Sketchbook: She Loves Selling and Is Crazy About Lowell

(By William A. Kealy)

Lowell.—Working as a clerk in a retail store usually involves long hours of standing, with hard work and plenty of frustration when you end up with a "no sale."

Mary Memos, manager of the Bell Shops on Central Street, has been at it for 15 years. Her opinion: "If you're in retailing for long you've got to either love it or go crazy. I love it."

Although she has had offers in other fields she stanchly maintains she doesn't know any other job she'd rather do. "I find that meeting many different people every day of your life is fascinating," she said.

She began retail clerking in Nashua, N.H., shortly after graduating from Nashua schools and has been at it ever since. First she worked for her brother who owned a cleaning plant in the upriver city.

When the plant closed she went to work for Bell Shops in Nashua and worked there for a few years as a salesgirl. Her pleasant personality and obvious interest in the customers was noticed by her bosses, and Mary was assigned to a special crew working for the large retail chain.

Her crew specialized in store openings, a difficult operation in which a group of men and women go into a new city, start from scratch, and set up a new store.

The important part of the job, however, is to build as much good will in a new city as possible and then to choose responsible people to take over the new store while the opening crew moves on to another territory.

Her chain operates more than 50 stores throughout New England and Mary has worked for short periods of time in many of them.

In 1955 she was made manager of Nugent's in Lowell and in the next 3 years fell in love with this city and its people. She says no city can compare to Lowell because of the warmth of the people. "They're so friendly that selling becomes a pleasure and sociable job rather than a frustrating chore."

The glamorous and witty Miss Memos became manager of the Central Street store 4 years ago and has been busy there ever since. She directs the whole operation of the store which includes three floors of merchandise, a dozen clerks, and extensive bookkeeping.

She has no idea how many hours a week she puts in although she's there every hour the store is open.

When she's not working, Mary spends her time sightseeing in her new car, reading the current bestseller, and skiing.

"I'm really crazy about skiing," she said, "but lately I've become a little wary of it. I was getting pretty good at it 2 years ago but not good enough because I broke my ankle." She was on crutches for 6 weeks, and limping for many weeks after that. "I haven't been on skis since then" she said, but, after a pause, added that she still might give it another try.

She's heard so much about golf and people that play the game she's determined to start taking golfing lessons soon. "Golfing seems, so—well so safe—compared to skiing."

Mary has two sisters and a brother all married, and lives what she calls a "quiet life," but a very active quiet life.

Tribute to Lad Lake: Wisconsin's Home for Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on September 4, 1962, Lad Lake, Wisconsin's Home and Farm School for Boys, marked its 60th anniversary.

Created to fulfill a fundamental need in our society, that is, providing a home-school life for underprivileged boys, Lad Lake has not only made a wonderful contribution to improving the life—hope of underprivileged boys; but also stands as an outstanding nongovernmental accomplishment in meeting a fundamental need in our society.

Established in 1902, Lad Lake has provided a home, opportunity for education, recreation and work, and a brightened outlook for the future for hundreds of boys, generation after generation, both from Wisconsin and other parts of the Nation.

Recently, the Wisconsin Home and Farm School's publication "Our Boys" published an article highlighting the milestones in Lad Lake's 60-year history.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILESTONES IN LAD LAKE'S 60-YEAR HISTORY

Wisconsin Home and Farm School Association organized by small group of people from Plymouth Congregational Church in Milwaukee, 1902.

Ignatius Dega becomes the first Farm School boy when directors authorize the payment of his board in a private home. Site of first home selected—a farm on lower Lake Nemahbin, near Delafield, at an annual rental of $150. Prof. James Melville, a civil engineer, elected first superintendent. School opens first time in October with six boys, 1903.

Special meeting of the directors considers the advisability of purchasing a permanent location, 1904.

Farm purchased near Dousman as permanent site, 1905.

First schoolhouse, a one-room frame building, constructed. Completed in 8 days, its total cost, including furnishings, was $600, 1906.

Our Boys published for the first time. This newsletter for friends of Lad Lake has been in continuous publication ever since, 1907.

Wisconsin Hall dormitory completed, 1909.

New brick school building dedicated as part of 15th anniversary observance. Gov. Woodbridge N. Ferris, of Michigan, featured speaker, 1917.

Seventeen boys serve in World War I, one missing in action, 1919.

Purchase of lake frontage surrounding Dutchman's Lake, 1923.

Half-mile lane of American white elm trees planted to form Elm Tree Avenue leading from Highway 18 to main grounds, 1932.

Additional 100-acre tract purchased, 1943.

Announcement that 507 boys from 81 Wisconsin cities and villages had been served at the institution since its founding. These boys had lived at the Home and Farm School for periods ranging from several months to 8 years. Admission records dating back to 1911 show that a number of boys from outside of Wisconsin had also lived here, 1950.

Institution becomes known as Lad Lake. First executive director with child care training and experience named. Major remodeling of Wisconsin Hall completed to conform to modern child care concepts, 1951.

First boy admitted under new program. Admission limited to boys between 10 and 14 years of age. Just prior to this change, the population at Lad Lake ranged in age from 8 to 17. In 1903, a boy of 6 was eligible to enter. All boys attending school in surrounding communities, 1952.

Casework department started with the addition of a professionally trained social worker. First psychiatric consultant named. State approval received to make foster home placements, 1954.

Plans approved for a new cottage to house teenage boys. First major building program in 40 years, 1955.

A $50,000 fund drive for cottage launched, 1956.

Lad Lake, Inc., adopted as official name. Second caseworker added to staff. Cottage dedicated, with Gov. Vernon Thomson, of Wisconsin, as dedication speaker. Added emphasis on upgrading of houseparent staff through increased inservice training, 1957.

First professional social group worker employed. School opens for boys who cannot attend regular community school classes because of severe emotional disturbance, 1958.

Second psychiatric consultant named, 1960.

Consolidating program gains and continuing to seek improved methods of serving emotionally disturbed boys more effectively, 1962.

Foreign Policy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ted Lewis:

CAPITAL CIRCUS
(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, September 10.—Let's be honest about it. President Kennedy did not really invite Ike to drop in for a private luncheon at the White House today just to chat about Ike's recent European tour.

He wanted something from his GOP predecessor. And despite buoyant expectations that he would get it, Ike really let him down.

What Kennedy obviously was after was a flat statement from the former President that he was backing the administration's foreign policy, particularly on Cuba. Arrangements had been made for Ike to use the White House sounding board for this purpose, but Kennedy's distinguished guest disappeared from the scene without using it.

This vanishing act was a real blow to the smart White House operatives. They had been surer than sure that Ike would fall for Kennedy's college try and at the least come out with a forceful statement to the effect that the Berlin and Cuban issues should be kept out of the sordid arena of partisan politics in this fall's elections.

There had been valid reasons for believing that Ike would give Kennedy a lift on the foreign policy front. Just last week at a GOP rally in Frederick, Md., General Eisenhower had said just what it was hoped he would repeat today.

Before fellow Republicans, Ike had given a frank reminder that the President is responsible for the conduct of foreign relations. He then went on in this fashion, which was most pleasing to the White House "It would be silly to expect that any group like the one gathered here would not have any opinion. But we are on the outside, and we do not have all the information. I think all good Republicans have the right to offer constructive suggestions, but this does not mean that we should make Cuba, or any other part of our foreign relations, the object of partisan fighting in this country."

Just why did Ike pass up the opportunity Kennedy offered him today to say to the national audience the same thing that he had said to a local Republican gathering?

We are not privy to Ike's mental processes. But there is reason to suspect that he had begun to doubt that the Democrats intended to run their campaign this year on the high level, so far as foreign policy is concerned, that he had in mind for his own party.

H.S.T. GAVE IKE SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

What the last Democratic President, Harry Truman, said in Hartford, Conn., in a Sunday political speech was enough to put Ike on his guard. Harry's nasty slur that Ike was "the laziest President we ever had" was not one-two with Truman's harsher injection of the foreign policy issue as it pertains to Cuba.

It was Ike, according to blabbering Harry, who was responsible for the mess in Cuba because he "didn't have the guts to enforce the Monroe Doctrine."

Our guess, therefore, is that when the real lowdown is available on why Ike was standoffish after breaking bread with Kennedy today, the whole failure of the Kennedy approach can be blamed on Truman's demagogic political mouthings.

Unfortunately, Kennedy has no way of controlling Truman. Apparently no one has. Adlai Stevenson found this out in 1952 when Truman, during that presidential campaign, insisted that the American people would be more than sorry if they elected a general to run the country.

KENNEDY REFUSES TO JOIN NAME CALLING

Kennedy deserves a certain amount of sympathy for having Truman fudging up his efforts to put foreign policy matters an edge above partisan politics. For if there is any single job that Kennedy has been trying to do well and until now, with some significant success, it was the task of keeping Ike agreeable and helpful with the administration's foreign relations efforts.

Kennedy has refused to get involved in any partisan name calling with Ike. He has said so publicly. For instance, when Ike charged he was "grabbing for power," Kennedy said softly he did not care to mix in a controversy with his predecessor.

Until today this hands-off-Ike policy had paid Kennedy considerable in dividends. After the Cuban Bay of Pigs fiasco Kennedy prevailed on Ike to come down to Camp David from Gettysburg in the Presidential helicopter. Ike gave Kennedy the lift he needed—a statement to the effect that all the people should back the President as the only man who had all the facts.

Since then the Ike-Kennedy relationship has been carefully cultivated along this same line. In Palm Springs, Calif., last March, the President saw to it there was a congenial meeting with Ike and he briefed the former President on the whole foreign policy situation.

It may be that what Truman said at Hartford has not knocked the Ike-Kennedy foreign relations setup into a "cocked hat." But what happened at the White House to-

day more than suggests some quick repair work is in order.

AND THERE'S MORE TO COME FROM HARRY

But it may be too late for Kennedy to get Ike back on the reservation, for Truman has a political speaking schedule across the country in the next 2 months which is made to order for more demagogic below-belt socks at Ike. And who can get Truman to cramp his style?

Harry can be expected to follow up his Hartford diatribe in his 3-day swing through California this week. And in California Richard Nixon also is certain to get the back of Harry's lusty hand in a way which will inject the Cuban issue into the gubernatorial campaign, where it certainly does not belong.

Ike knows that Truman will be in the thick of this election. He plans to be himself. But it is now obvious that Ike wants to feel free to throw a counterjibe on the Cuban issue at Harry. Hence he abstained today from giving Kennedy the support he wanted, which was smart politics.

More Cultural Programs Needed in Our Telstar Broadcasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Los Angeles Herald Examiner makes the observation that our first Telstar broadcast to Europe was confined almost entirely to materialistic subjects. On the other hand, the article points out, when Europe made its return telecast the accent was primarily on culture. I agree wholeheartedly with the suggestion that this great advance in telecasting be used to let the world know that we too are formidable in culture and not just "grubbers for the almighty dollar."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald-Examiner]

FITTING MESSAGE TO EUROPE

Now that we have Telstar and the power to broadcast television programs to Europe and other sections of the globe, we should provide in those programs good cultural entertainment.

It is noteworthy that in the first Telstar telecast from this country to Europe our program was confined almost entirely to materialistic subjects. On the other hand Europe's return program to this country contained considerable culture, including an opera singer in Rome.

It is time that more of Europe learns the truth that we are not a nation of untamed savages and grubbers only for the almighty dollar. They should be given the advantage of learning that we, too, are formidable in culture.

What would be wrong with, in the near future, telecasting to Europe by Telstar one of our fine concerts from the Hollywood Bowl in its entirety, including a view of the tremendous crowd attending?

A Tribute to the Honorable Victor L. Anfuso

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the 87th Congress, the Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO will retire as a Member of the House of Representatives. This dedicated American has faithfully and effectively served people of the United States and the cause of democracy and brotherhood throughout the world. He has now heeded the call to further dedication in other areas of public service in his own State of New York.

I take this opportunity to pay personal tribute to him as a public servant. Throughout the many years of his service, his achievements and character have earned for him the respect and commendation not only of the public officials of this country but of those of many other countries of the world. He was a patient and wise mentor to me during my years in the House of Representatives. His wisdom and counsel have enabled me to perform my duties in the best interests of all of the people. I know that this is true also in the case of many of my other colleagues.

It is appropriate at this time to set forth the distinguished biographical and public record of Representative ANFUSO as an example to future generations of Americans for their inspiration.

Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO was born in Sicily, Italy, March 10, 1905. He came to America with his mother, two older brothers and two sisters in 1914. They settled in the Williamsburgh section of Brooklyn and have lived there ever since. He was educated in New York City's public schools and Commercial High School, studied law at St. Lawrence University Law School—now Brooklyn Law School—from which he received an LL.B. degree in 1927. He was admitted to the New York State bar in 1928 and has been engaged in private law practice since then, specializing in civil and criminal law.

During the early 1930's Mr. ANFUSO formed the Citizens Welfare Association to help people in Brooklyn who were hardest hit by the economic depression. In 1936 he organized the Italian Board of Guardians, now affiliated with the Catholic Charities in Brooklyn, to aid delinquent children and children from broken homes. He served as president of the organization for four terms.

From 1941 to 1943 Mr. ANFUSO served on Selective Service Board No. 221 and later as a member of Selective Service Appeal Board No. 26 by appointment of the Governor of New York. In 1946 he received the Selective Service Medal. In 1943 he served under Gen. William "Wild Bill" Donovan with the Office of Strategic Services—OSS—in the Mediterranean Theater. He was later awarded the Certificate of Merit by the Regular Veterans Association "for distinguished achievement and meritorious service." Upon his return from Europe in 1945 he became Special Assistant to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

In 1946 Mr. ANFUSO was appointed by Pope Pius XII as Knight Commander of the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre for his "humanitarian work on behalf of youth." Two years later, during the crucial elections in Italy in 1948, he drafted and mailed over 250,000 letters to the Italian people urging them to vote against the Communist candidates and to help keep Italy a free nation. For this effort, he was described by the New York Times as "the one-man crusader."

Mr. ANFUSO was elected a Member of the 82d Congress in November 1950, and served on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. He was instrumental in obtaining a much needed salary increase for postal workers in 1951. He sponsored legislation to create a Bureau of Crime Prevention in the Department of Justice to curb juvenile delinquency.

Due to reapportionment of congressional districts in 1952 and the elimination of a district in Brooklyn, he was forced to withdraw after serving one term in Congress. He was later appointed by Mayor Wagner as a city magistrate and served until August 1954, when he resigned to become a candidate for Congress again. He was elected to the 84th Congress on November 2, 1954, and took his oath of office on January 5, 1955.

Upon his return to Congress, Mr. ANFUSO asked that he be appointed a member of the House Agriculture Committee, in order that he could be the spokesman for big city consumers. He has been serving on this committee since then and has become known as a forthright representative of the consumer. At his instigation, a Consumers Study Subcommittee was set up in March 1957, with Mr. ANFUSO as chairman, to study the high cost of living and seek ways to prevent further rises.

He was appointed by Speaker Rayburn as a member of the U.S. congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Conference in Paris in 1955. In 1956 he served as a member of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization Conference in Rome. In 1957 he undertook a special mission for the House Agriculture Committee to study stockpiling and disposal of U.S. food surpluses in Europe and the Middle East. In the same year he made a tour of New York State to study farmer-consumer problems, and submitted an extensive report to Congress on his findings.

Mr. ANFUSO was reelected to Congress for a third term on November 6, 1956, and to a fourth term on November 4, 1958.

During his years in the House of Representatives, he was the author and sponsor of forward-looking and progressive legislation which enhanced the democratic ideal and benefited all of the people of the world.

Mr. ANFUSO supported aid to the people of Poland through the sale of

surplus food in the belief that strengthening Poland in this way would make her less dependent on Russia. For this effort he was lauded by Polish groups in the United States. Mr. ANFUSO urged greater economic aid to Israel, as well as military assistance to assure Israel's security and continued existence.

In recent years Mr. ANFUSO was the recipient of many awards, including the Liberty Award from Governor Harriman on behalf of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee for championing the cause of minority and nationality groups; the American Legion award for Americanism activities; the Commander of the Order of Merit from the Italian Government for his efforts in behalf of the people of Italy; the Humanity Award from the Order Brith Abraham for 30 years activity in behalf of "human welfare, world peace and justice."

Mr. ANFUSO is a member of the American Bar Association, New York State bar, and Brooklyn bar. He has been admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court. He is active in civic, religious, philanthropic and political organizations. He was a delegate to several Democratic State conventions and to all Democratic National Conventions since 1948.

In January 1959, he was appointed a ranking member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and also a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He was subsequently made chairman of the Subcommittee on International Cooperation and Security, and in the latter capacity led the U.S. delegation to the International Astronautical Federation Conference in London in September 1959. He was also appointed congressional adviser to the U.S. representative on the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. In November 1960, he was again a member of the U.S. delegation to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference in Paris.

On November 8, 1960, Mr. ANFUSO was reelected to his fifth term in Congress. He is married to the former Frances Stallone of Brooklyn since 1930 and they have five children, three sons and two daughters.

To him and to his loved ones I extend my best wishes for a healthy and happy life.

End of Monroe Doctrine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Senate an editorial from the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., on the subject of the Communist military buildup in Cuba and the U.S. foreign policy on Cuba. I feel that this editorial entitled "End of Monroe Doctrine?" merits the attention of the Members of this body. I ask unanimous consent that this September 11, 1962, editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Orangesburg, S.C., Times and Democrat, Sept. 11, 1962]

END OF MONROE DOCTRINE?

The recent announcement by Moscow that she is materially aiding Cuba and threats from Moscow, that an attack on Cuba would bring rocket retaliation on the United States from Russia, seem to make a shambles of the Monroe Doctrine.

While it can be argued that Russian aid does not make Cuba a Russian stooge, it cannot be argued successfully that Cuban communism is independent from Moscow communism. And if Russian aid to Cuba is not in many ways the same as old-time colonialism, then Russia today would not control so many countries it is aiding.

Certainly the boasts of Nikita Khrushchev that Russian rockets are ready to help reply to any U.S. action against Cuba, and his statement that the Monroe Doctrine is "dead" are both signs that Russia has her hands in the affairs of the American hemisphere.

And no one in his right senses can doubt that Russia does not seek to control events in Cuba. Eventually the Russians will control Cuba, if that is not already the case, and when that day comes, a foreign power will have flouted the Monroe Doctrine's vital principle.

That principle was stated first by President James Monroe in 1823 has been in effect for 139 years. In essence, President Monroe told European powers to let Latin America alone. He announced that the United States would look upon any attempt to gain colonies in the hemisphere as dangerous and a threat to peace.

Yet both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy have not invoked the Doctrine in the case of Cuba. We have said we are relying on joint action of all the American republics but in the last meeting of Organization of American States, Secretary of State Dean Rusk utterly failed to win any significant action against Cuba.

During President Eisenhower's term of office, an undercover effort was initiated for the invasion of Cuba. Under President Kennedy this plan was bungled. Since that time, our faces have been red.

All of which goes to show that as soon as it was established that the Communists were in control in Cuba, and in league with Moscow, our best policy would have been to immediately invoke the Monroe Doctrine and to have taken action. But we hesitated, as usual, ignoring the vital Monroe Doctrine, and the situation gets worse month by month as we do practically nothing.

Not One More Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Evening Tribune of June 28, 1962:

NOT ONE MORE SURRENDER—ADA SEEN THREAT TO U.S. DEMOCRACY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the fourth of five articles excerpted from a speech entitled "Not One More Surrender." It was made before the San Diego Rotary Club by Paul A. Terry, manager, education department, the Evening Tribune and the San Diego Union.)

(By Paul A. Terry)

History shows that 21 recorded civilizations have gone into oblivion not by conquest from without, but because of the surrender of individual freedom to all-powerful government.

History also records that socialism and welfare statism are preludes to communism.

There are many informative reports, books and studies that to me prove beyond any question of doubt that the Fabian Socialists have moved into the most sensitive positions in our National Government. They advise on foreign policy, economics, military strength, health, education, and you name it.

BOOKS TELL THREAT

I hope you will take the time to read a study known as "Keynes at Harvard." This is a factual report on the Fabian Socialists by a Harvard alumni group known as the Veritas Foundation.

A new book, "America: Listen," by Frank Kluckhohn, ranking officer of the U.S. State Department from 1955 to 1961, deals with this threat. This report reveals that the threat to our survival is greater than most Americans have been permitted to realize.

A Washington correspondent recently wrote a series of seven articles which reveal we are well on the road to losing our freedoms.

COMMENT ON ADA

Here is what this newsman has to say about the Americans for Democratic Action.

"The ADA is a very small, but very dedicated and articulate minority, striking like the British Fabian Socialists. The socialism they want to bring about would be quite as total industrially as that in Russia, but would be accomplished by legislation."

We must be on guard against the ADA in government.

For the sake of review, I want to deal with how the Socialists go about destroying a government. It is important that we have a thorough understanding of their sinister plans. To help us in this, Congressman Pettengill, as long ago as 1944, said the 12 points which follow are the "Socialist Manifesto."

"First: The people must be made to feel their utter helplessness and their inability to solve their own problems. While in this state of mind, there is held up before them a benign and all-wise leader to whom they must look for the cure of all their ills. This state of mind is most readily developed in a time of economic stress or national disaster.

"Second: The principle of local self-government must be wiped out, so that this leader or group in control can have all political power readily at hand.

"Third: The centralized government, while appearing in form to represent the people, must dutifully register the will of the leader or group in control.

"Fourth: Constitutional guarantees must be swept aside. This is accomplished in part by ridiculing them as outmoded and as obstructions to progress.

"Fifth: Public faith in the legal profession and respect for the courts must be underminded.

"Sixth: The lawmaking body must be intimidated and from time to time rebuked, so as to prevent the development of public confidence therein.

"Seventh: Economically, the people must be kept down by high taxes which under one pretext or another, they are called upon to pay.

"Thus they are brought to a common level, and all income above a meager living is taken from them. In this manner economic independence is kept to a minimum, and the citizen is forced to rely more and more upon the government that controls him. Capital and credit are thus completely within the control of government.

"Eighth: A great public debt must be built up so that citizens can never escape its burdens. This makes government the virtual receiver for the entire nation.

"Ninth: A general distrust of private business and industry must be kept alive, so that the public may not begin to rely upon its own resources.

"Tenth: Governmental bureaus are set up to control practically every phase of the citizen's life. These bureaus issue directives without number, but all under authority of the leader to whom they are immediately responsible.

"It is a government of men, and not of laws.

"Eleventh: The education of the youth of the nation is taken under control to the end that all may at an early age be inoculated with a spirit of submission to the system and of reverence for the benevolent leader.

"Twelfth: To supplement and fortify all of the foregoing, there is kept flowing a steady stream of governmental propaganda designed to extol all that bow the knee, and to vilify those who dare raise a voice of dissent."

How do we best clean up government? As I said earlier, we outcompete the opposition and restore our constitutional form of government. We must demand that men who represent us in government—regardless of political party—stick to the fundamental concepts of our Constitution.

In other words, men who represent us in government should be for national security, and against appeasement and capitulation to an obvious enemy, either outside or within our country. Our representatives should be for private ownership and against governmental ownership and control of the means of production and distribution.

They should be for private, competitive markets, and against unnecessary intervention in those small areas where the Constitution expressly delegates such authority to the central Government. They should be for States rights, and opposed to the welfare state.

Let me ask you a sincere question: How far down the road of appeasement have we gone? The record speaks for itself. You be the judge.

THIRTY-FOUR HUNDRED ACCORDS MADE

Right now we are talking about a summit conference, disarmament, and trade with the Communists. During the past 25 years we have had 3,400 meetings with the Reds. From these meetings came 52 major agreements. The Soviet Union has broken all but two of them.

The Soviets meet with us not to negotiate peace, but to disarm the West intellectually and psychologically. The liberals, Socialists, Communists and some members of the current administration favor summit conferences with Soviet leaders.

Al Davies Addresses North Dakota Dedicatory Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on the occasion of the ground-breaking ceremonies for the new National Metabolism and Radiation Research Laboratory in Fargo, N. Dak., Al Davies, vice president of the American Meat Institute, was featured as one of the ceremonial speakers. His address is both informative and interesting.

During his address, Mr. Davies pays some well-merited tribute to the senior Senator of North Dakota, MILTON YOUNG, who is recognized in Congress as being one of the best agricultural authorities in Washington. MILT YOUNG was also very instrumental in having this great new national laboratory located in Fargo, N. Dak.

I ask that the text of the Davies address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY ALED P. DAVIES, VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE, AT THE GROUND-BREAKING CEREMONIES OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE'S NATIONAL METABOLISM AND RADIATION RESEARCH LABORATORY AT FARGO, N. DAK., SEPTEMBER 9, 1962

It is an honor to be invited to take part today in this ceremony, breaking ground for this new National Metabolism and Radiation Research Laboratory which will be built here on the campus of North Dakota State University.

As a representative of the American Meat Institute, national trade organization of the meat packing industry, I should like to reiterate our continued devotion to the purity and wholesomeness of the Nation's meat supply.

In the spring of 1959 I went to our friend, Senator MILTON YOUNG, who, as you know, is the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations of the U.S. Senate. He and I discussed the potential problems facing the livestock and meat industry which might be created by the increased use of chemicals in agriculture. I asked for his help, which as always, he freely gave. At Senator YOUNG's suggestion I testified before the Senate committee and urged that an appropriation be made for the establishment of this laboratory for which ground is being broken today and urged the U.S. Department of Agriculture to take the lead in the program that will be carried on here.

Senator YOUNG gave untiringly of his time in seeing to it that his colleagues, both on the committee and in the Senate, became aware of the need to move forward to meet the challenge of the hazards created by science at the same time that we use science to develop a more abundant and better food supply. What we are doing today is largely a result of the vision and untiring efforts of Senator YOUNG in recognizing the significance of this problem early.

While I share the concern of those people who are worried about the residual effects of the use of chemicals in agriculture, we have to recognize that man is in a constant struggle for survival within his environment. This has been so since the beginning of time. Through increased knowledge and his God-given ability to think, man has emerged into dominion on this planet only because he has been able to control his environment to some extent. Probably the most significant advance has been in developments in the field of agriculture. Without scientific research developing new methods and new plants and new chemicals, we would not today be surrounded with the abundance of food that we enjoy as the best fed nation on this earth.

The year 1920 will some day be recognized as a great milestone year in American economic history. In that year we attained an acreage of developed cropland which has not since been significantly exceeded—and in fact may never be exceeded. For four decades we have lived on a nearly static amount of crop-producing land. During these same 40 years our national population has increased from 106 to 186 million—an increase of over 70 percent.

The 186 million are now eating better than the 106 million did in 1920—but the major factor in our ability to feed this sharply increased population and to upgrade the diets of all of us has been increased food yield per acre of land and per head of livestock.

All aspects of agronomic and biologic science have gone forward together with the result that we now eat better than any other people ever have before. A truly indispensable part of this scientific advance has been the development and use of the vast array of chemical material in crop and animal production, as well as in food preservation and processing.

In future years our national population will continue to grow. Any one who lives to ring in the year 2000—just 38 years from now—will be living among a population in this country of between 300 and 350 million people. This larger population will have to be fed from an acreage of farmland probably no greater than we are using at the present time but probably less. We will have to strive for constantly higher yields per acre and per animal. In other words, we will have to look to the increased use of science in feed products and food handling of which chemistry will be a major part.

According to experts in the Department of Agriculture, American farmers today spend at least a billion dollars a year for chemicals and services required for application. This is exclusive of fertilizers. The use of these chemicals, including insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and plant growth regulators saves products with a current farm volume of at least $4 billion. The $3 billion thus saved has been a major factor in farm income and has resulted in lower food prices to consumers and greater protection to human health and comfort. Significantly, we should be aware that the Government of the United States through the Department of Agriculture and the Pure Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, screen at least 5,000 new compounds per year in preliminary evaluation as to effectiveness and safety to man, crops, and livestock. Industry spends nearly $30 million annually in the research and development of new safer and more effective chemicals for agriculture.

All this means that we have no choice, at present or in the future, but to depend upon a greater use of chemicals in our agriculture. We will not be able to eat except upon that basis. This, of course, places an ever-increasing responsibility on the producers of crops and animals, the processors and handlers of food, and the Government constantly to be aware of and have as their watchword the fact that the wholesomeness and purity of our food supply is paramount. We have been especially fortunate in this great land since the establishment of the Department of Agriculture just 100 years ago that we have had as Secretaries men who are dedicated to scientific research and the use of scientific knowledge to increase agriculture productivity. They are men who have been aware of their responsibilities to both agriculture and the great consuming public.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, as Benson was before him, is deeply interested in this effort and he is to be congratulated that the plans for the building of this laboratory are moving apace. The program which will be carried forward here is in conformity with the expressed concern of President Kennedy that we need to know more about how to control better our eternal enemies in the insect world and how to do it with a minimum upset of the balance which is necessary to our health.

Dr. Byron Shaw, Administrator and Dr. M. R. Clarkson, his associate, of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture, as Senator YOUNG will testify, have been working diligently for many years in this field, and I know that they and their dedicated colleagues in the Department of Agriculture are as grateful as I am that we are moving ahead in this forward-looking venture. The American National Cattlemen's Association, especially, and the National Wool Growers and other farm organizations are to be complimented that 2 years ago they worked with Senator YOUNG and the Department of Agriculture in urging Congress to appropriate the funds for this laboratory. They also are deserving of praise for their educational effort for the intelligent and safe use of pesticides and other chemicals in agriculture. This has been a most effective program.

Three years ago, speaking on a scientific panel on "The Good in Our Food," Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president of the National Academy of Science, said: "If we are to achieve a more desirable way of life, we shall require more research, a more general understanding of science by the people of our country, and wiser administrators who will, with understanding of science, guarantee freedom to the investigator and apply scientific knowledge in the formulation of policies affecting the people of our country."

The results of research in the future that will be done in this laboratory will be aimed in this very direction. I am proud and happy to be associated with this program.

Thank you.

Right-To-Work Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress the highly questionable nature of an alleged survey of public opinion by the antilabor propagandist organization known as the National Right To Work Committee.

This obviously stacked poll has been widely circulated among Members of the Congress in a devious attempt to influence action against repeal of section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Labor-Management Act at such time as it may come before the Congress for consideration.

The survey purports to demonstrate that the great majority of Americans favor enactment of so-called right-to-work laws to outlaw in individual States the federally guaranteed freedom of labor and management to negotiate union shop provisions in collective bargaining contracts.

Among other claims aimed at destroying national labor-management policy and the collective bargaining process, this poll purports to prove that overall public opinion opposes repeal by Congress of the section of the Taft-Hartley Act which made these antilabor State laws possible, and favors placing the Nation's working people under the antitrust laws.

The alleged findings of this loaded survey are contradicted by far more believable evidence of American public opinion, notably the results of the 1958 election when the right-to-work law issue was on the ballot in six States and was rejected by voters in five of these States by overwhelming majorities.

At the same time, this anticollective bargaining law has been repeatedly rejected year after year by the legislatures of many of our States.

I point out that questions in this poll, which were loaded to evoke favorable antilabor answers, were submitted to only 1,413 persons throughout the United States but are being widely advertised as representative of the considered viewpoint of 180 million Americans.

I am concerned additionally about the misleading nature of this survey because this same National Right to Work Committee is financing a campaign presently in the great industrial State of Pennsylvania in an attempt to undermine our consistent record of sound labor-management relations and to disrupt industrial peace. At the same time, this group of hired propagandists has mounted similar antilabor campaigns in the States of Oklahoma, Maine, Michigan, Wyoming, Idaho, Montana, Vermont, and New Mexico.

I believe it a service to my colleagues in Congress and to the American public to call attention to the real nature of this poll. It has come to my attention that President George Meany of the AFL–CIO has analyzed this so-called survey and presented his findings to his membership. In order that my colleagues in Congress may have a counter viewpoint of the purported findings of this poll, under unanimous consent, I insert Mr. Meany's statement in the RECORD as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., August 29, 1962.

To All National and International Unions, State, and City Central Bodies:

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: This letter is a warning against a new malicious attack on the trade union movement launched by the viciously antilabor National Right-To-Work Committee.

This group operates in a manner that is as dishonest as its name, for, of course, the committee is not at all interested in finding work for workers, but only in smashing their unions.

The latest attack by this notorious propaganda front group for big business is an alleged poll in which the viewpoint of 1,413 persons interviewed is publicized as representative of the opinion of 180 million Americans.

The poll is loaded on its face. The antilabor committee confesses that it "worked with" the Opinion Research Corp. in "getting up the poll." It is obvious that the questions have been designed so as to draw answers harmful to labor.

Already the alleged survey has been picked up by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER and shown in film form to more than 100 conservative Congressmen. This survey obviously did not change any of these Congressmen's enmity toward labor. It did give them alleged facts for continuing their fight against legislation labor seeks.

The survey seeks to prove that unions should be brought under antitrust law. It displays figures which purport to show that the average American fears union power.

They say that among these Americans who have heard of the so-called right-to-work laws sentiment is a solid 4 to 1 in favor of such laws.

The principal question of the poll reveals its loaded nature: "No American should be forced against his will to join a church, union, or political organization."

On this point the claimed result was 93 percent.

It is small wonder that the result was not nearer 100 percent because the whole question is based on an exploitation of human, religious, and political ideals.

It goes without saying that a Presbyterian, Methodist or Baptist would not agree that he should be forced to become a Catholic and that a member of the Jewish faith would not agree he should be forced to become a Protestant, Catholic, or member of the Moslem religion. Wars have been fought and new nations founded on such a fundamental issue.

Likewise the answer is a foregone conclusion when a Democrat is asked whether he believes it would be right to force him to become a Republican.

To equate membership in a trade union with man's religious and/or political beliefs, to inject this question into the same sentence and to surround the whole with the imputation of force, is not only dishonest but malicious as well.

The claims by those making the poll contradict proved fact in a number of important instances.

In the nine Western States, grouped by the pollsters, they claim that 59 percent of the population favor right-to-work laws.

This fingertip sampling ignores the result of the 1958 national election when the so-called right to work issue was placed before the electorate of the Western States of Washington, California, Idaho, and Colorado with the result that voters in those States voted against the right to work proposals by overwhelming majorities. In California, for instance, the vote against this proposed law was by a plurality of 1 million. In Montana, in the same year, an attempt to gain a scant 25,000 signatures on an initiative petition to place the issue on the ballot failed.

Likewise, in nine Northeastern States the pollists claim that 62 percent of the population favors a right-to-work law. Here again the facts prove these figures false.

These are leading industrial States and not a single one of these States has a right to work law. On the contrary, repeated attempts to have a right-to-work law enacted by the State legislatures have failed miser-

ably. And in Maine and New Hampshire, right-to-work laws have been repealed.

By contrast, in the 11 North-Central States, 6 of which have right to work laws, the pollists claim only 55 percent are favorable. It should be pointed out that this group of States includes Ohio, where voters in the 1958 election defeated the right-to-work law by a plurality of nearly 1 million.

It is pertinent to note that the National Right To Work Committee had an earlier poll conducted in 1957 which also made glowing findings that the right-to-work issue would win at the 1958 election.

The fact is that the latest and most conclusive demonstration of public opinion in the Nation over the merits of the union-busting right-to-work laws was at the polls in the 1958 election.

Some 7 million persons voted on this issue in 6 States, and in a seventh, Montana, rejected the law on a petition basis.

The proposal was rejected by voters at the polls in five States by overwhelming majorities. It was approved in only one State, Kansas, and there by a small majority.

Including Montana, the result was a 6 to 1 rejection of the right-to-work law—a fact that far outweighs the fiction of an obviously loaded poll.

Since 1958, not a single State has enacted such a law, despite the fact that such laws have been introduced by the right to work mercenaries and propagandists at almost every session of every legislature. Presently we are engaged in bitter fights on this issue in Maine, Oklahoma, Vermont, Idaho, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

As is well known by labor-management authorities, the manner in which a union shop agreement comes into being is carefully set forth and conditioned by the Federal Taft-Hartley Act. It is a demonstration of the democratic process, the will of the majority, and the exercise of freedom of contract in collective bargaining.

However, these facts are not generally known to the public or to the average individual.

It is up to the labor movement itself to tell the true facts. In your respective areas you will be hearing much of this poll in the near future. It will be your task to carry the brunt of the fight for the truth.

You can expect this poll, especially in the filmed version Senator GOLDWATER is now using, will appear in your area in the near future. These paid propagandists, who have admitted using 42 percent of the funds they raise from the American business community just to raise more funds, plan to make wide use of this new propaganda device.

Therefore, I urge you to be on your guard. When this stacked poll is used in your area, demand the right to be heard so that the public will learn the truth about this issue. Remember, the American people believe in fairplay and when they know the facts they will turn their backs on those who use lies for political purposes.

I have given you a few examples you can use in your presentations to the people. In addition, there are materials available at this headquarters that effectively answer these hired hands of big business on the goals of their campaign. I hope and expect that the leaders of labor at every level will obtain these materials, and use them to counter the mounting campaign against not only the unions which make up the labor movement but the people whose hands and hearts make up unions.

Fraternally yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
President.

Where Are the Jobs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as a backer of the retraining approach to overcoming the very serious unemployment problem that continues to burden our economy, I am frequently faced with the question, "Where are these jobs for which you will retrain the unemployed?" It has been my contention that there are hundreds of thousands of jobs in our country going begging, jobs seeking men and women but unable to find those qualified to fill them. From time to time some very concrete example of these jobs are found in the news columns of our daily press. A constant reminder of them can be found in the help wanted columns of any major newspaper.

A large step forward in finding a more extensive answer to the question of "Where are the jobs?" is now in process in the Labor Department. It is the "Directory of Occupational Titles," a work designed to help classify the skills which our economy needs. It is real progress for one of the most basic problems in fighting unemployment is that of recognizing the skills which are becoming obsolete with the dynamic movement of our economy and tagging those which are increasing in demand.

The Washington World, in its September 4 issue, included a statement by Mr. H. H. Pope, a cafeteria owner from my own part of the country, St. Louis. Mr. Pope spoke of the need which his firm has for workers, and this in an area of considerable unemployment. I should like to place Mr. Pope's remarks in the RECORD, along with the introduction by the World, and note an earlier item which I placed in the RECORD also pointing out this matter of jobs going begging in the restaurant industry—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 30, 1962, page A6534. On the same page as Mr. Pope's remarks the World comments on the lack of accurate statistics in this field. The "Directory of Occupational Titles" will help meet the need which is noted in this item, which appears following Mr. Pope's statement. Finally, another step forward is noted in the September 3 issue of Newsweek. I am placing that, too, in the RECORD to help indicate the paths that progress may take:

[From the Washington World, Sept. 4, 1962]

UNEMPLOYMENT HEIGHTENED BY REFUSAL OF UNSKILLED TO TAKE AVAILABLE JOBS

(NOTE.—Unemployment, at some rarefied levels, is a heady statistical draft used to induce talk of vast public works programs, shorter workweeks and other labor-thinning tactics. Down at the working level of everyday business, it becomes a dollars-and-cents, horsesense matter of practical concern—and it also produces some surprises. Here, for instance, is an unsolicited letter from H. H. Pope, of Pope's Cafeterias, Inc., St. Louis, Mo. It is presented here as possibly symptomatic of a growing question that has profoundly important implications for every American seriously concerned about employment.)

(By H. H. Pope)

For some time I have been puzzled by reports of widespread unemployment in the United States. Apparently, President Kennedy, Congress, the unions, and other people are concerned about the alleged unemployment situation.

Many proposals, such as tax reduction and public works, are motivated by desire to "do something about the unemployment situation." What has puzzled me is our difficulty in finding applicants who are neat, clean, dependable, willing, and able to work.

Our starting rates range from $1.12 to $1.25 per hour, plus approximately 35 cents per hour in fringe benefits. Admittedly, this is not so much money as a worker could earn in certain factories, but we think it is a fair salary in view of our working conditions and the fact that we require no skills. We hire unskilled employees and train them ourselves.

A few days ago the local director of employment security was quoted in the local newspapers as saying that there are over 15,000 unskilled unemployed in the local area. Many years ago we had given up trying to get employees through the local employment security office as they were never able to supply applicants who were neat, clean, dependable, willing, and able to work.

After reading the report of the large number of unskilled unemployed, we again tried to get applicants through the employment security office. We have met with limited success in getting applicants from this source. In order to get sufficient people to meet our employment needs, we must still spend several hundred dollars per month advertising in newspapers.

Early this week, while attending a meeting of the Regional Food Service Management Guild in Buffalo, I discussed our experience with other guild members and found that the failure of the employment security office to supply unskilled applicants is rather typical in many parts of the United States. Our member from Boston, for example, reports that the employment security office there frankly admits its inability to supply applicants.

There is a growing suspicion in my mind that a great proportion of the so-called unemployed are either unavailable, unemployable, or underqualified for the jobs they hope to obtain.

Is it possible that the expectations of our unemployed have been raised to the point that they are setting their sights on positions which they can never obtain? Is it possible that many of the people who could and should be working as babysitters, housemaids, or lawnmower operators are trying to secure high paying jobs in industry?

We see statistics about the total lack of unemployment in most European countries. Is it possible that these statistics are not obtained in the same way that we obtain unemployment statistics in the United States? Or, is it possible that the lack of unemployment in Europe is the result of the willingness of unskilled people to accept menial jobs?

[From the Washington World, Sept. 4, 1962]

WHAT CAN I DO?

Sadly lacking in the talk of unemployment in America are statistics to illuminate this all-important question: To what extent is unemployment a result of lack of qualified workers rather than lack of job openings?

Top economists in Congress, notably Representative TOM CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, cite this factor as the key to the problem. To help shed some more light on it, the Washington World asks its readers to write directly to the editor describing the help-wanted situation in their hometowns.

Do the classified ad sections of your newspapers indicate there are as many, or less, job open than jobs wanted?

Does your own experience in business indicate any difficulty in finding qualified workers?

Are local employment offices (particularly State operated ones) able to supply all the trained and willing workers needed in your area?

Answers to those questions, which will be passed along to appropriate Members of Congress for their consideration, may help do something about the situation.

[From Newsweek magazine, Sept. 3, 1962]

LABOR DEPARTMENT

The day may not be very far away when unemployment listings will be accompanied by a tally of job vacancies. All that's necessary, experts here say, is a little experience with the new retraining act which will force the Department to keep up on what jobs are available and where. These experts are convinced there is usually a worker shortage in many areas even when unemployment is a burden.

Coinage of a Medal in Recognition of the Distinguished Services of Sam Rayburn

SPEECH
OF
HON. RAY ROBERTS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Senate Joint Resolution 133. This resolution would provide for a service medal for the distinguished late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, my predecessor as Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Texas.

Prior to this recommendation, the only other gold medal struck for service as a Member of Congress was for Alben W. Barkley while he was Vice President. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency stated in their report that the committee was making this recommendation "only because Sam Rayburn was an extraordinary man, one of the truly great men of his generation."

The language on this medal will relate to Mr. Rayburn's service to the people of the United States. He often said "service" was the most beautiful world in the English language. No man exemplified service to his fellowman and his beloved House of Representatives more than Sam Rayburn.

His heart was big enough to love each of the more than 3,000 Members with whom he served, and he inspired the confidence and trust of all who knew him.

Because of his dedication and devotion to his district, his State, and his Nation, his memory will be a living inspiration to all of us.

I consider it a great honor and privilege to recommend the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 133.

Cuba: Red Police State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Robert Betts on September 11, 1962:

SAN DIEGO REPORTER ESCAPES FROM CUBA; CONFIRMS SOVIET BUILDUP, GRIM RED POLICE STATE

(By Robert Betts)

KINGSTON, JAMAICA.—Communist Cuba's Iron Curtain is closing down fast as the Russian military buildup continues.

A British corespondent, Edwin Tetlow, of the London Daily Telegraph, and I scraped under it by the skin of our teeth this morning after four correspondents were picked up during the previous 24 hours by the G–2, Cuba's secret police.

During 4 days spent around Havana watching the buildup in progress, our every movement was closely watched. We were trailed wherever we went, on foot or by car.

We could not leave the hotel without the G–2 being close behind. Telephone calls were so difficult to make that it soon became obvious every call was being tapped.

SPIES, MILITIA WAIT TO POUNCE

Meanwhile, there were Russians, Czechoslovakians, East Germans and others of the Soviet bloc milling all around us—in the hotel, in cafes and nightclubs and on the streets. There were stocky young Russians who might have been in any part of the Soviet setup, from engineers to intelligencemen.

In addition, we had to contend with the Cuban Communist spies and militiamen. Along the narrow streets we were passed from one tracker to another. Obviously they were waiting only for us to make one move against the strict regulations which now govern this country to justify an arrest and a charge that would keep us there.

Preferably they wanted to catch us spying. Nobody can be trusted in Cuba now. If you order a taxi you do not know which side the driver is watching, for no Cuban will be drawn into conversation.

Everywhere there is fear of watching eyes and listening ears. This was the Communist police state in grim reality.

TECHNICIANS HAVE MILITARY BEARING

The island we escaped from yesterday morning after three searches, one by the customs followed by two more searches by G–2, is no longer Prime Minister Fidel Castro's Cuba. It is Soviet Premier Nikita Khruschev's Cuba. Bearded Big Brother Castro still keeps watch from stickers on public buildings, hotels and places of entertainment. But the paunchier face of Bigger Brother Khrushchev grows daily larger beside him, together with portraits of Lenin, Marx, and others and the usual Communist slogans.

Khrushchev's sturdy young men, who have been described as technicians but who by their bearing could easily be trained military men of varying rank, can be seen in the hotel, strolling in groups along the street or being driven in trucks to some unknown destination on the island.

Trying to visit some of these camps was presumably what put the four correspondents into the clutches of G–2.

We were lucky to have been released yesterday morning to fly to Kingston and safety. We were trailed as far as the airport, accompanied by seemingly friendly fellow travelers.

The plane, loaded with Cuban passengers anxiously waiting to get away, was kept waiting an hour while the G–2 men searched every piece of our luggage and clothing. They released us, then called us back and searched again.

When finally they let us proceed to the plane, we received a last-minute message that four missing correspondents had not been traced.

As we watched Cuba drop behind us in the calm Caribbean sky, a KLM steward brought us a drink and two little packets containing a moisture pack to freshen you up. He smiled. We took them gratefully.

We needed them.

For a Better Way on Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Boston Herald on September 8, 1962:

FOR A BETTER WAY ON COTTON

The refusal of the Tariff Commission to grant a compensatory extra duty on cotton textile imports will be no tragedy if other and better means are found to stabilize the domestic industry. The Kennedy administration will be under sharp pressure to find those other means.

Today the Government provides two conflicting forms of protectionism on cotton. To enable American grown raw cotton to be sold on the world market it grants an export subsidy of 8½ cents a pound on all cotton sold abroad. This means that competing foreign textile manufacturers can buy American cotton for less than our own manufacturers have to pay for it.

Thus the subsidy that helps to keep the American cotton farmer happy is a special charge on the American manufacturer.

To even up this competitive injustice the Tariff Commission was asked to provide a special fee of 8½ cents a pound on imported cotton goods. But the Commission found, 3 to 2, that it could not properly consider the manufacturer's problem, but must confine itself to the needs of agriculture, which did not take in the fee. (There is a regular duty on imported cotton goods of about 14 cents a pound.)

What has been basically wrong here is not the lack of a compensatory fee for the manufacturers but the export subsidy itself. We ought to be finding out why American agriculture, which has been so immensely successful in increasing productivity, cannot compete with far less mechanized foreign farming.

If we progress toward an agreement with the European Common Market, as we must,

the export subsidy is going to be one of the serious obstacles.

But if our curious farm policy still compels such a subsidy, we must fully face the cost of it and provide the same subsidy for cotton sold on the domestic market as for that sold abroad. It is economic dishonesty to force a kind of reverse subsidy on our own textile industry.

The Tariff Commission's decision cannot be considered bad if other and better means are found to adjust our textile economy.

Unemployment in the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the August 21, 1962, issue of the Washington Post a full page advertisement sponsored by the National Coal Policy Conference, the extract of which will follow. The emotional appeal of this advertisement is perhaps unexcelled. Its objective of full employment has unquestionable merit and my complete support. But there I must end my plaudits, for the disregard of facts in drawing conclusions is astounding. The National Coal Policy Conference has concluded that the unemployment in coal communities and all the problems of the coal industry are due to the importation of residual oil. This is ridiculous.

With specific references to the claims of this advertisement, Mr. E. A. Evans, managing director of the Oil Users Association has drawn together in a letter to President John F. Kennedy well known facts which disprove these claims of the National Coal Policy Conference.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of the advertisement and Mr. Evans' rebuttal letter to President Kennedy:

AMERICANS NEED JOBS, NOT A DOLE, MR. PRESIDENT

PRESIDENT KENNEDY: We must end unemployment and move the economy ahead, as you said in your recent television address on the state of the Nation's economy.

But a dole and a handout of surplus food are not the answer.

Only jobs will solve America's economic problems.

Extended unemployment compensation, aid to children of the unemployed, job retraining, work camps for unemployed youth—all of these things are fine and what you have done to ease the hardship of America's unfortunate unemployed families is commendable. But they are only stopgap measures.

You say that employment and income are rising nationally and that other economic indicators do not warrant the conclusion that we are entering a new recession.

Unfortunately, this is not true of coal communities. Unemployment in some coal communities is not 5 or 6 percent—like the national average—but as high as 35 or 40 percent.

Our people want jobs.

You can help put them to work—right now—in the coal fields of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Illinois, and Ohio—pockets of persistent unemployment and economic distress in which, as you said in your TV address, coal miners can no longer find jobs to support their families.

How can you create the jobs our people want and need?

By using the powers of your office to stem the flood of foreign residual fuel oil imports.

This imported waste product of foreign refining operations is taking jobs away from American coal miners in those very pockets of distress where the Government has been forced to undertake expensive temporary remedial action. If you cut back the amount of residual oil which can now be imported, and limit imports in the future, many of the unemployed miners will again find work and become self-supporting. No longer will their families be subjected to the degrading experience of living on Government handouts. They will again become taxpayers—good customers of the local merchant.

The coal industry is the key to economic recovery in many of the Nation's pockets of unemployment.

But the coal industry cannot expand production and employment—it cannot put these unemployed miners back to work at productive jobs—as long as imported waste residual oil is permitted to take over coal markets.

The power to end this threat to economic expansion—to expanded employment—to economic vigor and growth in widespread areas of the Nation—rests with you, Mr. President.

We respectfully urge you to act today.

This message is published by the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., in behalf of the following State committees working for the economic recovery of the bituminous coal industry: The Illinois State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference; the Indiana State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference; the Kentucky State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference; the Maryland State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference; the Ohio State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference; the Pennsylvania State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference; the Tennessee State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference; the Virginia State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference; and the West Viriginia State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference.

OIL USERS ASSOCIATION,
Miami, Fla., August 31, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On August 21, 1962, there appeared in the Washington Post a full page advertisement of the National Coal Policy Conference.

The Oil Users Association, whose members consist of organizations such as manufacturing industries and utilities that use large amounts of energy-producing fuels, take strong issue with the statements contained in this advertisement.

The statements of the National Coal Policy Conference, in reference to their claim that coal miners of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Illinois, and Ohio could be put to work "right now" by stopping all imports of residual oil, is clearly misleading and does not follow the facts as pointed out in our formal presentation of July 1, 1961, to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

Residual oil has long been in short supply in this country and the imports of this product over the years has had very little, if any, effect on the employment of miners in the coal States. That this is true can best be pointed out by the three principal factors which have been responsible for such unemployment.

First. The "mechanization" of the coal industry, as shown by the data provided by the coal industry itself in "Bituminous Coal Data, 1960." In 1950, the bituminous coal industry employed 415,582 men and produced 516,311,000 tons of coal. The output per man-day was 6.77 tons. Ten years later the industry employed 159,100 men and produced 413 million tons at a productivity rate of 13.25 tons per man-day. In the 10-year period over a quarter of a million men have left the industry, yet the output of those that have remained has doubled. During the same 10-year period the use of residual oil in the United States remained relatively constant: 554 million barrels in 1950 and 556 million barrels in 1960.

Second. The railroads have caused a tremendous decline in the demand for coal. They used 114 million tons of coal in 1947 and they have now switched almost completely to diesel fuel and today use only about 2 million tons of coal per year. This is a loss in volume of approximately 112 million tons per year, or nearly half the total decline in coal demands since 1947.

Third. Millions of families throughout the country stopped shoveling coal into basement furnaces and installed oil burners or gas burners in their homes. In 1947 the figure for retail coal deliveries was 137 million tons; in 1960 the figure was 29 million tons, a loss of 108 million tons per year.

It is of interest to note that the National Coal Policy Conference chose to completely ignore all of these facts in attempting to present their case and it is also of interest that in addition to ignoring them, they chose not to base their case on whether or not the present import program is or is not in the best interest of national security—the only reason why imports of residual oils should or should not have their imports restricted.

Again, as we have clearly outlined in our reports to OCDM and OEP, a reduction in residual oil imports is not in the best interests of national security but do, in fact, have the opposite effect. We have the greatest confidence in the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and feel that at the proper time his report will be submitted to you with recommendations which will be fairly made. All of the inequities created and the increased costs suffered by the public, because of import restrictions on residual fuel oil, continue to exist in ever-increasing quantities and we, therefore, urge that the question of the possibility of entirely removing import restrictions on residual fuel oil be considered by you as soon as conveniently possible.

Very truly yours,

E. A. EVANS.

Town of Wales, Mass., Bicentennial—1762–1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the beautiful town of Wales, Mass., in my congressional district celebrated its bicentennial, 1762–1962, from August 11 through August 26. I had the distinct pleasure of speaking to the townspeople on the opening day of the 2-week-long observance. I will insert my speech at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD,

along with the names of the town officers, and the members of the bicentennial committee:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN BOLAND DELIVERED AT WALES, MASS., BICENTENNIAL

I am grateful for the invitation of the bicentennial committee for inviting me to be a part of this celebration.

This is a historic event that occurs but seldom in the annals of this community.

Fortunately, no words of mine are necessary to embellish the significance of the occasion. The program that has been arranged for the next 2 weeks gives greater vitality and spirit to the meaningfulness of this celebration than wordy proclamations of mine.

But, believe me, I did seize the opportunity to come here for it brings back fond memories of years ago as a Springfield Boys' Club camper that hiked the magnificent and challenging woods that surround this town—to explore the abandoned lead mines and trails of yesteryear and to plunge into the invigorating and sparkling blue waters of Lake George.

No one who has done these things and glanced at the history of this town could ignore the significance of this bicentennial. We see this town today as a peaceful, quiet, charming, picturesque and beautiful place. It is difficult to picture it as a rather thriving, humming community of yesteryear. But it was. Craftsmen in currying, tanning, shoe building, experts in weaving cloths—wools, cottons and satins—all of these people added to the luster of the 1800's. And these were the people who followed the hardy pioneers of 1726 and the founders of this town in 1762.

And one could not read the information contained in the little yellow bicentennial history pamphlet without catching the spirit of America—without recognizing the basis upon which our national existence was built.

For the people who came to this place 200 years ago came to build a better life for themselves and their families. The hardships they endured and the sacrifices they made are difficult to realize by us in this year of 1962. For the year of 1762 was fraught with dangers and totally without conveniences. It was their own indomitable will—their pulling together with their neighbors—their faith in the Almighty and their lives revolving around their church—it was all of this that helped them to succeed and to survive. It was indeed this spirit that was sewed into the fabric of our system that has enabled this Nation to grow and prosper.

We have a duty in this day and age to preserve what has been handed down to us by those who walked this ground 200 and more years ago.

We can best perform this obligation by doing the best we can in the job that is ours—by understanding the meaning and significance of the kind of government under which we live.

As a chain is only as strong as its weakest link, so too, a nation is only as strong as smallest and weakest adjunct of government. It is the decay at the bottom that weakens the structure to a point of collapse. This Nation needs to be strong at all levels of government—good morally, spiritually—embued with the finest realization of how much good citizens mean to the continued existence of our country—the overriding importance of a well-educated and informed people.

And so it is well to pause and reflect during the period of this bicentennial celebration of the heritage that has been draped around this good little town and to ask ourselves if we have kept faith with those who pledged their lives, their fortunes and their honor to build this town 200 years ago.

I congratulate the committee, the people of Wales—present the town with a flag—high honor and personal privilege, to bring to this gathering and to the town of Wales the congratulations, best wishes and greetings of the President of the United States.

TOWN OFFICERS

Selectmen and board of health: Wallace H. Adam, Robert Archambault, Ithamar B. Davis, Jr., chairman.

Moderator: Holywell Dreyer.

Town clerk: Agnita Baker.

Town treasurer: Lois Carrier.

Tax collector: Agnita Baker.

Town accountant: Sylvia Worth.

Assessors: Walter Worth, Ithamar B. Davis, Jr., and Robert McKay.

Cemetery commissioners: Samuel Dickinson, Jr., Guy Johnson, and Albertie Dunham.

School committee: Holywell Dreyer, Helen Adam, Peter Pernoski.

Tree warden: Guy Johnson.

Library trustees: Jules Slepian, Mary Bushey, John Blakely.

Constables: Robert McKay, Donald Morgan, Myron Heck.

BICENTENNIAL COMMITTEE

David S. Terrill, chairman; Ray Allen, town parade; Mrs. Donald Morgan and Mrs. Charles Reynolds, queen; William Bowden, beards; Mrs. George Brelsford, publicity; Mrs. Walter Worth, decorations; Mrs. Clarence Brown, Jr., block dance; George Gregoire, old home day; Mrs. I. B. Davis and Mrs. Albert Green, town history; Mrs. Roland Poirier and Mrs. Cutler Heck, fashion show; Joseph Poirier, etchings; Mrs. Rena Bowden, bi-cenball; Walter Worth and Roland Poirier, barbecue; Peter Pernoski, tickets for ball; Mrs. Mary Bushey, field day; Mrs. Roland Poirier, square dance; and, Mr. and Mrs. H. Sebolt, tickets for barbecue and square dance.

Anderson—Uncensored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Anderson Free Press of Anderson, S.C., is one of the most outspoken and courageous newspapers in this country. It is edited by Mrs. Beth Klosky, and its publisher is Mr. H. G. Anderson. This newspaper is noted for taking strong editorial positions regardless of the consequences which may flow from doing so.

One of the most interesting features in this newspaper is a front page column entitled "Anderson—Uncensored." I ask unanimous consent that this column as printed in the September 6 Anderson Free Press issue be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANDERSON—UNCENSORED

A posse of preachers, mostly from New York and New Jersey, who went to Albany, Ga., last week to support the integration efforts of Dr. Martin Luther King—and were lodged in jail after staging a demonstration at city hall and refusing to obey police orders to move on—should be ashamed of themselves. Certainly, their exhibition was unworthy of the cloth they wear.

Northern ministers have plenty of problems at home to which they could devote their energies—take, for instance, the sorry stories of sin and degradation in the housing jungles of New York and other northern cities. But instead, these preachers chose to come all the way down to a small Georgia city which, without agitators and their allies—including intruding white ministers—would continue to maintain harmony in race relations.

The Albany police chief's remarks to these northern ministers massed around city hall should have been enough to shame any responsible citizen of decency and conscience. However, the very fact that the ministers had advertised their coming, knew what to expect, and deliberately set about to create a disturbance which could have easily led to bloodshed inclines us to liken their conduct to that of any other hoodlum who defies the authority of the police to protect lives in the community and maintain law and order. Such misguided actions in the name of the clergy serve no good purpose and, we fear, may lessen the influence of the pulpit.

We wish it had been possible to present to every one of the 70-odd preachers, for required reading in jail, a factfinding memo of Rev. Martin Luther King whose efforts at racial agitation they so ardently champion. We are of the opinion that this memo would also be good reading, between sailboat outings, for President Kennedy who intervened in King's behalf back when the President was campaigning for office.

The research department of the Grass Roots League has come up with the following facts:

Martin Luther King, Jr., started his academic education in Morehouse (Negro) College, Atlanta, Ga., where he was noticed by president Benjamin E. Mays, a notorious Negro radical with a public record of affiliation with some 25 fronts of which 7 were Communist Party fronts operating among the Negroes. (Report of hearings by the Louisiana Joint Legislative Committee, Mar. 6–9, 1957, p. 57, and also the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Feb. 23, 1956, p. 2831.) Mays played a major part in putting King's feet on the road which eventually led to Montgomery (bus boycott). (New York Post, Apr. 10, 1957, article by Ted Poston.)

After graduating from Morehouse, King entered Crozier Theological Seminary in Chester, Pa. At Crozier, he was influenced by president Mordecai Johnson (Negro) of Howard (Negro) University, who has a public record of 14 Communist-front citations, with 2 Communist affiliations (Florida Legislative Investigation Committee hearings, Feb. 10, 1958.)

A scholarship won at Crozier took King to Boston University for a Ph. D. degree. Two influential members of the Boston University faculty were professors of religion, Allen Knight Chambers, treasurer and a director of the NAACP, with at least five Communist-front affiliations; and Rev. Howard Thurman (Negro), dean of the Boston University Chapel, with a public record of six Communist-front citations. Chalmers and Thurman were early members of the Advisory Committee of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), believed to be a Communist front with directing Red cell in the advisory committee of which Martin Luther King is now a member.

While Reverend King appears to have been well trained in Red ideology, revolutionary aims and tactics, it is evident that the commies are making sure King operates according to their plans. According to the Communist Daily Worker of April 12, 1957, Reverend King has a secretary or manager named Bayard Rustin (Negro) who claims to have been one of the founders of CORE. Rustin is described as an expert on "civil disobedience" and advocates violent "nonviolence." (Associated Press dispatch, Apr.

11, 1960.) Rustin not only is one of eight "impartial observers" who attended the 16th National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., but also was identified as a member of the American Forum for Socialist Education, cited as a Communist front by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, December 19, 1957.

Further evidence that the Reds make certain that Martin L. King follows the Communist line by keeping Bayard Rustin, his secretary at King's side is seen in the fact that, although Reverend King led the Montgomery bus boycott, he was aided by organizer Rustin in the 1958 march on Washington which included three busloads of Communists from New York. Actually this march was a Communist project (Communist Worker, May 17, 1959).

King was a speaker at the Labor Day seminar (1957) of the Highlander Folk School (known as a Communist training school), and was photographed in company with Communist leader Abner Berry, Negro, and other racial agitators.

The factfinding memorandum concludes: "Rev. Martin L. King's leadership of Negro malcontents, in our opinion, could succeed only by the overthrow of the Government of the United States. Clearly, any citizen whose activities are likely to result in the undermining and downfall of the American Republic, whether done wittingly or unwittingly, must be regarded as a traitor to his country."

How many clerical dupes may one day find themselves in this category?

Five Big U.N. Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the issue in H.R. 2768 is whether we believe in the United Nations as an effective means of peace. Other persons subdivide the issues and find more than one. One of the most interesting analysis was made by Peter Edson, editorial writer for the Washington Daily News. I believe it merits reading as a capsule form of the situation facing the United Nations. The editorial follows:

FIVE BIG U.N. ISSUES
(Second of a series)
(By Peter Edson)

Disarmament, the nuclear test ban, peaceful use of outer space, colonialism, and United Nations financing are considered the five most important isues before the General Assembly opening in New York next Tuesday.

The Cuban situation, the Congo, admission of Red China, and possibly the Berlin and the U-2 flights may be noisier issues during general debate. But only the Congo issue in this second five is on the agenda this year and the U.N. will do little or nothing about the others. Admission of Red China is again expected to be defeated.

The issues with top priority are probably the nuclear test band and disarmament. There isn't anything the U.N. can do about disarmament except recommend that the major powers keep on negotiating and come up with an agreement. But another resolution of this kind is needed by U.S. Chief Negotiator Arthur Dean before the recessed Geneva Disarmament Conference reconvenes November 8.

The test ban is a more immediate question. Only 4 of the 104 U.N. members have nuclear weapons. Theoretically India should have no difficulty getting nearly 100 votes for its resolution for an uninspected test ban. U.N. Secretary General U Thant reports the members about evenly divided on this issue, however.

The United States must oppose this resolution or stop testing to support it. Russia may support the resolution but go right on testing whenever it pleases. The United States must therefore work for another resolution calling for an inspected test ban.

Since Americans, British, and Russians will be continuing test ban talks at Geneva while the General Assembly is in session, an inspected test ban resolution will strengthen the West's hand.

The 28-nation U. N. Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space began its deliberations a week before the General Assembly opening with the Russians orbiting procedural monkey wrenches.

Last year the General Assembly approved extension of international law and the United Nations Charter to outer space. This invalidated Russia's flag of conquest on the moon.

The American position now is to try to get agreement on establishment of worldwide weather observation and communications satellites as soon as possible. The Russians oppose this as an attempt to begin military reconnaissance in space for aggressive purposes.

The American reply to this is that military reconnaissance is a necessary peaceful use of outer space until there is a signed agreement on disarmament. And in the American disarmament plan there is a ban on military use of outer space.

The colonial issue is due for heated debate again. Russian membership on the Committee of 17 considering this question has converted its deliberations into a rabble rousing, cold war harangue to free all colonies at once.

There are still seven African territories under British colonial status—Northern and Southern Rhodesia, Nyassaland, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Swaziland and Zanzibar—as well as British Guiana. Portugal still has two colonies of much interest to the U.N.—Angola and Mozambique.

One move under consideration is to get Russia off the Committee of 17 so that its African, Asian, and Latin-American majority may adopt a more sober policy on colonialism.

United Nations financial affairs will be extensively debated this year in getting the General Assembly to implement the World Court's recent opinion that U.N. special assessments must be paid, the same as regular contributions, by all members. The General Assembly must approve this by a two-thirds majority.

Failure To Lower Taxes Blamed for Business Lag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body have long been convinced of the need for true tax reform. National economic growth is essential, and this Government's role in that growth is keyed to our tax system. I have introduced legislation on this subject, and I regret that there has been no real congressional progress in tax laws this year.

Seldom has the case for tax reduction and reform been more cogently stated than in a recent article by the noted columnist, Sylvia Porter. This article, which appeared in the August 29, 1962, issue of the Minneapolis Tribune, is worthy of the attention of all lawmakers.

FAILURE TO LOWER TAXES BLAMED FOR BUSINESS LAG
(By Sylvia Porter)

NEW YORK.—"Why is it that our tax system is now getting so much blame for being a drag on our economy?" asked the woman across the dinner table the other evening.

"I listened to President Kennedy's TV address on taxes, heard him condemn our high rates, promise tax cuts in 1963, and refer to how much faster the Common Market countries are growing than we are. But I've not heard a simple explanation of why the system is a drag and how our tax rates compare with those of Europe."

These are pertinent observations. So here goes with my "simple explanation."

No other government takes so big a bite out of the paychecks of workers and the profits of businessmen as ours does—and this goes from Communist Russia to the socialistic and totalitarian nations of Europe and South America. None hampers employment and production with such confiscatory tax rates as the United States, proud upholder of free enterprise and capitalism.

In our capitalistic nation, 86 percent of the Government's take comes from taxes on paychecks, profits, estates, or gifts. In Russia, in complete contrast, only 15 percent comes from taxes on incomes and the 85 percent balance comes from direct taxes on Soviet citizens when they buy food, clothing, shelter, etc.

In the prospering Common Market nation of West Germany, only 22 percent of the Central Government's collections comes from income and capital taxes; the rest is raised from sales, excise taxes, customs duties. In prospering Italy, the income-capital tax bite is only 26 percent. The closest to the United States in relying so heavily on income and profits taxes is New Zealand, which collects 65 percent from these sources.

No other government penalizes individuals or businessmen with extraordinary abilities and ambitions to the extent that our tax structure does. Our top tax rate of 91 percent on individual incomes is frankly confiscatory, can't possibly be justified on financial grounds, for few individuals who qualify for this bracket permit themselves to get into it.

A personal income tax rate which reaches 50 percent on as low as $16,000 of taxable income is distinctly discouraging to individual risk taking. As for the 52 percent tax rate on corporations, the evidence is overwhelming that this has retarded American industry's ability to reinvest earnings in job-creating activities.

No other government has held to an oppressive tax structure as long as we have—with the possible exception of Great Britain, another nation turning in a sluggish performance.

Every other nation which slapped on steep taxes during World War II has long since reformed them—which is what President Kennedy was referring to when he mentioned in his TV address that "by lightening tax burdens," the Common Market countries have achieved "full employment and an economic growth rate twice ours."

No other government has "accepted" four recessions since the end of World War II without its leaders getting down to work and saying flatly our tax structure is at least partially responsible and reform is overdue.

There is no doubt that our tax rates helped strangle the 1959 recovery. They bit so substantially into rising income and profits that the advance didn't have a chance to survive.

Tax reduction reform was bypassed in 1960, though, bypassed again in 1961, and now it's dead for 1962. Meanwhile, as Mr. Kennedy pointed out, during the past 15 months of economic expansion, Federal taxes have siphoned out $5 billion more from our economy than increased Federal spending has poured into the business stream. This is a measure of the way our high rates tend to brake a recovery almost automatically as it proceeds.

Attorney General Speaks of Efforts To Combat Communist Activity in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an interview broadcast on the NBC "Monitor" program, Sunday, September 2, 1962, in which the Attorney General spoke of the efforts of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover to combat Communist activity in the United States.

A portion of the transcript of that interview follows:

Question. "Monitor" over the past several weeks has been examining the work of the FBI and its efforts in, among other things, the fight against subversives. Recently, J. Edgar Hoover was described as an ineffective "spy swatter" in this work. How would you characterize the work of Mr. Hoover?

ATTORNEY GENERAL. Well, I think that he has contributed one of the outstanding jobs of public service over the period of the last 30 years, and I think that if it hadn't been for his efforts, his direction, his organizational ability, that the Communist Party and subversion in the United States would be far stronger, far more dangerous, and would have received—the Soviet Union, Communist countries abroad—would have received far more security information than they have. I think that the ineffectiveness of the Communist Party in the United States at the present time is due more to Mr. Hoover and the FBI than to any other individual or group.

WARD. Mr. Kennedy, what is the status of the Communist Party in this country? Is the Nation's security actually threatened from within or have we been given a scare campaign blown up out of proportion?

KENNEDY. The Communist Party, I don't believe, has any political following in the United States. I think it's been overwhelmingly rejected by the American people. I think that there is a problem, even though the Communist Party is few in numbers, now down to probably less than 10,000 with some others on the fringes who follow its concepts, but it still poses some danger in that as the Supreme Court held 8 to 1 that the Communist Party in the United States is dominated and directed, controlled by the Soviet Union which is, whose aim is, the destruction of the United States, so when they have even a relatively few number of people here in this country which are working for them against the interests of the United States, I think it always poses a security problem for the country.

WARD. "Monitor" over the past several weeks has been examining the work of the FBI and its efforts in, among other things, the fight against subversives. Recently, J. Edgar Hoover was described as an ineffective "spy swatter" in this work. How would you characterize the work of Mr. Hoover?

KENNEDY. Well, I think that he has contributed one of the outstanding jobs of public service over the period of the last 30 years, and I think that if it hadn't been for his efforts, his direction, his organizational ability, that the Communist Party and subversion in the United States would be far stronger, far more dangerous, and would have received, the Soviet Union, Communist countries abroad would have received, far more security information than they have.

I think that the ineffectiveness of the Communist Party in the United States at the present time is due more to Mr. Hoover and the FBI than to any other individual or group.

WARD. Mr. Kennedy, there seems to be a division of political opinion regarding the threat of communism. Some conservative groups on the one hand warning that we must keep our guard up; some liberals on the other hand discounting the threat. Does this division indicate a weakness in our ability to cope with the problems affecting national security?

KENNEDY. I think it is a disservice to discount it, the Communist Party, Communist Party activity, to say it means nothing, because that is untrue. It's also, I think, a disservice to say that there is a Communist under every bush or behind every tree. Or when the State Department or the Government does something with which you disagree to indicate it must be run by a bunch of Communists. The John Birch Society, for instance, said that there are all these Communists. I have written, contacted them to ask them for the names of any that they said existed in Government and never received a reply. The only one that they have identified at all, Mr. Welch has identified, is Dwight Eisenhower, and I think that that is an indication of the disservice of this kind of an operation can bring to the country.

WARD. Since you have occupied the post of Attorney General have you noted a change in Communist activity in this country? Has there been any change in goals or method of operation?

KENNEDY. No. I think that they have, the Communist Party U.S.A. has continued. There has been more effort over the period of the last 12 months to—more effort in the field of universities and colleges, but in my judgment, with not much success.

They also attempted to penetrate into some of these internal disorders that we have, as far as racial questions are concerned, but I think that this is a continuation of their goals that have existed over a period of some years. Communist operations of the representatives of Communist countries abroad who were stationed here in the United States, their activities are steadily increasing, and this is focused mostly on espionage and in attempting to learn security secrets of the United States.

WARD. Thank you, sir.

Rostow's Peace Plan Seen as Good Bargain for Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Tribune of July 5, 1962:

ROSTOW'S PEACE PLAN SEEN AS GOOD BARGAIN FOR REDS

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Unilateral disarmament, or disarmament by example, is the heart of a plan by Chairman Walt W. Rostow of the State Department Policy Planning Council.

Why has the administration slowed up the development and production of the mighty, manned missile bomber, the B–70? There are technical and financial difficulties, to be sure, but the reason under the Rostow plan is that Russia will interpret a slowdown on this B–70 as a voluntary example of partial disarmament and will follow suit.

Why has the administration planted the idea with friendly writers that we are preparing only for a war against weapons, not a war against people?

Why have we let it out that, in the event of hostilities, we would bomb military targets only, and would spare Russian cities? The answer is the same. We hope that the Kremlin will get the message and will follow suit.

The following quotation is from a broadcast interview with Richard Fryklund, author of "One Hundred Million Lives," which he calls an administration-inspired book. The author said over the air waves: "Now if people from the Russian Embassy are watching this program, it would make some of our defense officials very happy because they want, through every means possible, diplomatic and public, to encourage the Russians to think through this problem."

Why do we have such an inconsistent policy in southeast Asia?

In South Vietnam, our troops are engaged in combat training missions against the Red invaders. But we do not attack North Vietnam, where these invasions are mounted.

Our troops stand defensively on the Thailand side of the Mekong River. But instead of sending troops to Laos, where another invasion was recently in progress, we agreed to a troika plan for a neutralist Laos. We have resumed aid to Laos at the rate of $3 million a month. Well, why? The answer is the same under the Rostow plan.

Let us hear Dr. Rostow speak for his own plan. In a June 28, 1951, speech at the U.S. Army Special Warfare School, Fort Bragg, N.C., attended by guerrilla warfare trainees from Vietnam and 18 other nations, Rostow, then a White House adviser, said these things:

"We have, indeed, begun to take the problem of guerrilla warfare seriously * * *. This will not be a victory of the United States over the Soviet Union. It will not be a victory of capitalism over socialism * * *. If Americans do not seek victory in the usual sense, what do we seek? * * * The United States has the primary responsibility for deterring the use of nuclear weapons

[and] over aggression with conventional forces.

"The sending of men and arms across international boundaries and the direction of guerrilla war from outside a sovereign nation is aggression." (Something, by inference, which the United States must never commit against sovereign nations like Communist North Vietnam, Red Cuba or a neutralist Laos.)

In this address Rostow was performing a partial, voluntary disarmament of the United States. He ruled out use of nuclear weapons. He ruled out the strategy of attacking Red nations. He was, in effect, inviting the Communists to follow suit, and to some extent they have done so.

They have returned several American military personnel who were taken prisoner in Vietnam. They have agreed to accept an American-aided neutralist Laos. They have not crossed the borders of Thailand.

All this is a good bargain at a small price for the Communists. They are safe from our mightiest weapons and from any counter-invasion.

But is the Rostow plan good for the United States? Manifestly, it is a very poor bargain for the United States.

We are letting the enemy choose the weapons, the battlefields, the strategies.

In Laos we are even paying him good money for doing so. Although choosing disarmament and peace, we are discarding a victory policy and are accepting defeat.

F. L. Megginson: Outstanding Postal Employee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the high caliber of the civil service employees in our U.S. postal service.

I have received a report from Postmaster Roland F. Wooten at Charleston, S.C., that, I think, would be an excellent rebuttal to any criticism of our civil service employees.

Included in his report of outstanding achievements by postal workers is a superior accomplishment award won by Carrier F. L. Megginson.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to insert this report so the Nation can read of the caliber of the people I have the honor to represent in the Congress:

F. L. MEGGINSON: OUTSTANDING POSTAL EMPLOYEE

U.S. POST OFFICE,
Charleston, S.C., September 5, 1962.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
House of Representatives, 326 House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MENDEL: Please note enclosed copy of citation to Mr. Megginson. As you know, he has been awarded the U.S. Post Office Department's top citation, the Superior Accomplishment Award. Mr. Megginson is among the very few to have received this recognition.

Until my arrival at the Charleston Post Office, no Superior Accomplishment Awards had ever been made here. Since then, eight have been awarded to Charleston postal personnel.

Also please note brief official mention in Bulletin of August 2, 1962, that Charleston was not only leader in its group but leader for the Nation with top number of outstanding suggestions offered during fiscal year 1962.

You will note that the general average for suggestions per 100 employees at large post offices runs about 35 to 40. Here in the historic city we registered a new record at 276.

While we are proud of this achievement, it is our hope to set another top record during this current fiscal year.

To all of Charleston's 400 postal employees go the credit for this fine performance.

Some 160 of these suggestions have already been adopted locally, some nationally. Numerous cash awards were received and are still coming in.

Our suggestions are all ideas for an improved postal service at reduced cost.

It is a pleasure to report our progress for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ROLAND F. WOOTEN,
Postmaster.

CHARLESTON, S.C.,
July 23, 1962.

Mr. F. L. MEGGINSON,
Carrier, U.S. Post Office,
Charleston, S.C.

DEAR MR. MEGGINSON: It gives me considerable pleasure to present to you a Superior Accomplishment Certificate, a lapel emblem, and an award of $25 less withholding tax, in recognition of the superior work you are performing as a carrier in the Charleston Post Office.

The recognition which is given in this presentation is the result of sustained efforts by which you have achieved the constant, high degree of efficiency in performing all assigned duties, the excellence of service rendered to the patrons whom you serve, and the superior spirit of cooperation always evident in your associations with fellow workers and your supervisors. These attributes, which you have displayed during your many years of postal service, reflect favorably upon you as an individual, upon your fellow workers, and upon the postal service as well.

I am extremely proud of your achievement, as I believe you are, and take this means to express my sincere appreciation and congratulations to you.

A copy of this letter will become a part of your official personnel record.

Sincerely,

ROLAND F. WOOTEN,
Postmaster.

SUPERIOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS
MAY 24, 1962.

SUGGESTIONS AND AWARDS COMMITTEE,
Charleston Post Office,
Charleston, S.C.:

I respectfully recommend carrier Francis L. Megginson for a Superior Accomplishment Award.

Carrier Megginson serves residential mounted route No. 44 out of the St. Andrews Branch. He has served this route for 1½ years out of a total of 21 years postal service. He is 45 years of age. He often serves his route in intense plain as he is suffering with a ruptured disk and must wear a back brace.

I have observed his work in the office, on the street, and reviewed records on file of his past performance of duty. He is consistent in his work, courteous to the public, and gets along excellently with coworkers and supervisors. Mr. Megginson serves a heavily populated area. I have received no complaints from any patron on his route.

The week of count and inspection for this fiscal year shows Mr. Megginson to have an average of 118 minutes under maximum office allowances. On this type route, 40 to 50 minutes under maximum office allowance is considered excellent. Mr. Megginson not only attains this high degree of efficiency on the week of the count, but consistently. Records are on file to substantiate this. Mr. Megginson very seldom needs assistance or overtime to complete his delivery on schedule.

In terms of monetary savings, Mr. Megginson has saved the Post Office Department approximately 60 minutes a day above the average carrier. He has attained this high production rate through application, willingness, and diligence. Intangible benefits are numerous because of his conduct and devotion to duty. This has greatly improved public relations for the Post Office Department.

F. C. PLATTS Jr.,
Superintendent, St. Andrews Branch.

Further Progress in Defense Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe of August 12, 1962, on the subject, "Pentagon To Unify Machine Tool Buying."

I am certain that this article will be appreciated by you, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as it is another example of Secretary McNamara using his authority under the McCormack-Curtis amendment to unify common activities in the Department of Defense. While the article to which I refer is not explicit as to the number of machine tools available in the Defense Establishment, it does state that "$3 billion worth" are now being used by the armed services. It is my understanding that these tools are scattered in numerous agencies and inventories. Obviously, there must be a controlled inventory as a precedent to efficient requirements determination and procurement. I wish again to laud Secretary McNamara for his courage and determination to bring about more efficiency and effectiveness through integration of common areas under the broad and flexible authority provided by the McCormack-Curtis amendment.

I would be remiss if I did not pay a tribute to our Speaker for his foresight in sponsoring this legislation.

The article follows:

PENTAGON TO UNIFY MACHINE TOOL BUYING

Defense Secretary Robert J. McNamara plans to unify all machine tool buying that previously has been scattered throughout the Pentagon. In the next few weeks a new unit will be placed—at least temporarily—under Assistant Secretary Thomas Morris and it will also control the $3 billion worth of machine tools now being used by the armed services.

McNamara, who is personally knowledgeable of modern production methods, is expected to give emphasis to automation and new processes that are needed to fabricate

the new exotic space age metals for our new weapons. These light, heat resistant and very hard metals cannot be handled by ordinary machine tools.

The new metals now being developed include titanium, beryllium, tantalum, niobium, molybdenum, and zirconium. New processes now being studied to handle these metals include explosive forming, ultrasonics, electric erosion, ultra speed grinding, radial draw forming, and chemical milling.

Considerable savings in manufacturing costs have been made by some of these processes. Convair makes such claims in the exploding forming methods they have developed. Several firms are developing the ultrasonic and high speed grinding proceses but they are not yet practical for close tolerances.

Many titanium, beryllium, and molybdenum parts for our largest missiles and aircraft are now formed by the Bath process, a method of stretching the metal in one direction and compressing it at right angles.

A mammoth radial draw former is now being installed by the Air Force at the Convair plant in Fort Worth, Tex. It will be used to shape complete wing sections of new all-steel aircraft now being designed. It will eliminate the enormous cost of riveting required in aluminum aircraft. It will also eliminate thousands of employee jobs.

The new unit that will handle the unified machine tool buying will also distribute the hundreds of millions of dollars of surplus tools now in Federal warehouses. These are available to other Federal, State and local agencies and to public schools, colleges and other institutions.

The 10-day concept of a nuclear war has laid emphasis on "weapons in being" and has made obsolete the need for standby plants and equipment. The distribution and sales of this surplus is being handled in a manner so as not to disturb the machine tool industry.

One of the largest of these standby arsenals is in South Chicago where the Ford Motor Co. was given the contract for an alternate J–57 and J–75 jet engine factory. Under the regime of ex-Secretary Charles "Engine" Wilson over $400 million was spent in tooling this plant. Only two small production runs were made.

A study group appointed by Mr. McNamara recommended that unified buying of machine tools be assigned to the new Defense Supply Agency which handles expendable common use items such as food, clothing, parts, medical supplies, and office supplies. However, the three armed services, stating that machine tools were in a different category, asked that their functions be transferred gradually from the Navy bureaus, the Army arsenals and the Air Force bases and be placed under a production management unit.

A Worthy Queen of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, a beautiful girl, a lovely trophy, and a host of proud admirers are back in Roscommon, Mich., today, following a strenuous week of competition for the selection of Miss America of 1962.

Miss Carole Jean Valin of Roscommon, proved herself a worthy queen even though she was edged from the race in the homestretch which narrowed contestants down to tne final five young women.

Michigan is proud of Carole Jean and even though she did not capture the highest honor, she captured the admiration of millions, won a trophy in the swimsuit competition, and brought added fame to Michigan.

The Bay City Times has given her an appropriate editorial salute which follows:

A WORTHY QUEEN OF MICHIGAN

She failed to win the coveted crown but she captured the hearts of millions.

In so doing, Carole Jean Van Valin brought renewed fame to Michigan as the home of lovely girls and won for herself a $1,000 scholarship and the right to the claim of being one of the 10 most beautiful girls in the 1963 Miss America contest.

Her hometown of Roscommon, that backed Miss Van Valin with a busload of supporters at the Atlantic City contest, gave its Miss Michigan a gala welcome home last night.

Featured was a torchlight parade to show the Miss America contestant how proud the entire State is of the fact she was one of 10 girls selected from a field of 54 of America's most beautiful women to compete in the semifinals.

The hometown folk all agreed it was during the long, drawn out "talent" part of the program that Carole failed to score heavily enough to win the Miss America crown.

Any Roscommon resident will tell you there was no contestant lovelier than Miss Michigan. Nor was there any one of the girls more popular with the thousands crowded into the huge auditorium or the millions watching the nationwide telecast of the event.

And as for looking good in a swimsuit—those loyal Roscommon fans pointed out that Carole had taken first place in her swimsuit division and thereby won the big trophy she brought home with her.

Roscommon residents are quick to point out that the Ohio beauty who won the Miss America title, Miss Jacquelyn Jeanne Mayer, is 2 years older than the blue-eyed blonde from Roscommon and boasts a wealth of stage experience, having sang with Fred Waring's Pennsylvanians before attending Northwestern University.

Beauty, charm and personality our Miss Roscommon has in abundance, and she used these attributes to win national acclaim for Michigan and Roscommon.

Now she also has the memories of an experience most girls can only dream about.

Roscommon, northern Michigan, our entire State were proud to be represented by such an outstandingly beautiful and charming contestant.

Miss Van Valin has proven herself a worthy Queen of Michigan.

Red Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are very much concerned over what is happening to our neighboring island of Cuba just 90 miles off the coast of Florida and our massive missile base at Cape Canaveral. The President has expressed his viewpoint on the situation and daily leading citizens of our country are calling for assurances that our position will not further deteriorate. I share this concern of our people and I want our Government to take every proper step to protect our country and hemisphere from Communist infiltration. I enclose an editorial from the September 7 edition of the Lowell Sun of Lowell, Mass., which I believe is timely.

The editorial follows:

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, Sept. 7, 1962]

RED ARSENAL

The Nation should probably take its mind off politics long enough to cast a long and hard look in the direction of Cuba. The Soviet technical and military build-up of Castro's island must be considered a serious threat, if not to the United States, at least to small nations in the Caribbean, Central and South America. And when the time comes that Castro figures he can become aggressive, hostilities in the general area could ignite major trouble.

For many years the United States has proudly and defiantly advised European nations that "any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere will be considered as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Since the Monroe Doctrine was announced to the world 140 years ago the United States has told foreign countries to keep away from the Western Hemisphere "or else."

The United States has now been put in the peculiar position of either modifying its interpretation of this famous document or of taking the big risk of enforcing it. President Kennedy and other leaders of our Government have shown they are well aware of and greatly concerned by what is going on in Cuba, but they are conscious of the dire results of making a rash move. Therefore, they must watch and wait.

And in the meanwhile, the Soviet ships, loaded to the gunwales with military goodies for Castro, continue to arrive in Cuban ports.

All the while the huge U.S. Naval base at Guantanamo Bay must be on a constant alert in case the day might come when Castro might feel big and strong enough to take over. This the United States would resist, Russia or no Russia.

Description of President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the World dated September 18, 1962:

DESCRIPTION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

A Democratic National Committee publication just now going into circulation contains this description of President Kennedy: "* * * a leader who had beat down Khrushchev at Berlin, reshaped an Army, orbited a space man, committed troops to Vietnam, isolated Cuba, restrained labor, chastised steel, launched a revolution in trade and aid

policy and turned around the American people to face the direction of the enemy."

There are one or two little points, however, with which one might quibble. For instance: "* * * beat down Khrushchev at Berlin." Russia's sum concession so far has been to soft-pedal talk of deadlines in regard to continuing insistence that we get out of the walled city.

"Reshaped an Army." Along with an admittedly fine emphasis on guerrilla warfare units, this reshaping also has left our Allies in a state of open and worried doubt as to our resolve to use nuclear weapons—the real edge of our sword—in opposing Soviet aggression. Some, perhaps unduly cynical, observers have commented that the reshaping of the Army may commit us to fight grinding land wars against the largest land force in the world—the massed troop array of the Soviet and Red China. This technique was not oustandingly successful in Korea.

"Orbited a space man." The orbital programs were begun under previous administrations. Such programs also, it is reported, have been undertaken by the Soviet.

"Committed troops to Vietnam." Effectively true. At the same time, however, the work of those troops has been somewhat complicated by the diplomatic negotiations that turned neighboring Laos into a guaranteed privileged sanctuary for local communist and Red Chinese troops fighting in Vietnam.

"Isolated Cuba." This does not refer to any actual blockade of this now hostile island 90 miles off our shores. Nor does it refer to any isolation that has prevented the Soviet and the Red Chinese from pouring troops and weapons into Cuba. It presumably refers to the smashing diplomatic rebuff dealt Castro when we, and a few other nations, stopped talking to him.

"Restrained labor." The verb here as ambiguous. Whereas price rises have become taboo, wage and fringe benefits have risen apace.

"Chastised steel." The one, clear case of understatement in the description. It could also, without false modesty, be applied to big business in general.

"Launched a revolution in trade and aid policy." This refers, apparently, to the Alliance for Progress which, although launched, is not notably full-sailed, and to the President's request for personal tariff-lowering powers, a revolution still being debated by Congress.

"And turned the American people around to face the direction of the enemy." The government, although facing them, also has been carefully instructed not to say anything that would seriously anger them (e.g. State Department censorship of military speeches, refusal of the President to sign a "Captive Nations Resolution" singling out the Soviet as the captor."

K.H.

Visitors to Rushmore Break All Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, with the reckless drive toward socialism that this Nation is now experiencing, I believe the words of Gutzon Borglum, the great sculptor who carved Mount Rushmore, should be quoted again and again and again.

While working on this great monument in the Black Hills of South Dakota, Mr. Borglum said:

I want, somewhere in America, a few feet of stone that bears witness to the great things we have accomplished as a Nation, carved as close to Heaven as we can, then breathe a prayer that wind and rain alone shall wear them away.

The editorial of F. C. Christopherson in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader of September 9, 1962, warrants not only space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but consideration of every Member of Congress and every good American. The editorial follows:

VISITORS TO RUSHMORE BREAK ALL RECORDS

MOUNT RUSHMORE, S. DAK.—They all come to Mount Rushmore—rich man, poor man, beggar man, and perhaps thief.

It is an ever-changing pattern of faces at what is rapidly becoming the Nation's best known memorial. By the thousands and the hundreds of thousands, they travel up the mountain in the Black Hills to see the heroic figures that Gutzon Borglum carved out of the solid rock.

The daily crowd, as many as 12,000 to 15,000 persons in the busy tourist season, is a cross section of America. Included are persons from all walks of life and from all of the States.

The appeal of the memorial, it seems, is so broad that it reaches every group.

The Labor Day weekend visitors provided a typical example—artists and artisans, city folks and country folks, teenagers and their elders, the cultured and the uncultured.

But all had one thing in common. They marveled at what they saw and gazed in awe at the massive sculpture high in the sky.

BORGLUM'S OPTIMISM

This is a recordbreaking year for visitors at Mount Rushmore. The million mark was reached in early August and it is now estimated that the total this year will reach 1,250,000. That will be approximately 200,000 above the previous high mark.

As I watched the steady procession of cars and people, I recalled a previous visit to this spot. That was back in the twenties when Rushmore was just a gleam in the eyes of imaginative men such as Doane Robinson, then State historian, and Senator Peter Norbeck. They had asked Borglum to look over the possibilities.

Borglum, as imaginative as they, was interested. The place he had selected—the present site—was off the beaten track.

A conference was to be held near the mountain to study the possibilities. Mrs. Christopherson and I attended but not without difficulty. First we drove along a makeshift mountain trail out of Keystone for a mile or two. Then we tramped on foot over rock, creek, and valley for a considerable distance to an eminence from which Rushmore could be seen.

Borglum was there, so were Norbeck, Robinson, and a few other hardy adventurers.

"This mountain is just right for what I have in mind," Borglum explained.

"But," someone asked, "shouldn't it be carved closer to a highway so that the people can see it?"

That comment irked Borglum a bit. "If I build the monument," he answered, "the people will come."

And most certainly his confidence was justified, as the attendance figures show.

Now there's a broad two-lane highway up the mountain from Keystone and a four-lane highway is being constructed from Rapid City to Keystone.

GROWING PAINS AT MEMORIAL

Purpose of my visit here last week was to attend a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society and a basic problem was that associated with growing pains.

Though much has been done to accommodate the many visitors, it is realized that much more is required.

Already parking lots are being crowded and other facilities require expansion.

It is confidently assumed that the Mount Rushmore attraction will grow and that something must be planned now to avoid future congestion.

People throughout the Nation are beginning to realize that Rushmore is one of the "must see" features of the country. And, as the Interstate Highway System is completed, it will be easier to make the trip to this area.

TAX PROBLEM

Incidentally, a matter that is creating no little amount of conversation here, is the effort by the Internal Revenue Service to assess an amusement tax on the Rushmore diningroom revenues.

This came about because the college students, employed here during the summer as waiters, waitresses, clerks, and aids, sing occasionally during meal hours.

They have been doing so voluntarily because they like to sing and the diners like to hear them. They aren't asked to do this by the management, they aren't paid to do it and singing ability is no condition of their employment.

They were flabbergasted and disappointed by the action of the Internal Revenue Service. "It's ridiculous," said a pert little miss. "How stupid," said another.

The matter is now in the hands of the tax authorities in Washington for such determination as they see fit. But if they rule that the tax must be levied, they'll terminate a delightful and wholesome feature of the Rushmore scene and take some fun out of the lives of a hundred and more eager youngsters. And no good purpose will be served.

RUSHMORE'S PURPOSE

Visitors occasionally wonder about the purpose of Rushmore and the selection of the men whose faces are sculptured out of the granite.

Borglum said his intention was not to glorify individuals but to emphasize ideals and achievements.

The objective is best told in these words uttered by Borglum as he started work on the extraordinary memorial:

"I want, somewhere in America, a few feet of stone that bears witness to the great things we have accomplished as a nation, carved as close to Heaven as we can, then breathe a prayer that wind and rain alone shall wear them away."

F. C. CHRISTOPHERSON.

Coach Paul Bryant, of Alabama, Picks the Eight Teams To Watch for 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a great article that I found in the Sunday

Star. It was in This Week magazine section of the Star of August 26, 1962. It is about a great man and a wonderful man, whom I have known practically all of his life. I am speaking of Coach Paul Bryant, of Alabama. We call him "Bear" Bryant and he is a "bear," too.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, a long time ago—it must have been 25 years ago—think of it, a quarter of a century, when I was asked to go down and meet the University of Alabama's team when they were coming here to play. They said they needed some help and they needed to be pepped up. We went down and they were a tired, weary-looking bunch, and they said they had not won a game in a good while. I asked them over to the Willard Hotel to have breakfast with me, and in that group was my son-in-law, Riley Smith, along with "Bear" Bryant and all of that other great group. Well, we had a wonderful breakfast and it was time for the team to soon finish, and I said:

What can we do to make you win this game?

So, "Bear" Bryant said:

What Riley and I want is a job.

I said:

Well, if you win this game tomorrow, I will guarantee you I will get you a job.

Well, they not only won it, but they went on to win more. You know what they did in California and all over the country, and what a great team Alabama had.

Well, after these two men left, Riley Smith went into business. "Bear" Bryant kept on, and he was covered with glory all over the country, wherever he had charge of these football players, making them into great and good players. At last we succeeded in getting Paul Bryant back to Alabama, and all of you know and this story will tell some of the things he did last year. Well, he will keep doing better just as long as he lives. He is a great man, and he is a good man; he was a wonderful football player, but he has brains and ability, as well as energy. He would have to have, to have a wife like he has; and you know what they say about a good man having to have a good woman behind him. Mary Harmon Knight, I remember her; she was there with my daughter, Frances Boykin. Mary Harmon married "Bear", and Frances married Riley.

Well, here they are now. This picture doesn't suit me, because it shows that "Bear" has a few gray hairs coming along on his temples; but if he did what he did, even if he wasn't but 21, he would have to have some gray hairs, because he has done a lot of thinking, a lot of work, a lot of praying and a lot of pulling; but he has done a superhuman job and made us so proud of him down in Alabama. Wherever you go, you will hear men and women, boys and girls, talking about "Bear" Bryant and his great team at the University of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Star tells a great story about our hero, and it tells what this great expert, "Bear" Bryant, thinks will happen in 1962.

Well, we have another great football coach, "Shug" Jordan, of Auburn University, our other great college. These two men were out talking over old times, and so forth, in a boat on Bankhead Lake. The boat they were in turned over and "Bear" Bryant fished out "Shug" Jordan. So, this fellow Jordan said:

Bear, I thought you could walk on water. Well—

He said—

if you won't tell the people at the University of Alabama that I can't walk on water, I won't tell them I saved your life.

Well, he has walked on water; he has done everything, because the superhuman jobs he did will just show you that "Bear" Bryant, this great athlete, this great manager, this great football coach, made such a great record for so many States, and the crowning glory is on our own University of Alabama there at Tuscaloosa. It is a great story and I know, Mr. Speaker, that everybody will enjoy this, and that this story will go to every library in the Nation and many foreign countries, and I would just like for everybody to know about "Bear" Bryant and his great work and the men who helped to make it possible. We could not have gotten the advertising of what he did as coach of this great team for a million dollars.

So, God bless "Bear" Bryant and give him strength to carry on.

The article follows:

COACH PAUL BRYANT OF ALABAMA, PICKS THE EIGHT TEAMS TO WATCH FOR 1962—WHAT'S NEW FOR 1962?—THE PRO GAME GOES TO COLLEGE

(By Paul Bryant as told to Frank Litsky)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This season you're going to see more speed, more passes, more scoring on the college gridirons—and the champs will be those who take more risks. Here 1961's Coach of the Year spots 1962's eight teams to watch.)

TUSCALOOSA, ALA.—Which college football teams will be the best in the country? That's always a tough question, and to complicate matters this year, college football will be a changed game because it is borrowing many of the best parts of professional football. This is a fair exchange because the pros have borrowed from colleges through the years.

This new look doesn't mean that the Green Bay Packers will be playing for my University of Alabama team—though the thought sure is pleasant. It does mean that the colleges are doing a facelifting job on their plays, formations and strategy.

In short, you will see college teams play more wide-open football this year. They will gamble much more, not because it is sounder football—it isn't but because each coach realizes he must take risks to keep up with the opposition.

Before I outline these trends I want to point out the differences between college and pro football. They really are different games.

MORE BIG PLAYS, MORE SCORING

Professional football is a business. Like any other business, its purpose is to make money, and to make money it must provide constant entertainment. That means heavy emphasis on the offense—more spectacular plays, more scoring, much more passing.

Under these circumstances, it is no surprise that defense takes a back seat. Technically, that doesn't make for better football, but the pros know that few people will pay $5 a seat to watch them play a 0 to 0 game.

So the pros play gambling football. They use red-dogging—sending linebackers crashing through the line to rush the passer but risking a long gain if the play is a run and not a pass. Their defensive backs use the dangerous man-to-man system of covering pass receivers. If the receiver breaks away, a touchdown is likely. They will pass on third down with their backs to the goal line instead of playing it safe with a punt.

The pros also have great builtin advantages over the colleges. Their players are bigger and stronger. They should be, because the pros draw talent from an unlimited pool.

Free substitution rules allow them to alternate offensive and defensive platoons and use other specialists whenever the need arises. If a man must learn only one job instead of four or five, he can master that job and become a real expert at it.

In addition, the pros have the same players year in and year out, except for changes of their own making. Graduation doesn't leave them high and dry. This continuity makes for better teamwork.

What about college football? It needs no apologies because it is a fine sport. Constant emphasis on defense creates a balance that makes for a sounder game, even with the increased accent on the attack.

There is an aura around college football, too, that makes it a wholesome sport. The pros have nothing to match its campus atmosphere, its spirit, the personal loyalties it fosters.

Bearing these differences in mind, here are the major changes college teams are making this year:

1. Red-dogging: It's a pretty sight when the linebackers crash through and flatten the passer before he can get rid of the ball. It's a pretty sight, that is, unless you're the passer. The colleges are putting so much more emphasis on passing that the defense will be forced to red-dog much more often. But woe to the defense when it guesses wrong.

2. Passing: You will see more—and better—passing in the college game. And you will see more unorthodox pass plays. Coaches have come to realize that they can't remain conservative and drive 60 or 70 yards on the ground for a touchdown against good defense. You will also see more situation passing—saving an assault on a defensive weakness for one big play that could mean a touchdown. Scouting of opponents has beecome so refined that no team can hide a serious weakness.

3. Platooning: College substitution rules allow a player to reenter each period only once, except that a team may make one uncharged substitution (known as a wild card) after each play. But to keep fresh players in the game, more and more colleges will substitute by units as widely as the rules allow. For example, Army, North Carolina, and Georgia have adopted Louisiana State's three-platoon system. Ohio State, among others, will alternate two platoons. Other colleges will try one of those systems if they can find sufficient manpower.

4. Specialization: The colleges will make more use than ever of special men for special jobs. Look for more defensive specialists, more place-kicking specialists, more passing specialists. These men will go into the game when their particular services are needed, utilizing the wild-card rule.

5. New formations: Many colleges are discarding or augmenting offensive formations because they have found others more suited to their talent. Here are two striking examples: UCLA has abandoned its traditional single wing attack for a homemade T formation that will allow it to use its best runners and passers in the same backfield. And Iowa State has thrown out its single wing for what

it calls a single-wing T just to keep two gifted players in the same backfield.

All these changes make it more precarious than ever to predict which college teams will be the best. Every team must alter its game to keep up with the times—and its opponents. The ones that make the changes successfully are the ones that will be sitting on top 3 months from now.

And now—for better or for worse—those predictions. My nominees as the eight teams to watch this fall are Georgia Tech in the Deep South, Duke along the Atlantic coast, Texas in the Southwest, Southern California in the Far West, Wyoming in the Rockies, Missouri in the Midlands, Ohio State in the Midwest and Penn State in the East.

I can hear the voices already demanding: "What about your Alabama team, coach? Aren't you selling it short?" True, we were the national champions last year, but that was last year. This year, we're a question-mark team. Spring practice didn't answer my question about our young linemen. We may have real trouble with our linebacking and with our offensive and defensive quarterbacking. So reality—not modesty—forces me to rate Alabama no better than a threat in the Southeastern Conference.

Let's take a closer look at the top teams in the Deep South and other sections of the country.

THE DEEP SOUTH

Most crystal-ball gazers this year are picking Louisiana State, Mississippi, or Alabama to dominate this football hotbed. My choice is Georgia Tech because its first unit is so strong. The line averages 222 pounds, and its anchorman, Dave Watson, could make All-American on his blocking alone. Coach Bobby Dodd also has an abundance of promising backs. His only fear is injuries at key spots. If Tech can escape those injuries, its experience should prove the difference in what I consider the strongest conference in the country.

ATLANTIC COAST

Coach Bill Murray of Duke again will use his imaginative offense, which combines features of the split T, drive series, sweep series, and swing formation. He has seasoned players everywhere except at fullback. Jay Wilkerson, the son of Oklahoma coach Bud Wilkerson, has been shifted from end to halfback. He is a terror when he breaks into the clear. Duke's line is still light, but it is quick and hits hard. Coach Murray tells me that his team will win or lose on aggressiveness. I think it will do a lot of winning.

THE SOUTHWEST

For a coach who lost seven starters, including a wonderful halfback named James Saxton, Darrell Royal, of Texas, faces a bright season. He has a host of reliable men from his fine 1961 team. Except at tackle, where there will be two new straters, there is no concern about the line. The backfield has speed to spare. On defense, no other team in the country can offer two linebackers as skilled as Pat Culpepper and Johnny Treadwell. If the players injured in spring practice return to shape, Texas could win every game.

THE FAR WEST

Southern California, like Texas, lost seven starters via graduation. Coach John McKay's task to strengthen the middle of his line. Otherwise, he's optimistic, though wary of a repetition of his team's 1961 injury jinx. His fullback, Ben Wilson, is a hardworking bread-and-butter runner. The passing attack, with Pete Beathard and Bill Nelsen throwing and Hal Bedsole catching, must be respected. Oregon actually may have a better team than Southern Cal, but its schedule is so rugged that a 5 to 5 season would do it credit.

THE ROCKIES

The Skyline and Border Conferences have disbanded, and six of their strongest teams will start play this season in the new Western Athletic Conference. Wyoming seems the best of the lot, although it must adapt to a new head coach (Lloyd Eaton) and a new offense (multiple T with balanced line). Blending with this something new will be some items traditional at Wyoming—a stout defense and power running with crisp blocking. The pass attack will be better, although Coach Eaton still is searching for a starting quarterback. Mike Wright may be his man.

THE MIDLANDS

Coach Dan Devine has never had it so good at Missouri. He is quick to point out that he must replace his two starting tackles and two starting guards, but his team nevertheless is experienced and sound. He will start nine seniors and two sophomores—Quarterback Keith Weber and Halfback John Roland. Both are potential stars and will add punch to a backfield already rich in talent.

Though the line may slip somewhat from last year's high standard, it will be fierce on defense. Andy Russell, the fullback, has few peers as a linebacker.

THE MIDWEST

Mark down Ohio State as the team to beat for the national championship. Coach Woody Hayes has a typical Ohio State team—big and tough. And this one is faster than usual and deep enough for offensive and defensive platoons. Magnificent is the word for the line, led by Bob Vogel at tackle and Matt Snell (a halback last year) at end. The backfield has no apparent weakness, though Bob Ferguson, twiicel an All-American fullback, has been graduated. Coach Hayes has no Ferguson-type fullback to replace him, but then, who has?

THE EAST

This is Rip Engle's 13th season as head coach at Penn State. He has had a winning team every year. He will have one this fall, too, and most likely an eastern championship as well if his boys can beat Navy in their opener. Penn State's line is hefty and rugged but not really fast. It needs help at center. The backfield is strong, versatile, and explosively fast. Halfback Roger Kochman is the type of breakaway runner every coach dreams about. Coach Engle says his prime concern is filling out his second and third units. And when a coach talks like that—beware.

Those are the eight teams that should be the best in their sections this year. Here are the teams I think will win in conferences we haven't covered: West Virginia in the Southern Conference, Wichita in the Missouri Valley Conference, Bowling Green, in the Mid-American Conference, Princeton in the Ivy League, Connecticut in the Yankee Conference, and Delaware in the Middle Atlantic Conference.

And now that I've gone out on a limb and made my predictions on the 1962 football winners, I've got to return to those problems of my Alabama team. More than anything else, I'd dearly love to make Alabama a winner, too.

Health Care: The Issue Becomes Clearer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the very unfortunate aspects of the debate which has been conducted in the Halls of Congress, on national television, in the daily press, and elsewhere on the subject of the administration's limited hospital care proposal financed by social security is the fact that the real issues and arguments have been so overlaid with a veneer of emotionalism and propaganda—and both sides are to blame for this, I must add—that they have been almost ignored. The real issues in this matter have, however, come more and more to the fore and, I believe, if the President lives up to his pledge to make the health care controversy the major campaign issue in this election year, we will find that this helps to strip the matter to its bare factual bones.

Nation's Business, in its September 1962 issue, has done an excellent job in trying to weed out distortion and present the facts of the matter. I believe that this is a real step in the right direction and I hope that other publications will provide similar services as this matter comes more and more under discussion in the political campaign which now has started. Along with this article, "Politics Distort Health Care Facts," the magazine printed an interview with Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma. Senator KERR is a leading figure in the Congress in this controversy and I believe his words supplement the matter presented by Nation's Business to help give a better understanding of our health care situation. I am placing the Nation's Business article and the interview with Senator KERR in the RECORD to help further real understanding of this issue.

The article and interview follow:

POLITICS DISTORTS HEALTH CARE FACTS—FAST-GROWING PROGRAMS PAYING MEDICAL COSTS OF THE NEEDY AGED

The heated domestic political issue of costly health care for the aged is actually based on a shrinking problem.

The Kennedy administration's pleas for a new law to buy hospital and nursing home care for the aged with social security taxes have failed to win over Congress. The President has promised to take the issue to the people as a key feature of the fall congressional election campaigns.

Meanwhile legislation is pending in Congress to provide more help for the elderly through private financing. A bill sponsored by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, would allow employers to take tax deductions for contributions they make to employee pension plans that include health care protection features.

The law currently permits tax deductions of contributions to employee pension funds to provide retirement income. But the Curtis measure would extend this to let employers claim deductions for contributions they make to health plans for employees after they retire. Millions of elderly could be covered in the future.

Moreover, the existing programs of medical care for the aged are rapidly paring the size of the problem.

The much maligned State-operated medical aid for the aged program, known as the Kerr-Mills law, is the major source of help for elderly with limited resources. It is now operating in one form or other in nearly all the States. Private health insurance protection for the aged is spreading at such a rate that 12 percent more of the aged are now covered than in 1960.

The political alarm about the condition and finances of the Nation's 17 million persons 65 and over has largely drowned out word of the progress in meeting the elderly's health needs.

Little known are these facts:

About 65 percent of the elderly now are able to get a wide array of medical services under State medical assistance plans without going on relief.

Another 15 percent of the elderly now get medical-help regularly through old-age public assistance, commonly known as relief.

Some 55 percent of the elderly now have health insurance.

Hospital-surgical insurance for the aged is now available for as little as $78 a year on a group basis and from $66 to $99 a year on an individual basis for a man 65, for example.

The number of recipients of medical care under new State plans has risen rapidly in recent months, by as much as 70 percent in Illinois and 269 percent in Pennsylvania.

About 10 percent of the heads of families 65 or older earn $10,000 or more a year.

Over 10 percent of the aged live with younger relatives; half of those with small assets do.

Around 15 percent of aged men are World War I veterans and can get free care in VA hospitals if they are needy.

Although Congress enacted the Kerr-Mills medical program in 1960, the pressure has been on to pass a health care program under the social security system to provide limited care to older persons whether they are able to pay for it or not.

Critics have attacked the Kerr-Mills law with four major charges. They say it is not meeting the need because most of the benefits are going to only a few States, that some States have not adopted it, that it requires recipients to make known their financial affairs, and that benefits are unequal among the States.

From the start of Government old-age assistance or relief programs in 1935, the cost of medical care could be paid by the monthly cash payments to the needy.

In recent years as the older population has increased, more aid has been given.

In 1950, Congress amended the law to permit payments for medical care directly to suppliers. In 1958 payments were increased. In 1960 a double-barreled program of assistance was provided in the Kerr-Mills law. First, medical care payments under old-age assistance were raised. Second, a new form of aid was provided to help persons not on relief who have enough resources to meet ordinary living expenses but who can't pay unusually high medical bills.

Some 31 States have adopted plans to implement the most important part of the Kerr-Mills program, known as the medical assistance for the aged (MAA) program, for those not on relief but with limited resources.

All except one of the States have put into operation increases in medical payments for aged under relief, which is the other part of the 1960 law.

Critics of Kerr-Mills have complained that almost 90 percent of the MAA money is going to only 4 States: New York, Michigian, California and Massachusetts.

This is true. It is also true that about 25 percent of the aged live in these 4 States. Even more important is the fact that these were among the first States to adopt the program. Naturally most of the money spent so far has gone into these areas.

Critics also have charged that the program is a failure because many States have not adopted it.

Several States have not yet put the MAA portion of Kerr-Mills into effect. But adoption of the program has certainly not lagged as compared with any recent similar program. For example, in 1950 Congress passed a program of aid to the permanently and totally disabled. It was intended to provide payments for needy persons over 18 who had severe disablements or handicaps. Payments are made on a matching basis, similar to the Kerr-Mills program. By mid-1951, about 18 months after the program began, some 27 States had it in operation. The same number of States and territories had adopted the Kerr-Mills MAA program after the first 18 months.

By 1961, 47 States and three territories had adopted the aid to the permanently and totally disabled program. In the program's first decade of operation, the number of persons aided had increased fourfold. The Kerr-Mills MAA program, however, can be judged a success even if all the States don't adopt it. Several States have extensive programs of medical care for needy aged similar to help given by Kerr-Mills. For example, Colorado has not adopted MAA because the State has had an elaborate program of medical care for the aged for the past 4 years. Some $10 million a year is being spent for health costs of needy elderly there.

In Texas, a medical program was started at the beginning of 1962 which provides hospital and surgical-medical services through a contract between the State and Blue Cross-Blue Shield. Direct payments from the State are made for nursing home care. It has been called a model program for elderly on relief.

Three other States not among the 31 that have approved MAA have expanded their relief programs so as to include residents not now on relief rolls, but whose financial situations are such that they need public help.

So the insistence that the success of MAA will be proven only when it is adopted in all States is unrealistic.

Another major criticism of Kerr-Mills is that there is a test as to financial need of recipients. This is held to be undignified and at odds with the American way. The argument is made that the administration's proposal to give health care to the aged under the social security system assures beneficiaries of this help without the indignities of a "means test."

Proponents of the social security approach overlook the fact that a form of "means test" is applied to persons drawing social security checks in their retirement.

Even though a retiree may have paid his social security taxes for 30 years, he starts losing benefits if his earned income is over $1,200 a year. And his social security retirement checks stop altogether if he earns as much as $3,000 a year and is under 72 years of age. Those who favor giving medical care to all the 12 million aged eligible to receive social security benefits overlook the fact that many of these persons are well-fixed enough to pay their own hospital bills. The social security taxes on unskilled factory workers, domestics, or other low-pay people, as well as their employers, would be used to pay health costs for some who don't need Government subsidies.

Another major charge against the Kerr-Mills MAA program is that the program is inequitable and has limitations in different States.

The fact that the programs differ in the different States is seen by some as an advantage, not a disadvantage. For example, the program in Hawaii provides for air transportation to obtain necessary care which is available only in another county. Many States wouldn't need to fly patients great distances to get medical care. But patients in the island State of Hawaii might often need just such service.

In New Hampshire, eye care is excluded from the scope of MAA because it is available through the sight conservation division of the State department of public welfare.

In North Dakota, the aged can get help under MAA depending on their income and assets. In this sparsely populated State a homestead of 2 acres in town is exempt and a rural homestead of 160 acres is exempt in figuring whether the applicant for aid has assets limited enough to qualify for aid.

Kerr-Mills plans in some States require needy persons to make cash contributions toward the cost of care. This is looked upon with grave concern by some proponents of the social security approach. However, the social security proposal would also require any beneficiary of health care to pay $10 a day for the first 9 days toward the cost of hospital treatment.

It is also pointed out that some States do not provide dental care, some don't pay for drugs prescribed by the patient's doctor, a few do not pay for visits in a doctor's office or for house calls. The social security legislation proposed by the administration would pay for none of these.

AN INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR, DEMOCRAT, OF OKLAHOMA, A LEADER IN THE HEALTH CARE FIGHT

Question. Senator KERR, what are the advantages of the existing Kerr-Mills medical care program over proposed health care under social security?

Answer. In the first place, the Kerr-Mills program provides greater benefits to those over 65 years who need those benefits. The benefits include doctors, surgeons, hospitalization, nurses and nursing care, medicines and drugs, dentists and dental benefits—even false teeth. Each State can provide what is needed by the people within the State. The administration's social security approach for aged care would provide mainly hospital and nursing home payments.

In the second place, the Kerr-Mills program is administered on a basis where both the doctors and the patients have the freedom of choice, the patient being able to choose the doctor wanted or the hospital wanted, the doctor being free to make his service available in accordance with what kind of medicine he practices.

Next, the Kerr-Mills program, being available to all over 65 who need it and cannot provide it for themselves, is paid for out of the general revenue fund, by taxes received from everybody, rather than being paid for by a limited group, primarily the self-employed and the employed workers and their employers.

Question. From a cost standpoint how does the Kerr-Mills program compare with the social security approach?

Answer. The Kerr-Mills plan if fully implemented in all of the States would cost much less than the Anderson-Javits proposal, which is the latest administration version.

The Anderson-Javits amendment had a tax beginning in 1963, a payroll tax that would have collected $810 million. Beginning January 1, 1964 the Anderson-Javits amendment would have increased the social security tax $2.2 billion a year. All evidence is that if it were fully implemented that would have been inadequate to pay for it.

Now, the estimate for the Kerr-Mills plan for fiscal 1964 is less than $500 million.

Question. Some States have not yet adopted or implemented the Kerr-Mills program. Why are they holding back?

Answer. Many States have anticipated that a social security tax-supported medical care program would be initiated and figured they would wait until that happened. Now, what those people don't realize is that amendments thus far offered for a social security tax-supported health program do not provide more than one-fourth of the medical or surgical or health requirements for the aged who need medical care that is provided under Kerr-Mills.

Then, some States have not done so, because their legislatures have not yet provided the funds for the State to put up its part of the money. However, when more people realize that the Kerr-Mills program is available to the States on a matching basis, in my

judgment, more and more States will implement the Kerr-Mills plan, especially now that it's apparent that the other program will not be put into effect in the next 2 years. The social security plan could not be put into effect until 1965 even if it should be passed in 1963, which I gravely doubt.

Question. Do you think that medical care for the aged under social security is a proper partisan issue for the 1962 election?

Answer. I do not, for the simple reason that the Anderson-Javits amendment was defeated by the vote of 31 Republicans and 21 Democrats. It was supported by 43 Democrats and 5 Republicans. I think in the final analysis it will resolve itself into a personal issue in the various States, and within both parties, not between the two parties.

Corrections Made in Bills Prior to Final Approval

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, August 31, I asked unanimous consent that the Clerk be directed to request the Senate to return to the House the bill S. 2965, with the House amendments thereto, and that when said bill and amendments were returned, the Clerk be authorized and directed to make a correction in the engrossed copy of the House amendments as follows:

On page 6, lines 12 and 19, strike out "section 9" and insert "section 3".

The request was made to correct an inadvertent error in the bill—the Public Works Acceleration Act—which passed the House on August 29.

The RECORD will show that an objection was made to the unanimous-consent request, and at this time I want to point out that this was not an unusual request as evidenced by the following instances where Congress has, by concurrent resolution, made corrections in bills prior to final approval with no objection by the House or Senate, or by both, as the case may be:

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Senate Concurrent Resolution 51: Small Business Investment Act amendments. To rescind Speaker's action in signing S. 902 in order to make technical correction (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 18, 1961, p. 18785, Senate; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 19, 1961, p. 19029, House). No objection in Senate or House.

House Concurrent Resolution 399: Civil Service supergrades. To make corrections in H.R. 7377 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 23, 1961, p. 19632, House; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 23, 1961, p. 19768, Senate). No objection in House or Senate.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 78: Transit fares for school children in District of Columbia. Requests return of S. 1745 to make correction (word left out) (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 11, 1962, p. 9386, Senate; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 18, 1962, p. 10141, House). No objection in House or Senate.

House Concurrent Resolution 493: Regulation of imports and agricultural commodities and products. To correct error in spelling in conference report (H.R. 10788) (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14, 1962, p. 9725, House; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14, 1962, p. 9811, Senate). No objection in House or Senate.

House Concurrent Resolution 506: Work Hours Act. To correct error in enrollment of H.R. 10786 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 26, 1962, p. 13842, House; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 1, 1962, p. 14218, Senate). No objection in House or Senate.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 83: District of Columbia Hospital Center. Requests return of S. 3550 to make correction in bill (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 5, 1962, p. 11853, Senate). No objection.

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

Senate Concurrent Resolution 109: Norman, Okla., project. To make corrections in engrossed copy of S. 1892 (106 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 11905, Senate). No objection.

House Concurrent Resolution 706: Hawaii, amending laws. To make corrections in enrolling H.R. 11602 (106 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 15248, House). No objection.

EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

Senate Concurrent Resolution 75: Rio Grande rehabilitation project. To make corrections in enrollment of S. 2120 (104 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5740, Senate; 104 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5840, House). No objection in Senate or House.

House Concurrent Resolution 372: Albeni Falls Reservoir, Idaho. To correct an error in the enrollment of H.R. 13209 (104 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 16566, House; 104 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 16625, Senate). No objection in House or Senate.

House Concurrent Resolution 380: District of Columbia teachers' salaries. To correct errors in the enrolling of H.R. 13132 (104 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 18559–18560, House; 104 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 18617–18618, Senate). No objection in House or Senate.

Old Granddad Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Borough of Queens, New York City, the Honorable John T. Clancy, is declaring September 16, 1962, as "Old Granddad Day." This occasion will be appropriately observed and marked by the final community concert in Forest Park Concert Stadium in my congressional district. The concert will be given by the Seuffert Band, conducted by its outstanding conductor, George Seuffert, Jr.

The principles of this day are well set forth in the proposed proclamation which reads as follows:

Whereas the American way of life is built upon the foundation of a solid and respected family unit; and

Whereas the keystone of any family is its head, its patriarch, its senior member; and

Whereas sound social values consistent with Western culture and civilization, as stated in the Ten Commandments, require that senior citizens, our fathers and mothers, grandmothers and grandfathers, be accorded honor and respect always; and

Whereas, as they live longer and granddads are younger than ever before, the position of these senior citizens grows ever more important, more influential, in our way of life:

I, therefore, as a sign of our deep regard for the head of the family do hereby proclaim and establish Sunday, September 16, 1962, as Old Granddad Day, to be fittingly observed and marked on the occasion of the final community concert in Forest Park Concert Stadium, in our beautiful Borough of Queens and hereby request that all our citizens cooperate with the Old Granddad Club to make this day an occasion to show their deep respect and honor for all granddads, long to be remembered.

Plebiscite for West Berlin—Political Countermove Against Khrushchev's Miscalculations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, Khrushchev's "war of nerves" campaign for the seizure of West Berlin is a critical phase of the Communist international politicomilitary war against us.

In Berlin, as everywhere else, our vacillating defensive policies and their resulting concessions not only fail to stop the Communist advances on all fronts; they actually invite more and more reckless Communist "miscalculated risks."

The United States is in dire need of a complete reorientation of its foreign policies. If we are to survive, we must seize the political initiative in this world civil war.

A plebiscite for West Berlin would serve to publicly expose the fraudulency of Khrushchev's proposal to make West Berlin a free city.

If Khrushchev is not totally committed to wage a nuclear war for West Berlin, the plebiscite would provide him with a face-saving opportunity to withdraw from his miscalculations for the seizure of West Berlin.

I am indebted to Mr. Joseph G. Whelan, and the Legislative Reference Service, of the Library of Congress, for the excellent background material furnished me on this subject.

The following article is an excellent summary of my address to this House on September 11. It was written by Mr. Frank Fortune, a most able writer and analyst for one of the Nation's finest newspapers, the Buffalo Evening News.

The article follows:

POLITICAL OFFENSIVE TO HOLD WEST BERLIN IS SOUGHT BY PILLION

(By Frank Fortune)

WASHINGTON, September 11.—Representative PILLION, Hamburg Republican, today told the House that a political offensive is needed to block the Communist drive to take over West Berlin.

He rejected as a "puny gesture" President Kennedy's call for authority to activiate 150,000 reservists if it becomes necessary.

Mr. PILLION warned that "this callup will only serve to further lull this country into a false sense of security and peace—the

callups is complete proof of the vacuous policies that emanate from our State Department.

"It is another defensive posture that is both self-deceptive and self-defeating."

In his House speech, Representative PILLION renewed his call for an immediate plebiscite in West Berlin.

WANTS CLEAR STAND TAKEN

Besides the plebiscite, Mr. PILLION said that initial steps in the political offensive also should include—

"A reassertion by the President that we intend to keep open all communication lines between West Germany and West Berlin.

"A new note from the President to Russian Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev reasserting our determination to use all necessary means to protect the freedom of the people of West Berlin."

As for the plebiscite, Mr. PILLION said he is confident that in free voting, between 90 percent and 95 percent of the people of West Berlin "would vote to retain the status quo and maintain the city's association with the West German Government," rejecting Khrushchev's proposals to turn West Berlin into a free city.

CALLS POLICY DEFENSIVE

Representative PILLON said "it is clearly evident that the tempo of the Comunist-conducted world civil war is being accelerated on all fronts."

"Our inhibited, our limited, and our defensive political strategy is not halting the Communist advances anywhere," he said. "Our country's margin for survival is being reduced day by day. * * *

"The seizure of West Berlin is not Khrushchev's final objective. It is another tactical, immediate objective. His strategic, long-range objective is the destruction of our NATO alliance."

As for President Kennedy's new request for authority to call up reservists, Representative PILLION said:

"It is a whistle in the darkness of our own cemetery.

RECALLS EARLIER CALLUP

"I would like to recall to the Members of the House that on August 1, last year, this Congress authorized the callup of 250,000 reservists; 150,000 of these were called up.

"A special subcommittee of this House found that last year's callup was shortsighted, badly managed, deficient and totally inadequate."

Representative PILLION declared that the 1961 callup had failed to prevent Communist successes in Laos, South Vietnam and Korea, nor the completion of the "Communist Berlin 'wall of shame.'"

"The callup of 150,000 men will not delay, by even 1 day, the construction of the nuclear missile silos and bases in Cuba," he said.

Advertising for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much lately of the need to sell the virtues of our way of life, and it stands to reason that we should be vigorous international proponents of our economic system that has contributed to our Nation's greatness.

This theme is most effectively presented in a recent editorial in the Lansing Journal, Lansing, Ill., entitled "Advertising for Freedom," which I ask leave to insert into the RECORD at this point:

ADVERTISING FOR FREEDOM

Since the personal enterprise system is the foundation stone on which rest individual freedom and freedom in government, those engaged in business in America have a responsibility and an opportunity to fight antifreedom ideas with all the strength at their command.

What can they do? For one thing, it is incumbent upon American business people to give their support to worthwhile organizations that spread the facts about our personal enterprise system; and, equally important, not to support any organization that, openly or covertly, goes along with the ideas of those forces that work to eliminate freedom.

Furthermore, the heads of all business enterprises, large or small, should make certain that their own policies are in line with the principles of personal enterprise. These policies should be made clear to each individual in every business organization.

Also—and this is of vital importance—business people should take the lead in avoiding the kind of timorous thinking that looks upon patriotism as controversial. American business, with an overall advertising budget this year of about $11 billion, has the means and the ability to make a great contribution toward the preservation of freedom in America by adding patriotism to its advertising.

Patriots who are the customers of business also have a fine opportunity in this connection, the opportunity of letting patriotic advertisers know that they approve.

The personal enterprise system has a wonderfully inspiring story to tell in terms of human happiness and satisfaction. The number of hours of work necessary for an American to earn his daily bread is far less than under any other economic system now or ever known to man.

Another Decision—Another Retreat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Frank B. Best, owner and manager of radio station WDIX, in Orangeburg, S.C., is noted for his interesting and informative broadcast editorial comments. On September 10, 1962, he broadcasted over his station an outstanding editorial entitled "Another Decision—Another Retreat?" which has also been used over a number of other radio stations in South Carolina. It is concerned with our policy in Laos, Berlin, and Cuba. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER DECISION—ANOTHER RETREAT?

The current U.S. News & World Report puts it this way. President Kennedy has made three "fateful decisions." They are Laos, Berlin, and Cuba. The decisions are stated in these words: "Laos—The decision was, after saying on March 15, 1961, that the United States was determined to defend Laos against the Communist rebels, Mr. Kennedy, on March 27, 1962, agreed to seek a deal with Russia for a 'neutral' Laos."

The second fateful decision was: "Berlin—The decision was, after the East Germans at dawn on August 13, 1961, completed the barrier cutting Berlin in two, President Kennedy decided against using U.S. troops to knock down these wire barriers by force."

The third fateful decision is the one the President made on April 16 of last year. It was a Sunday evening. An armed force of Cuban refugees was at sea. This is the report from the U.S. News & World Report. The Cuban invaders had knocked out all but seven of Castro's planes on the day before. The invaders landed with little opposition. They destroyed 2,000 of Castro's troops. They had success at their fingertips. They were faced by Castro's tanks. No air support came to protect them from the tanks. Castro put up what planes he had left, bombed the invaders' supply ship and destroyed their ammunition reserves. President Kennedy had canceled the air support of the invaders own planes. The President of the United States forbid this air support repeatedly during the 3-day ordeal of the Cuban patriots. They did not die in battle. They were nearly all captured. They were without ammunition and communications which the air cover that they had provided for themselves would have given them.

Now the President is faced with another fateful decision. Shall we fight to repel the Soviet invasion of Cuba? The alternative is to accept an enemy submarine base which could and would ring the eastern seaboard with Soviet missile-carrying subs. It would cut off the U.S. Navy and shipping access to the Panama Canal. With the enemy at the door, what could be the solution to United States interests in Europe, Asia, Africa, South America? Obviously the solution would be whatever the Soviet might dictate.

The President, because of three retreats, now faces the ultimate decision. Shall we fight in Cuba? Is this to be another retreat? Is there any end to retreat except slavery?

Shall we continue to follow the leadership of men who have demonstrated their folly? House Resolution 512 would permit investigation of State Department policy. House Resolution 512 will be adopted when you require it.

Platform of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the Affiliated Young Democrats is a very vital and vigorous force in the political life of New York State. At its annual convention it adopted a platform reflecting the progressive zeal of its delegates. I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD.

PLATFORM ADOPTED BY THE 15TH BIENNIAL STATE CONVENTION OF THE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS, INC., OF NEW YORK STATE—AUGUST 24, 1962, AT THE HOTEL PICCADILLY, NEW YORK CITY

Once again the people of the State of New York exercise the solemn responsibility of selecting those to whom the government of this State shall be entrusted for the next 4 years, and of electing a U.S. Senator and a

congressional delegation to represent them in Washington.

The Affiliated Young Democrats of New York State, therefore, without being hampered by narrow partisan advantage has for an extended period been analyzing and evaluating the multivarious policies and problems that confront the present State administration and will confront future administrations.

It is therefore with a profound degree of mature reflections and serious consideration that the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., as it has done for almost three decades of dedication to the concept of good government, respectfully submits herewith its platform for the 1962 State elections.

We have always stated clearly and without equivocation our position on the vital issues, and we do so now.

1. Reapportionment: We favor at once a program of reapportionment that would give the urban areas of the State a more equitable representation in the Legislature by population.

2. Primary elections: We advocate the speedy passage of legislation permitting and requiring statewide primaries.

We recommend that all primaries are to be held on a definite day in the spring of such election year.

We urge that change of voting in national elections to 2 days, the first Monday and Tuesday in November.

We support the enactment of legislation permitting presidential preference primaries giving the voters in each party the right to indicate their preference for candidates for President and Vice President of the United States and to elect delegates committed to the nomination of such candidates.

3. Presidential vote: We favor the abolition of the electoral college and the election of a President and Vice President by direct popular vote pending such amendment to the Federal Constitution, and in order to obtain an equitable division of the electoral vote. We urge the enactment of legislation at Albany permitting the allocation of the State's electoral vote among the candidates for President and Vice President in direct proportion to the popular vote.

4. Home rule: We favor a reexamination of the city-State relationship, with a view to effectuating a greater degree of home rule for the cities.

5. Education: We urge a study be made as to the reasons for the great degree of dropouts from high school and other such distressing data that so adversely affects the young, to ameliorate this condition and to institute programs to correct this disturbing situation.

We also favor a study to determine how to keep our teachers in the school system and how to attract talented and able people to the teaching profession.

We favor an increase in State aid for education so that New York City and other municipalities will receive a fair share of the taxes paid by their residents.

6. Higher education: We favor the restoration of the mandate assuring free tuition at city colleges.

We endorse granting parents a deduction for tuition costs of their children attending college.

We also favor free tuition to all community colleges.

We urge the building of a new science college in our State to help meet the new advances in science.

7. Housing: We urge the building of more middle income homes to meet this need in our State.

We favor a bill to extend the ban on racial discrimination in housing to all multiple dwellings and to one or two family houses throughout the State.

8. Child care: We advocate a program of State aid for child day care in the public schools.

9. Eighteen-year-old vote: We again urge that right to vote be given to those 18 years of age.

10. Board of elections: We favor a revision of the board of elections in New York City that the counties of Queens, Bronx, and Richmond have representation on this board as Kings and New York Counties have now.

11. Taxes: We favor a more equitable distribution of State revenues, whereby New York City would receive a commensurate proportion from the State.

We urge a reduction of State taxes to the greatest extent compatible with a solvent State government.

12. Fair Sabbath law: We favor the enactment of a law permitting the city of New York to enact a fair Sabbath law.

13. Home rule: We urge a reexamination of the city-State relationship, with a view to effectuating a greater degree of home rule for the cities.

14. Subway fare: We favor maintenance of the present 15 cent subway fare in New York City by requiring the State to contribute its fair share to the cost of operating the subway system.

15. Juvenile delinquency: We favor a study of the entire penal system as it relates to the juvenile and to recodify the statutes in order to properly resolve this grievous problem of our society.

We also favor a crash program which will coordinate all the facilities of the relevant agencies in order to guide and help our young to help themselves.

16. Off-track betting: We favor off-track betting by a referendum by each city or community that wants this legislation.

17. Pollution: We favor a study and research to be conducted to help curtail the pollution of our air and water.

18. Natural resources: We favor legislation for an extensive program by our State to conserve and develop our natural resources.

19. Public health: We urge more State aid for public health, more assistance to the mentally ill, and to build more rehabilitation centers.

20. Liquor laws: We favor the raising of the drinking age to 21 years.

21. Old age care: We favor a system that would render medical care to the aged with out requiring that the recipients submit to a degrading means test.

22. Narcotics: We favor a study of the problem of drug addiction to ascertain an effective means where possible for treatment and for the presentation of this dreadful evil. Urge Federal narcotics hospital be built in New York State.

We also urge more stringent penalties to dispensers of narcotics and the purveyors of this poison.

23. State bonus: We urge a State bonus for Korean veterans.

24. Transportation: We urge the building of more roads and better transportation to all our suburban areas of our State because of the fast growing of these communities.

We favor a transit agency that would study and attempt to coordinate and to integrate the public and private facilities available to make access to the various cities of our State more effective.

25. Motorists: We support the exclusive allocation of funds collected from gasoline and motor vehicle licenses to the development of the State highway system.

We favor examinations of all motor vehicle operators to be given every 3 years to help curtail automobile accidents.

26. East Hudson Parkway Authority: We urge repeal of the law creating the East Hudson Parkway Authority, and a return of the Westchester County parkway and the responsibility for their maintenance to the county authorities.

27. Three-day weekend plan: We favor the 3-day weekend plan that celebrates all holidays with the exception of religious holidays, on Monday and a bill be enacted to bring this about.

28. Legislature: We again advocate that a printed record be published and made available to the public of the full proceedings of the legislature.

Another Example of Deceit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, when will the Kennedy administration start telling the truth to the American people?

It seems that instead of improving, as the President said recently, our gold supply crisis is worsening. In the September 11 edition of the Washington Daily News, Henry J. Taylor gives us the real facts:

THE GOLD CRISIS

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Down goes our gold again—down and out.

On July 23 President Kennedy said: "Our gold situation is improving." He documented this by announcing: "Our loss based on the first and second quarters of this year, is half of last year."

Unfortunately, Mr. Kennedy was not free to make his claim. It hadn't happened. And impressing the uninformed can be very dangerous business.

In truth, our loss in the first and second quarters of this year ($455 million) was more than double the loss of last year ($217 million). These are Treasury official figures and, of course, Mr. Kennedy has them. So do informed financiers and governments abroad.

Mr. Kennedy wished to quash anxiety about his high spending. He even pointed out that he was on Telstar TV and thus his declarations were to a world audience. But nothing is so disastrous to confidence as misinformation. Revitalizing world confidence in our dollar this way is like revitalizing an automobile tire by shooting it full of holes.

By now our gold loss for 1962—less than 7 weeks since the President spoke—has exceeded the entire loss for all of 1961. Throughout 1961 we lost $837 million. Through August 28, 1962, we lost $849 million. And even though we gained an unexpected $190 million this spring from Canada.

Treasury figures for the last week of August show our gold knocked down to another new 23-year low. The United States now has less than $4.1 billion to meet $18 billion net foreign short-term demands, payable in gold. For all of Fort Knox—including our $11.5-billion currency reserve required by law—is mortgaged to creditors abroad, plus some $2 billion in gold we do not even have.

Thus the gold problem the President inherited became a gold crisis and now can only be described as a run on America's depleted gold.

Mr. Kennedy refuses to cut his unlimited-debt proposals and excess spending. He talks all around the point and sponsors other palliatives but refuses to stand up to this. Anxious foreigners exercise their option to

call for our depleted gold (as some depositors draw money out of what they suspect is a badly managed bank) because they distrust the up-up-upping of the debt limit, the irresponsible spending, the alibis and—most importantly—the official misinformation to the American people that accompanies much of this.

Unless Mr. Kennedy reverses himself in the matters that now destroy international confidence, most world observers insist the New Frontier is carrying us smack toward a devaluation of the dollar.

The John Birch Society in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, a years ago the Detroit Free Press reported that there were "more than 20" John Birch chapters in Michigan. A conservative estimate today is nearer 100.

In this fourth of six articles, staff writer Barbara Holliday takes you behind the scenes to watch the birth of a new chapter:

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY IN MICHIGAN

If you could put a John Birch Chapter, or cell, as it is often called, on a glass slide and slip it under a microscope, you would see a curious thing.

Every now and then, almost as if by some natural biologic law, you would see the cell divide and form two where only one had existed a moment before.

I saw the results of this curious process at the second John Birch meeting I attended.

The previous month there had been 12 persons present. The next month eight of these had vanished, along with two others on the roll.

I never saw those eight persons again. It was as if they had never existed.

But chapter 69 was still at full strength. Eleven names remained on the roll and some faces new to me appeared to replace those who were gone. These were members who had been absent the previous month.

Steve Crane, it was reported, had taken over the newly formed chapter as leader.

This process of growth and division follows the structural outline proposed by Robert Welch, founder of the society:

"The John Birch Society will function almost entirely through small local chapters, usually of from 10 to 20 dedicated patriots.

"Each will have a chapter leader, appointed by headquarters, or appointed through officers of the society, who themselves have been duly appointed by headquarters.

"We shall build the organizational framework from the bottom up, as made necessary by sufficient membership, in order to keep strict and careful control of what every chapter is doing, and even every member of every chapter so far as the effective work of the society is concerned."

However, once in a while, a cell starts to die.

Then, an entirely different mechanism is put to work.

It was just such a case that led me into one of the most intriguing situations I encountered in my 5 months as a member of the society—a situation where I actually became the nucleus around which a new chapter was to be built.

It was an unusually pleasant June night when I first met the Michigan State coordinator of the John Birch Society—Edward A. Kelly, of Roseville, no relation to Brian Kelly, the leader of Chapter 69.

The reason for his appearance was to give a transfusion to Chapter 290 which had fallen on evil days in suburban Huntington Woods with the loss of its leader, Dr. Dan. Dr. Dan had been "promoted" to section leader to assist Kelly.

CLAIMS REDS LAND TROOPS IN MEXICO

Edward Kelly and I met in the Huntington Woods home of Les Crane, who had been recruited from another chapter to act as chapter leader. Through default, I was the only member of Chapter 290 present.

Kelly is an agreeable athletic looking man about 36, with prematurely gray hair cropped short and light blue eyes that miss very little that's going on.

He has a rich timbre to his voice and speaks quietly, persuasively. He parrots the Blue Book but leaves out the vehemence. The more outrageous the statement, the more matter-of-fact he sounds.

We chatted briefly while we waited for other possible arrivals.

I mentioned an article in the June issue of the Welch magazine, American Opinion, about the Communist threat in Mexico.

"I don't know if you read about this," Kelly said conversationally, "you don't get the news in the papers any more—but 20,000 fully armed and trained Chinese troops have been landed in Mexico.

"One of our people was in Texas not long ago and he went over into the border towns to see what was going on. Villages that normally have 5,000 to 6,000 persons were bulging with 20,000 to 25,000—Mexicans—who are coming out of the bush, trying to get over the border into the United States.

"They sense danger like rats on a sinking ship. It looks as if our time is running out. They (the Communists) are getting ready to take over."

He fished around in his brief case and came up with another pamphlet about the "phantom cells" in Cuba.

"Listen to this," he said. "Word has been passed along to the loyalists to harass in anyway they can. Power failures, disruption of minor services, even the breaking of crockery and dishes in restaurants is part of the scheme. All reusable containers are being destroyed from large cartons down to cigaret packages—even pots and pans. Public toilets are filled with cement. There's hardly a usable public restroom left in Cuba."

This reminded him of the "little old ladies in tennis shoes" in California.

"You know what they do, don't you—or at least so I've heard secondhand—they go into a bookstore chewing bubble gum, get some of this modern filth off the shelves, stick a wad of gum in the pages and saunter out."

He laughed. "Not that this is a recommended Birch activity but it's the same kind of thing they're doing in Cuba."

We began to talk about how to get the chapter on its feet.

"I think we ought to do something spectacular—get some publicity," said Les Crane.

SEVERAL LINED UP AS NEW MEMBERS

"I think we should organize a 'Review of American Foreign Policy of Detroit, Inc.'—it only costs $35 to incorporate—and hold a 2-day school with some good speakers. It doesn't have to be described as a Birch activity. Just interested conservative people in Detroit taking action."

I asked Crane when he was moving (to Grosse Pointe). He said sometime in August.

Kelly commented that he had several persons lined up to come into the chapter.

"One can probably take over as chapter leader to replace you, Les—he's well qualified. I asked him to come tonight but it looks as if he couldn't make it. He's anxious to get in though. He's in investments—and he's pretty busy."

Crane explained that the people he had called were mostly Dr. Dan's friends and relatives and that perhaps they still felt a loyalty to him as chapter leader.

"Also," he added, "one of the most active is a Mrs. L. from Southfield. Antifluoridation is her pet. At any rate, she got the idea the chapter was Catholic dominated.

"I tried to tell her that as long as I was influential in the chapter (I'm an agnostic) it would not be dominated by Catholics or Protestants but by John Birch principles.

"I don't think religion or race has any bearing in the society except, of course, we stand behind the principles. But I say, if you've got a racial or religious peeve, fight it out somewhere else.

"Of course," he added thoughtfully "we get some of those."

"That's a point I want to make," said Kelly. "Before you take in a new member, spend some time with him, find out his background and let's try to steer clear of nuts."

Kelly stood up.

"Well, we might as well get underway," he said, and turned toward the American flag standing in the corner.

Crane and I followed suit, repeated the Pledge of Allegiance, and then sat back down to resume the discussion.

I lent Kelly my British bulletin because he had forgotten his.

He started down the Welch directives for the month explaining as he went along how a good meeting should be conducted.

First on the June list was the King-Anderson bill. Write your Congressman.

The second, display flag on the Fourth.

"We fly the flag at home every day," Kelly said. "Of course, the people where we live think we're nuts but I'd rather be a patriotic nut than just a nut."

FOUR-AND-ONE-HALF-YEAR-OLD STARTS DAILY FLYING OF FLAG

"It all came about rather strangely, he explained. "When we moved out to this house, I had just bought a flag and of course it needed a standard. So we put one up. Right away my 4½-year-old wanted to fly the flag. So we did. The next day he came running in and said, 'Why haven't you put the flag up?'

"So just to satisfy him, I ran it up.

"Because I was new in the neighborhood, one of my neighbors came over and said, 'You a nut or something?'

" 'Why?' I asked.

" 'Why, you're flying the flag every day.'

"It took me off guard," said Kelly, and I couldn't think of what to say. So I came back with, 'Well, I pay taxes every day—so I guess I've got a right to fly the flag every day if I want to.'

"While I was mouthing these words," Kelly continued, "I thought—why, you don't have to be ashamed of your country's flag—so right then and there I held forth for about 30 minutes on why I was flying the flag. Just as it occurred to me. And we've flown it ever since.

"We've sold about 20 flags in our neighborhood—my wife deserves the credit—and you ought to see us on holidays. It looks like a military encampment out there."

We arrived at last at the real issue of the meeting—recruiting.

"There are several good ways," said Kelly. "One of the best is to organize study groups. Talk to your friends and explain that this in an anti-Communist educational course.

"If you can get about a dozen together I will come or send someone once a week to show films such as "Communism on the

Map," "Operation Abolition" and "The Red Web."

"We'll save the new Welch film for the last night. We ought to be able to get at least eight out of the 12.

"Another way is hold a mock Birch meeting and bring along a friend. Attend other conservative groups. Get a conservative speaker for your P.T.A. and watch the reaction of individuals. There are good conservatives everywhere."

DECIDE ON PLAN FOR RECRUITING

Crane and I said we were in favor of placing a small box ad in the newspaper.

Crane said he was anxious to talk to people really interested—"but I want them to come to me," he said.

"Why can't we list a phone number—then they could come to my place of business or here—and we could direct all inquiries to the proper geographical area.

"In my business, I'm a closer. You've never sold a man a car regardless of his verbal commitment until he has put $5 or $10 down. Then he'll never let that $5 or $10 go.

"I think I can close for John Birch. If I know a man is a little interested I can sell him the rest of the way—and I'll get his $2 down. After that he'll feel committed."

Kelly and I agreed this plan sounded like a good one—I could take some of the calls and Crane the others.

As we were about to break up, Kelly's friend arrived. He was a stocky man of medium height who seemed somewhat nervous and ill at ease.

He was a conservative but not a member of John Birch. Kelly filled him in on most of the things we had talked about to reactivate the chapter.

"I don't know," the man said finally. "I'm tied up in so many things right now and I hate to say I'll do it and then not be able to find the time. However, I'll think about it and try to come to the next meeting."

Kelly shook his head good naturedly. "I wish," he said, half-seriously, "that people wouldn't be so transient. It makes my job so much harder trying to keep chapters together."

"What we have here," he said to his friend, "is the remnant of Chapter 290. I'm going to bring in Charlie and two or three others. But it looks as if we'll have to build on Mrs. Holliday."

The Need for a Tighter Gun Law To Check Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr Speaker, in recent months I have called attention to my bill, H.R. 613, which would require the filing of a registration statement with the FBI with respect to pistols and revolvers possessed by private persons. I have always stressed that this bill is intended only as a means to help fight crime and juvenile delinquency, which is today a tragic national problem. I have no desire to take away guns from those who have a right to keep them, such as hunters, sportsmen and others, but I do maintain that immature youngsters and minors have no right to have guns in their possession.

A very tragic situation in the Washington area recently illustrates the point I wish to make. On Saturday, September 1, a 17-year-old from nearby Fairfax County, in Virginia, named John Vinson, Jr., brutally shot and killed another 17-year-old, Lewis M. Goldfein. A young life of a brilliant student who had looked forward to a career as a scientist was snuffed out for no reason whatsoever. As it turned out later, the murderer had a record of crime despite his youthfulness, including also a stay at a mental institution. He had no right and no reason to have a gun in his possession. He was able to purchase that gun without the least difficulty.

If my bill, H.R. 613, had been enacted into law the murderer would not have been able to purchase a gun or to have one in his possession without prior registration with the FBI, and he could never have obtained it as a minor. The result is two very brokenhearted and tragic families, one having lost its son, the other having its son branded as a murderer and a criminal.

More than ever there is a need now for enactment of a law such as proposed in my bill, in order to prevent crime. Now it is finally beginning to dawn on the public that unless such a law is enacted the crime wave, already enormous, will grow even greater. Women and children are no longer safe on our streets, and few people will venture out in the evenings in our large cities. How many more such innocent victims will have to pay with their lives before we take steps to check this menace?

Mr. Speaker, in its issue of September 12, 1962, the Washington Daily News published an excellent editorial on the subject. Although the editorial does not mention my bill, it is actually an endorsement of the principle and the idea proposed in my bill. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD this editorial, as well as an earlier story from the same newspaper in the issue of September 6.

I commend these two items to the attention of all my colleagues, and most especially to the members of the House Judiciary Committee to whom my bill has been referred for action. I urge the committee to act on the measure while Congress is still in session. Every day's delay means the further loss of lives.

The articles referred to above read as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 12, 1962]

SHOOT THE WORKS—TOUGHER LAWS FOR OWNING GUNS

Despite the innocent uses to which they are often put, guns are plainly designed for one main purpose: To kill. They manage to do this quite regularly, efficiently, and illegally.

The recent shooting of one Fairfax boy by another has led to some understandable soul searching by various officials as to whether the laws controlling the sale and possession of guns—particularly in respect to minors—are adequate.

We realize that nothing is so bound to bring the red-blooded devotees of guns to the barricades as to question the free circulation of these instruments of death.

It is argued that people who like guns, respect guns. That they know how to use them, and do so safely. This myth is exploded by the annual toll throughout the Nation of deerslayers slain by fellow deerslayers, by the fact that men with loaded shotguns are still trying to find a way to get over that fence—alive—and by the fact that mentally retarded types, like those who join Nazi groups and other such racial and political idiocies, strut guns.

We're not inveighing against skeet and target shooters, or even against those people who, for fun, like to shoot birds and other small creatures. However: As things stand today, isn't it too easy for despondent husbands to get guns? For wives who feel in need of a change? Or children who get pop's pistol to show it to a playmate? Or roulette players, Russian-style? Or homicidal psychotics? Or teenager killers? Or criminals of all sorts?

True, many property owners do arm themselves in order to give their homes and families a modicum of protection that in many urban and suburban areas local police are unable to furnish. They are within their rights, although it should be noted that these people are preparing themselves to mete out punishment to trespassers and housebreakers far in excess of what society would exact, if society caught the transgressor.

Actually, armed householders seldom get the chance to protect themselves; their guns are always in the other room, or unloaded, or jammed from disuse. So, as it stands, the criminals' guns kill far more law abiders than the law abiders' guns do their attackers.

Mind you, we've nothing against the constitutional right of citizens to bear arms. But today it seems that the outlaws bearing arms outnumber the law abiders bearing arms. We're outgunned. We'd like to see some sensible controls, because we think it would cut down the firepower of the enemy, even if it inconveniences the sporting duck slayers.

The obvious place to start is with a law requiring all guns to be licensed and registered.

We license automobiles and nobody objects. Some States license boats. In Washington today, you are much more likely to be shot by an armed criminal than to be bitten by a dog. Yet we license dogs. So do most communities. If dogs, why not guns?

Licensing may not stop people from killing themselves and each other—by whatever means are at hand—but it would make shooting somewhat more difficult and would protect the innocent bystander.

It would be the first step toward some rational control of the sale and use of lethal weapons.

Just to kick off the discussion, we suggest:

No gun, of whatever caliber or style, should be sold without special police license.

No gun, of whatever caliber or style, should be sent through the mails, or across State lines, except by registered mail or some Federal equivalent.

No police license should be granted to anyone with a criminal record.

No license should be granted to anyone except those who, on personal application and after police check, qualify as responsible, employed, taxpaying citizens of legal age.

Fingerprints should be taken of all persons so licensed, in duplicate; one for police, the other for the licensee. The duplicate (showing the fingerprints of the purchaser) should be mailed to the police by the seller after the transfer.

That will do for a starter.

A set of regulations along those lines would make it more inconvenient—but not impossible for legitimate ownership by de-

votees of sporting guns or of firearms for home protection.

But they would make it much tougher for criminals, delinquent minors and nuts to get firearms. And it would make it much tougher on those other irresponsible delinquents in the business of selling guns to such people.

Such regulations should not give legitimate dealers or purchasers heartburn; but the plain fact is that the laws now in effect operate to put guns most easily into the hands of those who should not have them.

We think the District, Maryland, and Virginia would do well to give thought to tightening these laws. In fact, we like the idea of an overall Federal law.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 6, 1962]

TIGHTER GUN LAWS SOUGHT FOR FAIRFAX

The Fairfax supervisors yesterday asked staff members to draw up suggestions for tightening the county's laws on guns so that they can't be bought by anyone under 18.

Both a county ordinance and State law make it illegal for anyone other than a parent to sell or give a firearm of any type to a juvenile.

However, as Supervisor Robert C. Cotten pointed out, a 17-year-old bought a gun recently simply by telling the shopkeeper that he was 23.

With that gun, the teenager, John Vinson, Jr., told police he shot and killed Lewis M. Goldfein, also 17, a former schoolmate, early last Saturday.

Vice Chairman Anne Wilkins, who seconded Mr. Cotten's motion, said the staff also should look into the possibility of registering the sales of all guns in the county.

The District makes a police check of prospective gun buyers, who must be 21 and of good moral character. Arlington and Alexandria have a similar rule and swap information on gun buyers with the District.

In Montgomery and Prince Georges minors can buy guns with their parents' permission. Without it, buyers must be 18 and take an oath they haven't been convicted of a crime of violence. In both counties purchase records are sent to State police and county court clerks.

Freedom Is in Trouble in Haiti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding student at Yale University, Mr. William Wangensteen, worked with me this past summer as part of the Yale intern program for work in Washington. Mr. Wangensteen, whose home is in Minneapolis, traveled to Central and South America later in the summer and has written the following useful article concerning one of the areas he visited:

FREEDOM IS IN TROUBLE IN HAITI

(By William Wagensteen)

HAITI.—a Negro republic in the Caribbean, proud of its historical parallel to the American Revolution, a land strikingly beautiful in its setting and its verdant floral coverings, a land characterized by city neon lights and a strong, functioning voodoo religion, American automobiles and barefoot women bearing baskets on their heads. Haiti—the police state, the paradox of the New World, and a thorn in the side of New World democracy and progress.

The approach to Port-au-Prince, the capital city of some 250,000 population, presents the visitor with a stark study of contrast which is exemplary of the Haitian situation today. One is impressed, indeed overwhelmed by the beauty and harmony of this lovely harbor surrounded by towering mountain ranges—a vision soon marred, however, by the emergence of dozens of small boats from the shoreline bearing scantily dressed Negro children who swarm around the incoming vessels to beg. Two or three to a boat—usually including one specially emaciated or underfed little fellow to attract the heartfelt sympathy and thus pocket money of arriving tourists—these beggars crowd around the ship in a single mass and vie with each other in screaming up to the passengers for money—preferably quarters or halves nowadays (pennies are largely scoffed at), then diving in the water and fighting over the recovery of some coin which is quickly pocketed by the eldest of the group.

The sight is at once terribly fascinating and yet pitiful; and it is only a prelude to the other forms of indigence on this half-island country. Poverty and stagnation—the most prevalent indications that Haiti has been experiencing little but decline since the midfifties; decline in the realms of individual freedoms, economic well-being, and social harmony. The causes of this blight on Haiti are of course manifold; nevertheless, it can safely be asserted that primarily it is due to the progressive usurpation of dictatorial powers and gradually accelerated extortion of the people by President Francois Duvalier.

On May 2, 1961—now commemorated in Haiti as the Second of May Movement (the celebration of which this year our Ambassador discreetly excused himself from attending)—Haitians went to the ballot boxes in response to Haitian provisions of compulsory vote for legislative representatives. Interestingly enough, the presidential election was scheduled for the following November, a race from which the President, Duvalier by name, was automatically debarred from entry because of Haitian law forbidding a President from succeeding himself in a second term of office. The ballot on May 2, 1961, did offer a free choice for legislative candidates; however, at the bottom of each ballot was plainly printed the name of President Francois Duvalier. The effect of this ballot, as devised and interpreted by Duvalier himself, was that a vote for any legislative candidate was also a vote for the incumbent Duvalier for an unprecedented second term as President. The November elections never materialized and Duvalier reigns supreme today. And as has been true of other dictatorial governments in the past, the role of the legislative branch of Haitian government is farcical: the legislature is unicameral and serves as little more than a sounding board for approving and eulogizing Duvalier and his actions. Duvalier announces and implements a new law of his making and the legislature approves it at a later date, retroactively.

The depreciating effects of this type of democracy which Duvalier operates in Haiti are obvious to the inquiring visitor. For example, the roads in Port-au-Prince, and elsewhere in Haiti, are very poor due to consistent neglect. It is interesting to note that the main arteries of transportation in Haiti today, including the wharf in Port-au-Prince, were built by the U.S. Marines some 30 years ago.

Today, where an ounce of upkeep could have served to maintain the good quality of these roads, one experiences little more than eroding and crumbling surfaces.

Also interesting is the presence of propaganda posters and signs along the streets of Port-au-Prince—"Duvalier, spirit of the people"—a strange phenomenon in view of the nonexistence of any forthcoming elections of the Presidency. Then too, there are bulletins praising the "model town" which Duvalier is supposedly planning to build with taxes collected from road travel. This road tax is quite rigidly enforced—in fact the British Ambassador to Haiti was made persona non grata for refusing to pay the highway tolls—and it works a special hardship on the commuters from Petion-Ville, a suburb in the hills a few miles beyond Port-au-Prince who are subject to daily taxation of amounts exorbitant by even American standards.

To supplement the revenues derived from the road tax, Duvalier has instituted the stamp tax to fight illiteracy, a sizable portion of the proceeds of which thus far have gone into Duvalier's gift to his daughter upon reaching her 21st birthday, in the form of a gold Thunderbird (with the license plate, DD 21, for Diane Duvalier), now complete with an escort of guards.

In the center of Port-au-Prince there stands a huge, ominous prison, directly across from the presidential palace (appropriately enough), furnished with armed guards and a machine gun nest facing the road—al of which suggests a strong resemblance to France during the occupation. The impression of police state control is then hightened by the fact that the highways outside of Port-au-Prince are dotted every 3 to 5 miles with Government-installed road stations at which travelers must stop for registration and fingerprinting.

The results of this extortion and Government autocratic rule are self-evident to the returning travler and American personnel worker in Haiti today. The Haitian people now are more poorly dressed than a few years ago; shops close earlier; there are more idlers and beggars on the streets, especially children. Utilities are faltering; road repairs and maintenance are seemingly nonexistant; electricity is turned off in various districts in Port-au-Prince at different times of the day—certainly not a novel development of late in Haiti, but presently more distressing than ever before because of the increased amount of time during which houses are left without electricity and because of the irregularity with which the shutoffs occur—with resulting fear on the part of many Haitians of perhaps a total loss of electricity. And the situation regarding telephone service is even more precarious. There are telephones in Haiti, but they never seem to work. Ambassador Thurston says that he can expect to be able to make a telephone connection 1 time out of 30 attempts. The phone may ring, but no connection is usually effected.

When receiving calls from Washington, the Ambassador has to venture over to the telephone company itself to find a reliable phone; those in the Embassy cannot even be relied upon.

Illiteracy in Haiti is an ever-vexing problem. Educational facilities are being built and staffed by various interest groups, but the pace is slow and burdened by the added confusion arising from the fact that there has as yet been no settlement to the 40-year squabble over a written language for Creole, which is the spoken tongue of the majority of Haitians.

The Haitian agricultural economy is beset with the dual problem of drought and poor handling of distribution of landholdings. The watershed problem is a longstanding barrier to a growing agricultural economy in Haiti, a situation aggravated by Haitian ignorance of the means to handle watershed and by President Duvalier's rebuff of American supervision of the expending of money which the United States offered to grant

Haiti for the purpose of bringing thousands of acres of land in the interior of Haiti into irrigation.

Moreover, though Haiti does not suffer from the evils of the hacienda system, as still do Chile and Peru, Haitians have difficulties resulting from the fact that the private landholdings in the country are too small rather than too large, making it too difficult to eke out a living; and many holdings which formerly represented some of the best coffee plantations in the New World have now fallen into neglect and the coffee grows wild. Perhaps the most depressing factor, however, is that the Haitians on the whole do not seem to care, or are resigned to a disintegrating economy. True, the U.N. and Protestant missionaries have greatly enhanced the possibilities of inculcating a capitalistic spirit in the Haitian people through their establishment of cooperatives and workshops which have served to overcome the problem of undersized farm plots. But there is still no concept of tomorrow in their minds or in their hearts; the people, especially those outside of Port-au-Prince, even though growing ever poorer, are less sullen about it. The situation, however, is transitory; the state of apathy may easily erupt into violent political dissension and recourse to rebellion against the government forces which dominate and drain the economy.

Finally, added to the economic and political distresses is the serious issue of racial prejudice, a problem which has really been unknown in Haiti since the early 19th century when the natives rebelled against their French overlords. Today, with the rise to power of Francois Duvalier, there has emerged a definite campaign of prejudice against light Negroes (Duvalier's is the "dark regime" which represents a distinct change from the "light government" of former President Maguier), with growing fears among lighter Haitians of land confiscation and job discrimination.

Haiti today is a true police state, complete with effective and towering censorship, rigid and discriminating taxes and national lotteries which all are obliged to purchase every 3 months of the year, and an elaborate informer system of "bogeymen" comprising one-tenth of the population of the "republic" whose Gestapo-like methods and purposes infuse a strong element of terror into an already unstable and deprived society, kindling the embers of dissent.

Haiti is an anchronism; at one time a rich colony in the New World under early French dominion, later the second land to claim and win its independence from European colonialism at the beginning of the 19th century, Haiti has in the last century and a half failed to progress in the path of Western, modern-day standards of political freedom and economic well-being established by her sister republic to the north. Instead, she stands as a black mark on the pages of progress in the Western Hemisphere, an island of backwardness and corruption in a sea of rising expectations.

Problem: Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the September 12, 1962, issue of the Washington, D.C., Star. The editorial, entitled "Problem: Time," points out how little time remains for the Congress to enact effective legislation closing loopholes in the Food and Drug Act and strengthening the hand of the Federal Food and Drug Administration to protect the American people from dangerous, contaminated, improperly labeled, and inadequately tested drugs.

Unless vigorous and early action is taken, it may well be 2 years or more before the Congress acts to protect American citizens from things like thalidomide and Mer 29, which caused so much heartache to so many American citizens.

The editorial follows:

PROBLEM: TIME

The drug-control bill which the Senate approved by a 78-to-0 vote on August 23 would impose effective and, in our opinion, needed new safeguards on the production and distribution of pharmaceuticals. On Friday, the House Commerce Committee, headed by Representative HARRIS of Arkansas, will meet in executive session to develop a companion version. The committee's decisions at that time could well determine the fate of the remedial legislation during this session.

For the problem is that the time remaining for Congress to act is rapidly running out, and if the House version should differ substantially from that already approved by the Senate, there is danger that the entire package could bog down in controversy. The Harris committee should not permit this threat to arise. And it can best be avoided if the committee will accept the Senate-passed bill, at least as a basis for its deliberations.

Presumably the alternative is to report an amended version of an omnibus bill introduced some time ago by Mr. HARRIS, the scope of which far exceeds the Senate measure. Admittedly, the Senate bill does not reach all the shortcomings of the statutes under which the Food and Drug Administration operates—shortcomings which should be dealt with later. Its provisions, however, do correct the most glaring of the deficiencies which handicap the FDA in its job of assuring the safety and the usefulness of the flood of new drugs emerging from the laboratories of the Nation.

America's Profile Is Losing Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this House a very fine editorial which appeared in the Ashland Times-Gazette, an outstanding daily newspaper in the 17th Ohio District. It was written by Mr. Robert M. Beer, publisher, who is now in West Palm Beach, Fla., close to the scene of the Cuban cancer.

I commend it to my colleagues in the House:

AS REDS SAIL WITH THE SUNSET—AMERICA'S PROFILE IS LOSING FACE

Those who live within a hundred miles of Cuba are probably more acutely aware of the triple threat that Castro, Russia and Communist China are so arrogantly demonstrating.

It would seem, by the mild interpretation that our President has made of this latest unloading of military personnel, crates with missile silhouettes and the firing upon one of our military aircraft far beyond the international limit of Cuba's shores, that all is well—Pearl Harbor a lost lesson.

Are we to believe that all of this activity is for no serious purpose? Are we actually afraid to enforce the Monroe Doctrine because some neutral nations might take offense?

Where in the name of humanity is our courage and sense of danger?

President Kennedy writes of "Profiles in Courage," yet he projects a Caspar Milquetoast image to the rest of the world by tolerating a slap on each cheek as a gesture of friendship.

Our continued withdrawal from the ominous facts is neither consistent with the proved valor of President Kennedy nor the traditional bravery of our past generation.

We fail to conceal our horror of war by flinching from a crude and brazen campaign of Red effrontery.

If war is to be prevented it is difficult to understand why this country dissipates it's prime physical assets to buy support for a type of government that is losing all aspects of a republic and world power.

Soviet soil lies only 20 miles across the Bering Strait from our most northern State of Alaska.

Ninety miles from the southern tip of Florida sits the impudent and stupid Castro—responding to the strings of the puppet master of the Kremlin.

Many of our real friends are beginning to wonder how much longer this seeming timidity and evidence of faint heart is to continue. Those who are really weak can hardly be blamed for considering the prudence of joining communism if Uncle Sam is either unable or unwilling to stop the surge—the driving progress and slashing insolence of hammer and sickle.

Will we never learn that a bully can be stopped only when he is rebuffed with a dose of his own aggressive tactics?

Our space developments cost the people many billions, yet we broadcast our failures and illustrate our successful efforts in detail for the enemy to copy at our expense.

Certainly a barricade of Cuba would be no more provocative than the wall that divides Berlin.

Rickover's Thesis Is Debatable in Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover has been among the most prominent critics of the public education programs in this country. The debates which have centered around his proposals, including his two special appearances before the House Committee on Appropriations, are causing many Americans to consider the desirability of changing education practices in this country to incorporate ideas from abroad. While we need to adopt a critical attitude toward our own education programs, we also need to be care-

ful that we do not become deluded as to the wisdom and soundness of practices in other countries simply because they are different from our own.

The following article, which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, September 9, 1962, written by Mr. John Rosselli, deputy London editor of the Manchester Guardian, contains some words of caution for those who would transfer to the United States education practices which the British are about to discard. Under unanimous consent, I include this in the RECORD:

RICKOVER'S THESIS IS DEBATABLE IN BRITAIN

(By John Rosselli)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Deputy London editor of the Manchester Guardian, Rosselli spent 3 years in American schools and holds degrees from Swarthmore College and Cambridge University. He writes on educational subjects for the Guardian.)

LONDON.—The grass always looks greener on the other side of the wall. This is likely to be the comment of many here when they hear that Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover has extolled the British educational system at the expense of American schools.

By an ironic coincidence often found when one country looks at another's institutions, Rickover has praised those very features of the English system that are now most controversial and that many teachers want to get away from.

At the same time, some of the American practices which he attacks are now winning approval from Britons who only a few years ago would have scoffed at any idea of imitating them.

In his testimony to the House Appropriations Committee, Rickover praised British schools for grouping pupils according to ability, sometimes from the earliest years and always through the "11 plus" examination, which channels children at 11 into one of three types of school—grammar schools for the academic minded, technical for the machine minded, and secondary modern for the nonacademic majority.

Rickover said that all three types concentrated on basic education rather than "life adjustment," pointing to the advanced examination questions which British 18-year-olds are expected to tackle and to the study of calculus and coordinate geometry by 15-year-old students.

These are matters for fierce controversy in Britain. The last few years have seen a quickening opposition to practices that divide children and lead them to specialize from an early age. The trend of recent policy has been to undo or blur some of the arrangements that most attract the admiral.

Because they were solidly taught, Rickover's testimony added, British grammar school pupils who passed the advanced school examination at 18 reached a standard almost comparable to an American bachelor's degree. It followed that "an English student working for his first degree will be doing graduate work largely." Of all Rickover's claims, this has been most widely quoted here.

It will confirm many people in their opinion of American higher education—but will be skeptically received by a growing number of academics who know American universities at first hand and are not above wanting to imitate them.

Finally, the admiral praised British schools for sticking to a longer school day and school year than prevails in America, for holding examinations to a nationwide standard and for avoiding such frills as semiprofessional sport and fully professional fundraisers.

The delay in issuing the admiral's testimony, delivered on May 16, has insured its coming out within a few days of two remarkable and highly authoritative statements, both of which seem almost purposely designed to undermine his main thesis.

The new British minister of education, Sir Edward Boyle, has just declared that "old fashioned tripartism," the irrevocable channeling of 11-year-olds into one of three distinct types of school—is virtually dead.

By this he meant that measures taken by local government authorities in recent years had so blurred the frontiers between the three types as to make the tripartite system a misnomer.

These measures have come about because of widespread anxiety among parents and some teachers in the face of a system which appeared to determine at the age of 11 the future academic chances and—equally important in England—the future social status of most children. Those who did not get into grammar school were unofficially but universally said to have "failed the 11 plus"—a prospect that caused many sleepless nights and bitter tears.

Some local groups, such as the London County Council, have tried to get around this by setting up "comprehensive" schools. These still group children according to ability but under the same roof, so that switching from one group to another is easier and no status distinction arises.

Others, generally supported by the conservative government, have preferred to give late developers and other gifted children in secondary modern schools a footing on the academic ladder. Much prominence is now given to stories of secondary modern pupils who have won through to first-class university degrees.

Though there is a lot of leeway to make up, this is the way Sir Edward Boyle hopes to push the system, and few would wish to hold him back.

Grouping by ability is still a hotly controversial subject and the admiral would still find a good many British supporters. Early specialization, however, is fact becoming an educational dirty word. Here the admiral already looks like something of a lone seawolf.

"Looking at puddles of knowledge instead of the incoming tide" was how Percy Wilson, senior chief inspector to the Ministry of Education, described the early specialization common in nearly all schools.

Academic work, he said, "is semispecialized to a degree which, at the age of 14 or 15, makes no sense at all, and is indefensible in any circumstances or by anything other than the naked admission of competitive pressures."

In universities, too, a reaction has set in against the highly specialized honors course. Only one university, Keele, still requires students to combine arts and science subjects, but new universities at Brighton, York, and Norwich all demand a novel breadth of studies.

Rickover's most striking statement to a British ear, his comparison of a British grammar school finisher with an American college graduate, will confirm the prejudices of old-style academics here. The more wide-awake teachers, however, are now well aware of the difference between Harvard and Toonerville Tech.

Some go further and, like Professor Ely Devons of London University, have urged that Britain should go some way at least toward adopting the American pattern of graduate studies as a sequel to the normal undergraduate course—on the ground that knowledge is now too complicated for the average undergraduate to pick up more than a limited technical competence in answering examination questions.

The moral may be that the two systems already are more alike than the admiral thinks, that they may need to grow still more alike but that if they are to imitate one another it would be a pity to copy the model of the day before yesterday.

The Will Behind the Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very impressed with two articles which were printed in the September 9 edition of the Los Angeles Times. One is a column entitled "Foreign Policy Drains United States of Main Weapon," by Ayn Rand. The other is an editorial entitled "The Will Behind the Words." I ask unanimous consent that both of these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY DRAINS UNITED STATES OF MAIN WEAPON

(By Ayn Rand)

Those who do not understand the process by which the morality of altruism is destroying the world may observe it in the disgraceful nightmare of America's foreign policy.

We are draining our lifeblood—our economic power—on the sacrificial altar of global needs, asking nothing in return. Allegedly, what we expect to gain is the friendship of other nations. But we are betraying the friendly nations that trust us—we are destroying the recipients of our help—and we are delivering the world into the power of the very evil we are calling men to fight.

We are proclaiming that it is our duty to lead a world crusade against communism—and we are destroying its only opposite, the only system that can fight it, our own.

ESSENCE OF ALTRUISM

This is the essence of altruism: the first sacrifice it demands—of a man or of a nation—is the abandonment of self-esteem.

In a recent interview with a group of Brazilian university students, President Kennedy made it clear that we have no direction to offer the world, no political principles, no ideals, no goals. He declared that socialism was as acceptable to us as any other system.

"If by socialization you mean ownership of the means of production or of the basic industries," he said, "that is a judgment which you must make * * * We prefer the competitive market economy here * * * You may decide that or you may decide on another course of action. We would accept that as long as it represented a free choice."

I quote two definitions from the American College Dictionary:

"Communism: a theory or system of social organization based on the holding of all property in common, actual ownership being ascribed to the community as a whole or to the state."

"Socialism: a theory or system of social organization which advocates the vesting of ownership and control of the means of production, capital, land, etc., in the community as a whole."

Is this what we are asked to crusade, sacrifice, fight, and die for?

MEANS ONLY DIFFERENCE

There is no difference between communism and socialism, except in the means of achieving the same ultimate end: communism proposes to enslave men by force, socialism—by vote. It is merely the difference between murder and suicide.

The uniquely, specifically American political principle was the rights of man—not the rights of mob.

The American system, based on the rights of the individual, was capitalism. Freedom, progress, prosperity, and all the other values of a civilized society were the product of capitalism and have never existed (nor can ever be maintained) under any other system.

But it is capitalism that our statist-collectivist intellectuals reject—and our foreign policy is the monument to the bankruptcy of their leadership.

People the world over understand the nature of the global conflict, even though their leaders do not have the courage to name it: individual rights versus brute force—freedom versus slavery—capitalism versus socialism.

By condemning, denouncing, and apologizing for her own system, America is disarming them intellectually and killing their only hope.

Soviet Russia does not need to do much propaganda about altruism or about the right of the underprivileged to everybody else's property—we are doing it for her. She is cashing in on our ideological suicide, secure in the knowledge that communism is the most consistent political embodiment of altruism—of general self-sacrifice—and that the crude brutality of her conquests will encounter no resistance.

KNOW ONLY FORCE

Which side will the people of the world choose in such circumstances—particularly those new nations, emerging from savagery, who understand nothing but the power of brute force?

The gullible sentimental collectivists of the West are puzzled by Russia's current atrocities. They are wondering why Russia does not seem to care about the public opinion of the world, why she is dropping her humanitarian image and showing her naked soul in such acts as the detonation of the biggest nuclear bomb, the erection of the concentration-camp wall in Berlin, the sadistic horror of shooting fleeing children.

Those Western parlor pinks miss the nature of the message that Russia is conveying to the world.

The message is the boast of a brute, deliberately defying every value of civilization, every vestige of respect for human life and rights, proving that their champions are impotent to defend them—and thus declaring to the uncivilized hordes of the globe that the world is theirs to take over.

This is the purpose of shooting an 18-year-old boy who tried to escape from East Berlin, and letting him bleed to death at the foot of the wall, in the sight and hearing of the Western people.

FREEST ECONOMY

West Germany is the freest, the most nearly capitalist economy in Europe. The constrast between West and East Berlin is the most eloquent modern evidence of the superiority of capitalism over communism. The evidence is irrefutable. Russia does not intend to refute it. She is staging an ideological showdown: she is spitting in our face and declaring that might is right, that brutality is more powerful than all our principles, our promises, our ideals, our wealth and our incomparable material superiority.

Such is the silent symbol now confronting the world: the steel skyscrapers, the glowing shop windows, the glittering cars, the lights of West Berlin—the achievement of capitalism and of capitalism's essence: of free, individual men—and, lying on its doorstep, in the outer darkness, the bleeding body of a single, individual man who had wanted to be free.

Soviet Russia understands the heart of the issue.

When are we going to begin to understand it?

THE WILL BEHIND THE WORDS

The defiant warning issued by President Monroe against the designs of imperialist Russia was composed of strong words—and a strong will to enforce them. Our capacity to resist was slight but it was magnified many times by our great determination.

Ten days ago the reverse seemed true. President Kennedy said at his press conference April 29 that the Monroe Doctrine still "means what it meant" in 1823. But many Americans wondered if it did; many nations were acting as though they were sure it did not.

The will that had first given meaning to the words of the doctrine seemed strangely lacking in the months that followed the disastrous Bay of the Pigs expedition.

Caution and inaction were interpreted as weakness by the Soviet Union as it boldly stepped up its transformation of Cuba into an armed Communist base. Our close NATO allies—Britain, West Germany, Norway and Greece—were so unimpressed with our passive attitude that they stood by as their merchant ships carried arms, equipment, and technicians to the island outpost.

Not until Moscow publicly admitted its coarse intervention did the will of the Government again manifest itself.

Mr. Kennedy issued another reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine last week. This time, however, he began to take the first steps in demonstrating our determination. There could be no doubt as to the impatient mood of the Congress and the Nation: they possessed the will; they lacked only the leadership.

When the President asked Congress Friday for permission to call up 150,000 reservists, the bipartisan support was immediate and strong. Its leaders did not need to be told that the Reserves were necessary "to permit strong, prompt, and effective challenges * * * which may be presented anywhere in the world."

Mr. Kennedy should now act upon the proposal of Republican leaders that he request permission to use Armed Forces "as he sees necessary," just as President Eisenhower did to meet the Communist threat in the Formosa Straits. Congress will not say "No."

There should also be no hesitation on the part of the President in taking other necessary responses.

He should demand, not merely ask, that our NATO allies cease allowing merchant vessels carrying their flags to aid our common enemy. It is an outrage that those nations whom we have helped to defend and to rebuild should repay us in this way.

He should in fact insist that NATO countries and the members of the Organization of American States immediately join us in collective action against the Cuban threat including an effective embargo. It is late, yet not too late.

If our friends are irresolute, we must act alone, reserving to ourselves the right to take any action necessary "against those who would endanger hemispheric peace and safety."

We will surely be accused of rattling our saber. We are not, but we have drawn it from its scabbard and it will stay unsheathed.

Small Business: An Important Cog in the Wheel of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, several feature editorial writers have been criticizing the Kennedy administration as being hostile to business. A study of legislation which the 87th Congress has enacted and the attitude of the administration show that small business has been encouraged and protected from unfair competition. Such has not been the case always.

For the past 50 years there has been a growing conviction in the United States that American economic life and big business is synonymous, yet this conviction is one of those chronic stereotypes that seems to gain strength with age rather than from any intrinsic truth in its makeup. Actually, the small business is, as has always been, the backbone of American economic strength.

The 4½ million firms which can be considered small businesses carry on over 40 percent of America's total business activity and employ nearly 30 million people. They produce and distribute an immense variety of goods and services worth billions of dollars annually. If they were all to close tomorrow, the United States could not exist in spite of the presence of General Motors and even American Telephone & Telegraph would begin to lose money.

Yet the small businessman has often been the stepchild of the American Government, fighting against unfair competition, complicated tax laws, and conflicting regulations. In a time of general business prosperity, the small business has often felt the pinch of falling profits and business failure.

The advent of the Kennedy administration to office has made a significant difference in the attitude of the Federal Government to the role of small business in the United States. No better proof can be given than in the growing activities of the Small Business Administration. In New York State alone, small business investment companies increased almost threefold since January 1961. They grew from 25 to 73 in a period of a year and one-half.

In 1960, the SBA made only 52 business loans in New York State totaling almost $2,771,000. This number was increased to 178 loans of over $8.5 million in 1961 and in the first 6 months of 1962, 94 loans of almost $8 million were made.

One of the first actions taken by President Kennedy after coming into office was to reverse the trend of taking defense contracts away from small firms. A 10 percent increase in the number of defense contracts granted to such firms was ordered and today the number of defense contracts held by such companies is the highest since the Korean war.

The Kennedy administration instituted a more liberal allowance for the depreciation of machinery and equipment which in effect meant a generous tax cut for the businessmen of America. More important—regulations have been simplified and new guidelines were published which will make it possible for the small businessman who cannot engage high-priced tax specialists to make full use of these benefits. In addition to the new depreciation allowance, the Revenue Act of 1962 also allows any business the credit of 7 percent of an investment in new equipment against their tax liability.

A vital bill that is now under consideration is designed to help small concerns to obtain leases in prime commercial locations such as shopping centers. At present, it is often difficult for the small, one- or two-man business to obtain leases in such areas; the owners preferring to deal with larger companies that they feel are more stable and will be better able to meet long-term lease obligations. The bill would authorize the Small Business Administration to guarantee, directly or in cooperation with others, the payment of rentals of small retailers. Laws such as these, and a pending amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act, to permit issuance of temporary cease-and-desist orders are all evidence of the importance the Democratic administration attaches to the well-being of the small businessman.

My own city, New York, is a city of small businessmen, specializing in vital retail, wholesale, small manufacturing and service activities. The financial center while publicized is only a part of city life. A law that helps these businesses cannot help but improve the economic tone of our city by increasing its prosperity, help keep our people working.

It is important in evaluating the progress of this administration to reflect upon the action which this Congress has taken and the policy the administration has pursued. Sober reflection will show that business has a rosy future and New York City will continue to grow.

Gift to St. Joseph's Shrine, Lowell, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the pride and traditions of the French people are deeply rooted in the large Franco-American community in my district. One of the outstanding citizens and leader in this community is Father Armand Morissette, OMI, of the oldest French church in Lowell, Mass., St. Jean Baptiste.

Recently, St. Joseph's Shrine in Lowell was endowed with a gift of great beauty and of very great significance. The gift consists of a chalice, ciborium, and ostensorium made in the highest standards of craftsmanship and orginally presented to Father Morissette, who has now donated this unique gift to St. Joseph's.

I enclose an account of this presentation which appeared in the Lowell Sun of September 9:

FRENCH NAVY PRESENTS CHAPLAIN GIFT OF DEEP SIGNIFICANCE

(By Marguerite Lyons)

LOWELL.—Yesterday, quaint, old and devotion-inspiring St. Joseph's shrine in downtown Lowell was endowed with a gift and symbol of deep significance, so valuable not only in the gold of which it is made, but in the art and European craftsmanship that went into its making, that its value could not be adequately estimated in this country.

Donor of the gift, a personal one to him, was Rev. Armand Morissette, OMI.

For years, 25 to be exact, sailors and enlisted men from the newest recruit to the highest ranking officer in the French Navy have been engaged in a project to which each man took pride in making a personal contribution. Object of the project was to donate a tangible expression of the French sailors' gratitude to their beloved chaplain.

It took much thought, planning, and consideration to decide upon an appropriate memento that would henceforth be a constant reminder of them to their chaplain. And the occasion for giving it would be his silver jubilee of ordination. This anniversary was in 1960, but so demanding were the sailors in their specifications that it took 2 years longer for the artists to complete their work. The veritable chef d'oeuvre consisting of a chalice, ciborium and ostensorium finally arrived at St. Jean Baptist rectory.

As an added example that he believes it is more blessed to give than to receive and because St. Joseph's is the oldest French church in Lowell, there did Reverend Father Morissette wish that the unique threefold gift of the French Navy be enshrined.

All three sacred vessels styled in the richest of the pre-Renaissance were made in Spain. The chalice is an exact replica of the original chalice of St. Remi, one of the priceless treasures of the Cathedral of Reims.

St. Remi, the apostle of the Franks and archbishop of Reims, was born in the year 437. His chief aim in life was the propagation of Christianity in the realm of the Franks and he is comparable to them, as St. Patrick is to the Irish. The story of the return of the sacred vessels which had been stolen from the church of Soissons testifies to the friendly relations existing between the saintly archbishop and Clovis, King of the Franks, whom he converted to Christianity. A miniature of St. Remi, begging Clovis to restore the sacred vessels, which we had the pleasure of admiring 2 years ago, hangs in the library of the arsenal in Paris.

The chalice of St. Remi is one of the richest surviving examples of that foremost among all sacred vessels. Of solid gold, its cup is broad, its base and knop circular and its stem elongated. Like the original, the gold is enhanced by the details arrived at by the expertly skilled craftsmanship of the goldsmith. The patterns of tiny, handset mosaics and minuscule clusters of linked reliefs are of inestimable artistic value. In addition to this, the chalice is encrusted with hundreds of precious and semiprecious stones.

The luster of pearls emanates from the richly artistic, gold-toned accents reflected in an agglomeration of rare beauty that glitters and gleams from the countless rubies, emeralds, and sapphires. Subdued iridescence shines forth from the numerous amethysts and varied jades. Bathed in the sun, cascades of shimmering multitinted light from these jewels glisten in a nacreous setting that dazzles the viewer. The ciborium and ostensorium were made on the same elaborate pattern.

Because of the great difference in paid workmanship that has always existed between the European and this country, plus the fact that time is seldom considered by the European artist engrossed in his masterpiece, it is impossible to arrive at adequate valuation of this gift.

The chalice was consecrated and the ciborium and ostensorium blessed and dedicated by Most Rev. Louis J. Collignon, OMI, bishop of Les Cayes, Haiti, who celebrated the noonday mass, opening the novena in honor of St. Joseph the Worker, Labor Day. Hundreds viewed the sacred vessels on display in the rear of the church after the mass.

They will henceforth be treasured at the shrine not only for their material and artistic value and the significant roles they fulfill in the order of Divine Worship, but because they are symbol of the gratitude of men in the military service of a mother country, to an American citizen, the son of her descendants, who serves that mother country in a quite unique capacity.

Commodore John Barry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of House Joint Resolution 776, calling upon the President of the United States to proclaim the 13th day of September as Commodore John Barry Day, I am pleased to call the attention of the Members on this day to the numerous commemorations and celebrations taking place in our country on this notable occasion. In the city of New York the Honorable Mark J. Glynn, Jr., chairman of the New York Committee for the Commemoration of Commodore John Barry Day observance is engaged in appropriate ceremonies at the Commodore Barry Monument in New York City.

In order that my colleagues will be apprised of the stature of this great American I take this opportunity to recount some of the significant events in the life of Commodore Barry.

They follow:

COMMODORE JOHN BARRY

On the 13th of September 1803, one of the great men of the Revolutionary War died in Philadelphia. It is appropriate that the anniversary of his death be honored by brief remarks on the life, achievements, and patriotism of Commodore John Barry.

His most successful cruise started in February of 1781 when he sailed from Boston for France commanding the *Alliance*. He captured the privateer *Alert* en route. He put down a mutiny, and then captured the privateers *Mars* and *Minerva*. After a fierce engagement he forced two British brigs, the *Atalanta* and the *Trepassey* to strike their colors. Barry was severely wounded in the action.

To Barry belongs the distinction of having fought the last naval action of the War for

Independence. Aboard the *Alliance* he arrived at Martinique early in January of 1783 and found orders to proceed to Havana. Leaving that port he encountered the *Sybille*. His first mate, John Kessler, wrote as follows about the engagement:

"Two of the enemy's ships kept at a distance on our weather quarter as if waiting to ascertain about the French ship, while the other was in our wake with topsails only and courses hauled, as was also the case with the *Alliance*. The French ship approaching fast, Captain Barry went from gun to gun on the main deck, cautioning against too much haste and not to fire until the enemy was right abreast. He ordered the main topsail hove to the mast that the enemy (who had already fired a bow gun, the shot of which struck into the cabin of the *Alliance*), might come up as soon as he was abreast, when the action began, and before a half hour her guns were silenced and nothing but musketry was fired from her. She appeared very much injured in her hull. She was of 32 guns and appeared very full of men, and after an action of 45 minutes she sheered off. Our injured were, I think, 3 killed and 11 wounded (3 of whom died of their wounds), and 1 sail and rigging cut. During all the action the French lay to as well as the enemy's ships.

"As soon as the ship which we had engaged hove from us, her consorts joined her and all made sail, after which the French ship came down to us, and Captain Barry asked them why they did not come down during the action. They answered that they thought we might have been taken and the signal known and the action only a sham to decoy him. Their foolish idea thus perhaps lost us the three frigates, for Captain Barry's commencing the action was with the full expectation of the French ship joining and thereby not only be able to cope, but in fact subdue part, if not the whole, of them. The French captain proposed, however, giving chase, which was done; but it soon appeared that his ship would not keep up with us, and the chase was given over."

John Barry was born at Tacumshane, County Wexford, Ireland. He went to sea as a boy and in about 1760 settled in Philadelphia, where he eventually became a prosperous shipmaster and shipowner. In 1776 he showed an Irishman's enthusiasm for the cause of the Colonies against British tyranny and was placed in command of the brig *Lexington* by the Continental Congress. On April 17, 1776, he captured the British tender *Edward*. This was the first capture in actual battle of a British warship by a regularly commissioned American cruiser.

Barry received the personal congratulations of General Washington on his "gallantry and address" in the performance of a daring exploit on the lower Delaware in 1777. With four small boats he had cut out an armed British schooner without the loss of a man, and captured at the same time a number of transports and a large quantity of supplies destined for British troops.

Barry then volunteered for duty with the American Army and participated with distinction in the Trenton campaign. After this, he was given command of the *Raleigh*, 32 guns, with which he fought a gallant and obstinate battle against superior forces, finally being obliged to beach his ship, but saving most of his men from capture.

Years later, in 1794, when the Congress of the United States ordered the construction of six frigates to combat the depredations of the Algerian pirates, Barry was named senior captain and placed in command of the *United States*, being, as was said, "of all the naval captains that remained * * * the one who possessed the greatest reputation for experience, conduct, and skill."

During the hostilities with France, Barry was placed in command of all the naval forces in West Indian waters, remaining there until the beginning of May 1799. In December of that year he escorted the American envoys to France. On his return he took command of the Guadaloupe station in the West Indies, a position he retained until 1801. He died 2 years later at the head of the Navy.

This great man deserves our admiration and respect. Most of all, he deserves not to be forgotten.

For Fastest Growth—What Kind of Tax?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest economists in the country, Prof. Henry C. Wallich, of Yale University, formerly a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has written one of the clearest articles on the subject of tax reform that I have yet read. It appeared in the September 9 issue of the New York Times magazine and it should be widely read.

I am pleased, with the permission of the House, to insert Professor Wallich's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with the hope that as many Members of the House as possible will examine it:

FOR FASTEST GROWTH—WHAT KIND OF TAX?

(By Henry C. Wallich)

More Americans pay a sales tax, and pay it more often, than any other kind of tax. Yet because so much of it is in pennies, the take from sales taxes is relatively modest. It does not begin to compare with the massive sums that some 40 million income-tax payers annually turn over to the tax collector.

The present national argument about taxes—whether to cut them or to reform them, definitely not to abolish them—has brought out the interesting fact that Americans pay a higher proportion of their total taxes in the form of income taxes and other direct taxes than the citizens of almost any other industrial country. Conversely, they pay a lower proportion in the form of sales taxes and other indirect taxes.

The argument has also brought out that the industrial countries which have recently enjoyed the fastest economic growth are among those that rely much more on sales and similar taxes than on income taxes. This is strikingly true, for instance, as Prof. William J. Fellner, of Yale, has shown, of the European top-growth countries (France, Italy, and Germany) as well as of Japan. Other countries, relying more heavily on income taxes, have by and large grown less rapidly.

Findings like these do not prove anything conclusively, of course. The members of the fast-growth club may owe their success to some other factors, most likely to a variety of causes. And among the less developed countries of the world there are many that grow painfully slowly while relying exclusively on indirect taxes.

But in the cases of the successful countries of Europe, and of Japan, some logical connection between the tax system and growth does seem to emerge. No country can grow rapidly unless it plows back a high proportion of its output into productive investment. High income taxes probably tend to reduce the supply of savings that are needed, because they weigh most heavily on high-income earners who do the most saving. They may also undermine the incentive to invest, as well as the urge to work and make money.

The successful countries are all countries that save and invest a high proportion of their incomes. Recently, the rate of growth has slowed in some of them, for instance in Germany, though to a level still well above the growth of the United States. This has been accompanied by some slowing of investment. The Germans attribute this to overfull employment, shorter hours worked and a squeeze on profits through rising wages. The tax system, insofar as it has favored investment and growth in the past, still does so today.

The United States has been very successful throughout most of its history, but today it has become a low-investment country and our growth has slowed. These are grounds for suspicion, at least, that our tax system may have been one of the culprits in a complicated case.

Tax comparisons among countries are the most odious of comparisons, because in no two countries are tax laws ever exactly comparable. The variety of taxes is a monument to the ingenuity of governments. The simple distinction of income and sales taxes does not begin to do it justice. Even the economists' distinction of direct and indirect taxes, which covers roughly the same ground, does not really bring order into this chaos.

In the United States, the Federal Government levies no sales taxes proper at all. It manages, however, to raise about 13 percent of its budgetary revenues from exercises on gasoline, liquor, and tobacco, on transportation, telephone calls, and entertainment, and on a number of other articles and activities as well as from customs duties.

These are sales taxes in economic effect, if not in legal terminology. All the rest comes from taxes on income in one form or another. State and local governments do get a much larger share of their considerably smaller income from sales-type and property taxes.

The net result is that we hand over 62 percent of our taxes in the form of income taxes and 38 percent as sales and similar taxes. Only Sweden levies a slightly higher proportion of direct taxes. Meanwhile, France obtains only 26 percent from income taxes, the rest as sales and similar imposts; Italy 30 percent, including in all cases State and local revenues, but excluding social security taxes which do not seem to fit properly into either category. It is quite possible that these figures contain some of the European growth secret for which President Kennedy told his advisers to go looking.

How did the United States get so far out of line with the tax policies of the most successful countries? The United States had its first brush with the income tax during the Civil War. The tax was dropped thereafter, and did not rear its head again until 1913, following the passage of the 16th amendment. Introduced just in time to help finance World War I at rates up to 77 percent, it was cut back to a top rate of 24 percent during the 1920's by Secretary of the Treasury Andrew W. Mellon. As a peacetime tax, it came to full flower (if that is the word) during the great depression. Its sponsors had in mind two principal purposes—to discourage people who want to save (their money is needed to fiance growth), and to redistribute income. Politics aside, both purposes had their justification in the climate of the times.

Those were the days when it was believed, with some apparent basis in contemporary fact, that the U.S. economy had reached full maturity, that it offered few opportunities for new investment and could look forward to but little future growth. This meant that there there was little need for new sav-

ings. Wealthy Mr. Smith, who saved a good part of his income, thereby merely cut down consumption and destroyed jobs. By taxing him and easing the tax burden on impecunious Mr. Jones, who spent most of what he earned, it was thought that a positive stimulus to the economy would be achieved. Redistribtuion of incomes, through taxes and public expenditures, seemed the only means of raising lower bracket living standards in the absence of genuine growth.

Then came World War II, and with it tremendous financial needs and still higher taxes. In the different social climate of the post-World War II period, rates did not come down drastically as they did during the twenties. Today, with a lowest bracket rate of 20 percent and a top rate of 91 percent, we are very close to alltime peak levels.

Income tax adhrents rightly argue that the income tax is much more sophisticated than a tax on commodities. Taxes on the sale or transportation of commodities are easy to administer. Since time immemorial, princes and potentates have levied them—at the city gate, at the harbor dock, at the places of primitive manufacture, or in the town market. The income tax is a tax on an abstract number which cannot be arrived at, for the larger taxpayers, without subtle accounting concepts like depreciation.

The income tax has been described as a fair tax because it demands more from the wealthy than from the poor. It also permits account to be taken of individual circumstances—such as the number of children, the age of the taxpayer, expense through illness, and the like—through appropriate exemptions and deductions. It is thought to encourage good citizenship because it is a clearly visible tax, allowing everyone to know exactly what the Government costs him, in contrast to sales and excise taxes that can be concealed in the price.

Finally, the income tax seems attractive to many because it is flexible in recessions. When a taxpayer's income falls, the progressive feature of the tax, which makes the rate rise with the income bracket, goes into reverse. The taxpayer's liability falls faster than income and affords him relief.

But in the postwar years, the income tax has also revealed grave weaknesses. Tax rates designed to cope with supposedly permanent stagnation are out of place in an economy geared for growth. We can no longer afford to discourage saving—it is needed to finance growth. Even though, in the present state of the economy, there seem to be more savers than investors, that is largely a question of the business cycle and should not determine longrun tax policy.

We also have every reason not to discourage the willingness to work or invest. And we need no longer look to the redistribution of Smith's income to Jones as the principal means of raising Jones' living standards. Economic growth is a much more powerful lever than redistribution. If the two conflict, more is to be gained, for both Jones and Smith, if we go for growth than if we go for redistribution. All this suggests that a tax system relying less heavily on high income taxes may be more in tune with our times.

Practical experience with high tax rates has tarnished the glamour of the income tax in other ways. Tax avoidance and tax evasion have become familiar terms in the economic dictionary. Tax avoidance is the legitimate effort of the taxpayer to take advantage of all the facilities the law provides to hold his taxes down. A whole profession of tax specialists has been reared in the overheated tax climate of a 91-percent top rate. In this strange world, a penny saved is 10 pennies earned, and a penny of deductible expenditures is almost no cost at all. When a large part of a businessman's time is devoted to tax problems, and a large part of his decisions governed by their tax consequences, little good can be expected for the economy.

Tax evasion is the name for illegitimate efforts to minimize taxes—tax cheating, for short. The U.S. taxpayer is probably one of the world's most honest—many other countries do not trust their taxpayers to assess themselves, as we do, but prepare returns for them. Yet high taxes put a strain on the honesty and raise the possibility that tax morale may soften and be neglected.

The tremendous pressure of the top rates has knocked some highly inequitable breaches in the wall separating pretax from posttax income. Groups with strong political backing have molded the law to fit their interests. It is possible today to write off the same building several times over, to deduct depletion on an oil well long after the investment has been repaid, to charge off business expenses that are pure fun, and to stash away income for the future with a minimum of present tax.

Whatever the logic behind these devices, they make a mockery of the rate structure, and they create invidious distinctions between those who have oil wells, expense accounts or deductions and pension funds and those others with similar incomes who have not.

Even decisions regarding public expenditures are vitiated by high tax rates. When Mr. Jones, who has three children and pays a top rate of 20 percent, looks at a proposal for Federal aid to higher education, he may feel that he would be sending his offspring to college rather cheaply at that price. Mr. Smith, who also has three children but pays a top rate of 70 percent, figures that private education would cost him less.

Since in our taxable society there are more Joneses than Smiths, there is a chance that the Joneses may outvote the Smiths, and get the legislation passed. But the Smiths are apt to get more vocal about the matter, and perhaps they can pull the Congress their way. In any event, an ordinary and irrational element is injected into national-expenditure decisions that distorts them one way or the other.

Even the ancient faith that income taxes cannot be shifted from seller to buyer has begun to wane. That many corporations can, in certain circumstances, pass along part or all of their income tax by raising prices has long been evident. Many corporate executives insist that this is precisely what they do. The personal income tax may be a little harder to shift. But the level of taxes certainly is a feature in wage negotiations. And would many corporate salaries be quite so high if executives could not point to the need to compensate for the tax bite?

The troubles of the income tax are beginning to make the sales tax intellectually respectable again. The new support comes from curiously ill-assorted elements. There are those who are concerned about economic growth and who believe that a little less income tax and a little more sales tax would be an improvement over the present mix. There are old-fashioned conservatives who are mainly concerned with getting their high rates down, and who see in a Federal sales tax a means of making that possible. And there are the liberals who want to raise public expenditures and who, feeling that the income tax has been milked almost dry, are trying to overcome their innate aversion to sales taxes.

For most liberals, to be sure, the sales tax still carries a stigma. But avant-garde thinkers like Harvard professors Alvin Hansen and John Kenneth Galbraith have given support to a Federal sales tax. Galbraith has argued, possibly to the chagrin of some of his disciples, that in an age of affluence a sales tax no longer means what a bread tax or a salt tax meant in ages gone by. Hansen has calculated that the income tax simply cannot yield the kind of money he believes the Government should spend. Some former critics have sought to make their peace with the sales tax by suggesting that it be coupled with a special tax on luxuries. All in all, the sales tax seems to be coming up in the world. And there is work for it to do.

In trying to establish priorities among the various objectives of contemporary tax policy, the goal of faster growth strikes me as by far the most important. Faster growth will, in fact, give everybody pretty much what he wants. It will make the cost of big Government easier to bear for the well-to-do. It will permit larger public expenditures to satisfy the proponents of social priorities. If we can speed up growth by cutting back the income tax and introducing a Federal sales tax, the effort would be worthwhile.

The evidence that the maneuver will succeed is not conclusive, to be sure. In any case, no very striking result could be expected from such a reform alone. But there probably is enough sensible economics behind the case to justify moving in that direction.

We would have to move cautiously, however, because pitfalls are sure to beset the unwary sales tax enthusiast. Sales taxes have been the province of State and local authorities. A Federal sales tax would have to be designed so as not to interfere with this traditional source of revenue.

The question of coverage needs to be faced. Should the tax cover only goods, or also services? Should food be excluded? Should the rate be the same for all items? If a great many things were excluded, to which purpose tremendous political pressures are sure to be mobilized, and if the rate were severely fragmented, we might end up with little more than what we have now—a set of arbitrary Federal excise taxes.

I do not believe that in the near future there is much hope of reaching a national consensus on any of these questions, or even on the basic principle of a Federal sales tax. The experience of this year's tax bill, on its tortuous way through Congress, has made clear how very difficult it is to reach agreement even on relatively minor tax reforms. As a practical matter, the most likely way in which we might some day get a Federal sales tax is through a national emergency calling for large extra revenues. A sales tax might then be introduced instead of or along with the traditional income tax hike. Obviously that is not a consummation to be wished.

Meanwhile I would not propose to include a sales tax among the changes in next year's tax reform. The chances are that such a proposal would merely delay or altogether block other reforms that now seem within reach. We need time for a national conversation over an issue of this magnitude. But this conversation should proceed. Then, when the merits of the case are demonstrated, we might get somewhere.

The Kennedy Cult

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a Roman Catholic nun, Sister Mary Paul Paye, who is now on leave from her or-

der, the Sisters of Mercy, wrote the following article while preparing for a Ph. D. in mass communications, at Syracuse University.

The article has such depth and logic and makes necessary reading, especially today. I am pleased, therefore, to insert it in the RECORD for the whole country to read:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 10, 1962]

THE KENNEDY CULT

The gentleman smiles, the youngster sidles up to a pony on the lawn, the lovely lady bows. Cameras click, tape machines whirl, and the American public is exposed again to that dangerous phenomenon: the personality cult of the President.

I protest—vehemently, vigorously, apolitically and, almost, alone.

Three threats are inherent in this constant projection of the personal image of the President: the suppression or the obscuring of significant news; the amassing by the President of personal power; and—most insidious of all—the irrational worldwide identification of him with the country as a whole. We all—mass media and mass audience—could well pause to assess the ramifications of what less sophisticated societies termed hero worship—a phenomenon that, in our own electronic age, has become both more complex and more potent.

Because of the cult of personality, to the average man everywhere, Mr. Kennedy has become synonymous with the United States; his victories are American victories; his health, American health; his smile, his family, his hobbies, his likes and dislikes, become symbolic of the country. And the danger of this equation is that, should the President fail, then the country fails; should he make a mistake, the country errs.

This identification of the Nation with its Chief of State was clearly evident at the time of President Roosevelts election for the third and fourth terms, and, also at the time of his death in office. It was evident when Mr. Eisenhower suffered a heart attack. As a single recent example, it was militantly apparent when Mr. Kennedy addressed the assembled nations of the world at the U.N.

A President is not the country, Mr. Kennedy is not the United States. If he should fail—as well he may—the country will not distintegrate. But if the personality cult continues, if it increases during coming administrations, it will be very difficult to convince the people of that fact. And in the measure that the cult grows, the tendency will grow stronger to elect Presidents not on the basis of reason, but on the basis of the emotional pull the candidates engender.

A combination of causes has conspired to bring the personality cult to full strength in the current decade. Experts agree that changes in American society have made it necessary for a presidential candidate to appeal directly and personally to the mass of politically unalined voters; thus, when elected, he can maintain a certain independence vis-a-vis his party. The trend, in other words, is away from Government by party toward Government by a personalized Presidency.

Mr. Kennedy has exploited this tendency to a greater degree than any of his predecessors. Unlike Mr. Eisenhower, for instance, he uses the mass media directly to project his personality to the people; and, to the degree that he appoints nonpolitical men to decisionmaking offices, he stifles the political personalities of others.

It's time to examine the effect of this situation upon the collective public mind.

The President and his family are naturals for publicity, and journalists have not been slow to exploit the color, the drama, the human appeal that emanate from the White House. No day passes without the appearance of some news or feature about the Kennedy clan, and, while I admit that some of the items revealed are interesting or amusing, much is of questionable value.

In this category fall recently published articles on the following subjects: the President's preferences in clothes—illustrated, with sizes and patterns; the man who "trims" the President, the barber; the life in the White House of the puppy sent to Mrs. Kennedy by Khrushchev; the President's salary and his budget ("He and Jacqueline are determined to get along on his Presidential pay—of course, they don't have to" is the tag line on this).

On a slightly higher level are scores of articles like those about the trips abroad by Robert and Mrs. Kennedy, the plans for refurnishing the White House, the cultural interests of the family, the entertainment of distinguished guests, down even to the kind of napkin folding employed at the White House dinner parties.

Galleys of type and yards of picture spreads about the birthdays of the children, the social affairs of the First Lady, the horsemanship of a sister, the recreational habits of the Attorney General's family, feed the public's desire to know all about the White House inhabitants. Everything goes to deepen the cult.

That the mass media should so exploit the President and his family for circulation purposes is serious enough, but I submit that even more dangerous implications arise: the danger of the imbalance of news.

In newspapers and on the air, time and space are limited and every inclusion means a corresponding exclusion. Important events and decisions may well be obscured in the welter of feature material. And even when significant news is reported, as prisoners of the cult, we may be tempted to overlook it.

Readers, too, are pressed for time; and too often they prefer to be amused rather than informed. Who doesn't gravitate toward the human-interest story, perhaps to the neglect of the duller but more significant news?

The Christmas illness of the President's father is an example. Is it heartless to suggest that the event was woefully overplayed, that the international involvements of the United States became no less worthy of reporting because the elderly Mr. Kennedy had suffered a stroke? A spot check of newspapers reveals that the Kennedy story crowded out, in many cases, the following important international developments: Nehru's stand on Goa, and Tshombe and the Katanga peace talks.

Most papers gave No. 1 treatment to the President's talks with Prime Minister Macmillan. But, because of the emphasis that had been placed upon the father's illness, it is unreasonable to suggest that, for many Americans, the vision of the "anxious son" in conference became more important than the conference itself?

This is no imputation of machination or of deliberate preying upon public sentiment by the President or his associates. It exemplifies, rather, the furtherance of the cult through circumstances beyond the President's control. But, whatever the cause, the effect is the displacement, or downgrading, of significant events.

Stemming from this overemphasis on personality is the danger of the amassing of personal power. A grievous error was made in the American press regarding Fidel Castro, who survived in the media as a hero for a rather long period.

If the same kind of mistake had been made by the American people in selecting President Kennedy, how long would it have taken for the media's projection to reverse itself and present the true picture? But such a situation, you will say, could never arise in a democracy.

Or could it? As President, F.D.R. had a powerful impact upon the public. He was able to bring about action which would have been rejected if proposed by another; his personal magnetism obtained agreement to treaties and policies which were greeted with cheers when they should have been examined critically and unemotionally.

The same was true during the Eisenhower administration, when the public repeatedly absolved the President of responsibility in actions for which he should have been held to some degree accountable.

For the sake of argument, I am willing to concede that President Kennedy will never consciously be guilty of duplicity, or of evil or even of error. But, even in argument, it must be admitted that he will act. His actions should not be judged emotionally, but on the basis of reason.

While the political trend may be toward a personalized Presidency, with the substitution of career experts for politicians in key positions, certain facts are still true. No individual is capable of managing all aspects of Government. The Nation and the cult to the contrary, there are other politicians whose opinions and actions are essential. Truth is not served, nor the common good, if these men are not adequately reported by the mass media.

This is not to imply that the press is in any danger of approving all President Kennedy's proposals. But the media may cast a cloak of oblivion over political figures who, in other times, would be prominent in the public eye. Granted that the President makes decisions, and that the decisions are news; others make decisions, too, or have opinions worthy of publication. Now, as elections draw near, other politicians do capture a share of publicity, but the Kennedys obtrude successfully even here.

Since 1960, probably the only politician who competed noticeably with Mr. Kennedy for publicity was the late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn. During his illness, he briefly captured the spotlight on the national stage. Daily bulletins, eulogies, reviews, and features about his impressive public record had prime coverage. But he was dying, and then dead, and the dividend waters of the cult converged again upon Mr. Kennedy.

Strong words, I admit, in a situation in which it is difficult to be objective. But they emphasize the extent of the monopoly and the readiness of the press and the public to accept it.

The cult has its causes in current social and political trends. It is caught in a conveyor belt: The supply increases the demand, and the demand increases the supply. Pressures far removed from politics further it, for it is influenced by insecurity, by the anonymity of the man in the crowd, the public desire for status—even if vicarious.

The cult is dangerous because it seems as innocent as a baby's picture, as simple as a man's smile, because it is public and yet unseen. Even if events conspire so that no limitation of freedom occurs because of it, it is still an appalling trend; for it is symptomatic of an American disease: mental apathy.

The best defense against it is awareness—by the President, the public, the press. The White House—elections or no elections—should guard itself more stringently against frivolous reporting. Editors and program directors should weigh news and features for inherent value. And the American people—all of us—should be aware that we are beginning to respond to the Chief of State as we have responded to movie stars—and as other nations have responded to their monarchs.

Adulation of a monarch or a star may be permissible; similar treatment of a President, considering the power he wields, can never be.

Springfield Chapter, Aiding Leukemia Stricken American Children, Raised $20,000 To Maintain St. Jude Research Hospital; Entertainer Danny Thomas Thanks Teenage Volunteers for Efforts in His Life Dedicated Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, more than 500 teenage volunteer workers who raised more than $12,000 for ALSAC of Springfield, Mass., earlier this year were told by entertainer Danny Thomas during an August 31 reception at Springfield's Technical High School auditorium that America is not overrun by juvenile delinquents. Mr. Thomas, who describes himself as a "philosophizing bum," thanked the volunteers for their contribution for Aiding Leukemia Stricken American Children—ALSAC—and said they had raised more money per capita in Springfield than any other chapter in the United States.

The popular comedian has been traveling throughout the country to raise funds for St. Jude Research Hospital in Memphis, Tenn. Both the St. Jude Hospital project and ALSAC have grown out of a vow that Thomas made 20 years ago, when penniless and jobless, to St. Jude Thaddeus, the patron saint of the hopeless. Largely through his efforts, $2 million had been raised by 1957 to construct the hospital to combat leukemia in children. ALSAC was formed to provide permanent maintenance for the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure to be with Danny Thomas that night when we spoke at a fundraising dinner for ALSAC. Mr. Joseph Demos, the Springfield chapter chairman, was toastmaster. He is to be commended for the very fine fundraising drive put on by his chapter and the teenage volunteers who so generously cooperated in this great cause. At this time I include with my remarks the following excerpt from the Springfield Union's news account in the September 1 edition of Danny Thomas' appearance:

Thomas told the teenagers that "there is no more juvenile delinquency today than there was when I was a teenager. Your age is an awkward one and too many of you are taking the blame for a few juvenile delinquents," he said.

After telling jokes he sang two songs and signed autographs in the corridors where he was mobbed by admiring teenagers.

FOUR HUNDRED AT DINNER

In the evening about 400 guests attended a $25-a-plate dinner in the Sheraton-Kimball Hotel where Thomas and his charity were praised by such dignitaries as Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the Springfield Roman Catholic Diocese; Rev. Harry Struckenbrook, president, Greater Springfield Council of Churches; Representative Edward P. Boland; Mayor Charles V. Ryan, Jr.; Judge Abraham I. Smith; Rev. Stephen Papadoulias and others.

A telegram from President Kennedy lauding the work of ALSAC and Thomas was read before Danny went into one of his famous after dinner monologs.

Some excerpts of his famous wit: "Behind every famous man is a woman who thinks he's an idiot." "People accuse me of voting for the President because he's a Catholic. It's not true. I voted for him because I'm a Catholic."

CRACKS JOKES

His penetrating humor included jokes on Israel, Lebanon, and an imitation of Representative BOLAND.

In a more serious vein, he said that in the early days of ALSAC persons accused him of "coming into their territories and stealing their money. It's not true and never was. ALSAC benefits all, for some day there will be a cure for leukemia and other catastrophic diseases that will be shared in with the world."

Children are admitted free to St. Jude Hospital regardless of race, creed, or residency, he said.

"St. Jude Hospital was designed by a Negro, built by a Jew, and is staffed by Protestants," he said.

TOTAL OF $20,000 COLLECTED

He announced that money from the dinner will bring the total amount of money collected this year in this city to more than $20,000.

In a special interview with the Union, the cigar-smoking veteran of show business said he first got the idea for the hospital in 1955. He said he consulted with a group of scientists who decided that the one catastrophic disease they should center on should be leukemia. Since that time he has spent all his free time on the project, he said. "I'm like the businessman who can't get away from his business as far as ALSAC and St. Jude Hospital are concerned. It's with me all the time," he said.

FRIENDLY CITY

Of the 250 ALSAC chapters in the country, he said that the Springfield chapter was one of the best. "This is a fine and friendly city. Walking down Main Street I received more 'Hi Danny's' than I thought possible," he said. "Guess much of it is due to television. You see, television is a friendly medium. It allows you to enter the privacy of many, many homes," he said.

He said his program, "The Danny Thomas Show," seems to have a good affect on teenagers "The family problems in the show are as old as man, and have to be solved by the entire family. I don't think that father always knows best," he said.

Thomas, who was presented with two plaques of merit and appreciation by Michael P. Pagos, executive director, on behalf of the Springfield Boys Club, said that the first seminar of scientists from all over the world will be held at St. Jude Hospital in November in order that they may be able to discuss catastrophic diseases and the progress the hosptial has made in combating them.

Among the many contributors to the ALSAC at the banquet were five girls from Holyoke who recently wrote and performed a play in Holyoke that raised more than $100 for the fund.

Joseph Demos of this city, local chapter chairman, acted as toastmaster. He was assisted in arrangements by Dr. and Mrs. Alfred J. Ferris, and Dr. and Mrs. Emil M. Ferris.

Mr. Speaker, I also include with my remarks the story of how Danny Thomas made a vow to St. Jude to build him a shrine if he would help him find his place in life, followed by my remarks at the fundraising dinner, and the program listing honored guests, the patrons and patronesses and members of the committees who worked to make the fundraising a huge success:

A PRAYER, A PICTURE, AND PEOPLE

(ALSAC, of Springfield, Mass., presents Danny Thomas for the St. Jude Research Hospital, Sheraton-Kimball Hotel Friday, August 31, 1962)

Twenty years ago Danny Thomas was a struggling, unknown entertainer when he made a vow to St. Jude Thaddeus to build him a shrine if he would help him find his place in life. St. Jude, 1 of the 12 apostles was a forgotten saint for many years because of the similarity of his name to the betrayer, Judas Iscariot, and he became the patron saint of the helpless and hopeless.

Danny Thomas never forgot his vow. He devoted countless hours of his great energy, gave freely of his talent and funds to start a great hospital for research in leukemia and kindred catastrophic diseases of childhood.

The history of St. Jude Hospital really began on February 2, 1962, the date of its dedication, but the research hospital already had an exciting past and promises a future of seeking cures for diseases of children.

On his knees in that church 20 years ago, Danny Thomas had no idea of building a huge research hospital. It was the late Cardinal Stritch who suggested that he build a hospital for underpriviledged children. Armed with only a drawing of the nonexistent hospital he soon learned that blueprints and construction money were not enough to build a free hospital; somebody has to pay to operate the place, however noble its aims.

The ALSAC (Aiding Leukemia Stricken American Children) organization was formed in 1957 to support and maintain St. Jude Hospital. Good Americans decided to share this work, so that today in over 200 chapters they work and give for ALSAC on a completely voluntary basis. Because of this dedication over 90 cents of every dollar contributed goes for research at St. Jude.

St. Jude Research Hospital is a $5 million institution, with a maximum capacity of 100 beds. Since it is primarily a research center, the major areas are devoted to laboratories and research units. The entire institution is dedicated to the care of children stricken with catastrophic diseases and to research aimed at developing superior methods of treatment. Patients are limited to those with diseases involving the blood and blood-forming organs with particular emphasis on leukemia. Hemorrhagic diseases, aplastic anemia and hereditary diseases are also included.

The hospital is operated by a full-time paid staff and is not dependent on volunteer professional services. Physicians employed devote their entire time to the care of patients and to basic and clinical research, and do not engage in private practice. Graduate fellows and hematology residents carry part of the clinical load. Nursing services and day-to-day administration of the hospital are carried out by the Sisters of St. Francis.

Children will be admitted to St. Jude without regard to race, creed or residency. In general, patients who have diagnostic problems, or the type of disease being treated will be admitted. The cost of diagnostic service and hospitalization will be borne by ALSAC and patients will not be charged for care, drugs or any services. Children in St. Jude will receive superior medical care at no cost.

This is what can be done with a picture, prayers, and people—not just a hospital, but a research center with beds, staffed and equipped to give the finest of care to children suffering from leukemia and allied blood diseases—free to all.

HONORED GUESTS

Danny Thomas, president of ALSAC.

Michael F. Tamer, national executive director of ALSAC.

Hon. Charles V. Ryan, Jr., mayor of Springfield.

Hon. Edward P. Boland, Congressman.

His Excellency Christopher J. Weldon, D.D., bishop of Springfield.

Rev. Harry Stuckenbruck, president, Greater Springfield Council of Churches.

Hon. Abraham I. Smith, judge of probate.

Rev. Stephen Papadoulias, pastor, St. George Greek Orthodox Church.

Rev. Roland Abijaude, St. Anthony's Maronite Parish.

PATRONS AND PATRONESSES

Mr. George Abdow, Miss Phyliss Abdow, Dr. and Mrs. Alfred Aborjaily, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Abrahams, Mr. Edward H. Allen, Mrs. Paul Alonzo, Mr. and Mrs. Cosmo Ansara, Miss Nancy Ansara, Mr. Peter Ansara.

Mr. and Mrs. Francis Balicki, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Barkett, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Black, Mr. Stephen Bodolay, Mr. and Mrs. Angelo Bressani, Mr. and Mrs. Philip Bshara.

Dr. and Mrs. Sante M. Caldarola, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph C. Campbell, Mr. and Mrs. Norman Card, Miss Janet Caserio, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Cataldo, Mr. and Mrs. David Chase, Mrs. Edward Ciccarelli, Mr. Donald Cohon, Dr. and Mrs. William E. Coons, Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Coughlin, Mrs. Annie Couri, Mr. and Mrs. Peter Couri, Mr. and Mrs. Donald Craft, Jr.

Mr. and Mrs. James E. Davis, Mr. Louis Del Padre, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Demos, Mr. Louis Demos, Mrs. Michael Demos, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Dion, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Doubitz, Miss Diana Dowaliby, Mrs. John A. Dowaliby, Mr. and Mrs. Laurence Duclos.

Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Elkas, Mrs. Edward Ellis, Dr. George R. Ellis, Miss Hilda Ellis.

Dr. and Mrs. Alfred J. Ferris, Dr. and Mrs. Basil M. Ferris, Dr. and Mrs. Emil M. Ferris, Mr. and Mrs. Francis M. Ferris, Miss Laurice Ferris, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Ferris, Mrs. Michael Ferris, Miss Theda Ferris, Mr. and Mrs. William Ferris, Mr. and Mrs. William Foley, Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Fournier, Dr. and Mrs. George Franklin.

Dr. Bronislaus A. Galuszka, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Gampel, Mr. and Mrs. Ned Gareeb, Mr. Frank Gatti, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Ghareeb, Mr. George Ghareeb, Mrs. Hykel Ghareeb, Mr. Joseph K. Ghareeb, Mr. and Mrs. Philip Ghareeb, Mr. Anthony Gianetti, Mr. John Giokas, Mr. and Mrs. Jerome Good, Mrs. Henry Goodnough, Mr. Jack Grace, Miss Barbara Grenier, Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Grosso.

Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Habin, Mr. and Mrs. Eli Haddad, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Hafey, Mr. Charles Hapcook, Mrs. George Hapcook, Mr. and Mrs. Manser Hapcook, Mrs. Raymond Hapcook, Mr. and Mrs. William J. Hartt, Mr. Laurence Hashim, Mrs. Fred Hemsworth, Mr. and Mrs. Sol Herskowitz, Mr. and Mrs. Moses Hyder, Mr. Robert Hyder.

Mr. and Mrs. George Joseph, Mr. Joe Joseph, Mr. and Mrs. Philip Joseph.

Mrs. George Karam, Miss Marlene Karam, Mr. and Mrs. Milton M. Katz, Mr. and Mrs. William Kavaney, Miss Eve Kawie, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Kawie, Mr. and Mrs. Peter Kawie, Rev. Francis J. Keaney, Mrs. Donald Keefe, Miss Linda Kinnenan, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph J. Kosiorek, Dr. and Mrs. Joseph Kresock.

Dr. and Mrs. William Licht, Mr. and Mrs. William Lynch.

Mr. Alex Makol, Mr. Frank Makol, Mr. Edward Margolis, Mrs. Sheila Mariani, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Marieb, Mr. Taffy Marieb, Mr. and Mrs. Harry E. Marrewa, Mr. and Mrs. John H. McCarthy, Miss Sheila McCarthy, Mr and Mrs. Timothy McCarthy, Dr. Paul J. McKenna, Miss Roberta Menard, Dr. and Mrs. Irving Meyer, Miss Abbey Michaels, Mr. James Michaels, Miss Marilyn Monahan.

Miss Elsie Namnoun, Mr. and Mrs. George J. Nassar, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Edward Nassif, Mr. and Mrs. Philip Nassif, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Norman, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Paul Norman.

Rev. Raymond W. O'Brien, Miss Dorothy Ollari, Mr. and Mrs. Robert J. O'Neil, Mr. and Mrs. John Ostrowski, Dr. and Mrs. Walter J. Pacosa, Dr. Helen Papaiounau, Mrs. John Papaiounau, Mr. and Mrs. Clifford Phaneuf, Dr. Henry W. Polchlopek, Rev. and Mrs. W. K. Price, Mr. Edward J. Pryzbyla, Mr. Angelo Puppolo, Mr. and Mrs. Michael Puppolo.

Miss Joanne Ramah, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Ramah, Miss Martha Ramondetta, Miss Mary Ann Ramondetta, Mr. and Mrs. E. L. Raverta, Mr. and Mrs. C. A. Richmond, Mr. and Mrs. Normand Rouillard.

Mrs. Michael Salem, Mr. and Mrs. Sam Salem, Miss Elizabeth Saliba, Mrs. Mandabell Saloomey, Mrs. James Schoenenberger, Miss Jane Schoenenberger, Dr. and Mrs. Irving Selsby, Mr. Fred Semanie, Mr. James Semanie, Mrs. Domit Shaer, Miss Jamelle Shaer, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Shaer, Miss Mary Shaer, Mr. and Mrs. Irving Shapiro, Mrs. Bruno Sileski, Mr. Keith Silver, Mrs. Sarah Spano, Mr. John Satchowicz, Mr. and Mrs. David J. Stevens, Dr. and Mrs. Joseph R. Stirlacci, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Steinberg, Mrs. Esther C. Stone, Mr. and Mrs. George W. Sullivan, Mr. and Mrs. Ben Swirsky, Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Szlachetka.

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Venti, Mr. and Mrs. Norman Vester, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Norman Vester, Sr. Mr. Joseph Wihbey, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest B. White, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Wright.

Also Dr. and Mrs. Bruce B. Alicandri, Mr. and Mrs. Ignatius J. Andreis, Dr. and Mrs. Joseph Angelica, Mr. Michael X. Andrews, Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Breck, Mr. and Mrs. Daniel J. Bresnahan, Dr. and Mrs. John C. Bryson, Mr. A. Calderigi, Casty-Faneuil Associates, Mr. Alvin Chase, Dr. David O. Cohen, Mrs. Louis Consiglio, Mr. Joseph Czaja, Dr. and Mrs. William M. Davis, Mr. Joseph J. Davitt, Mr. Edward L. Donnellan, Mr. Isaac L. Eskenasy, Mr. Irving Fein, Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Hyder, Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Jasinski, Mr. Abraham Kamberg, Dr. Robert L. Kantor, Dr. and Mrs. Aldo J. Leani, Mr. and Mrs. Robert R. Lepak, Dr. and Mrs. F. A Mahoney, Menzel and Menzel, Mr and Mrs. Charles F. Miller, Dr. and Mrs. Robert Moriarty, Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Moynahan, Dr. and Mrs. Meran Nakashian, Mr. John J. O'Neil, Dr. and Mrs. John Prybylo, Student Prince and Fort Restaurant, Daniel M. Keyes, Jr.

COMMITTEES

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Demos, Cochairmen.

Tickets: Dr. and Mrs. Alfred J. Ferris, cochairmen; Dr. and Mrs. Emil M. Ferris, cochairmen; Mr. Manser Hapcook, Miss Jamelie Shaer, Mr. Joseph Kawie, Mr. George Joseph, Dr. Basil Ferris, Mr. David Stevens, Mr. Edward Barkett, Mr. Louis Demos, Mr. Joseph Ghareeb, Mr. Joseph Ramah, Mr. Philip Nassif, Mr. Sam Salem.

Marchers reception: Mrs. Philip Nassif, cochairman; Mr. and Mrs. Manser Hapcook, cochairmen; Miss Joanne Ramah, Mr. Joseph Ghareeb, Mr. Joseph Wihbey.

Public relations: Mr. Eli Haddad.

Reservations: Mr. and Mrs. Francis M. Ferris, cochairmen; Mr. and Mrs. Philip Ghareeb.

Invited guests: Mr. Cosmo Ansara, Mr. George Ghareeb.

Hostess committee: Mrs. Joseph Demos, chairman; Mrs. David Stevens, Mrs. Andrew Elkas, Mrs. Eli Haddad, Mrs. Philip Bshara, Mrs. William Kavaney.

Treasurer: Miss Jamelie Shaer.

Entertainment: Mr. Alex Makol, Mr. Frank Makol.

Decorations: Mr. and Mrs. Clifford Phaneuf, Mrs. Joseph Kawie.

Program: Mr. Joseph Demos, Mrs. Clifford Phaneuf, Mr. Peter Couri.

Sound: Mr. Andrew Elkas.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN BOLAND

This is not the best time of the season for any kind of a gathering. Labor Day weekend.

Neither is it for Danny Thomas. But, knowing as he does that leukemia is no respector of time or people, he gives up the rest and solace and quiet of this pleasurable time to carry on the magnificent work to which he is devoted. So, this is one of the reasons why I wanted to be a part of this wonderful world of Danny Thomas.

And what a world it has been from a horse farm in Deerfield, Mich., where his daughter Marlo says, "Daddy was not only born on the farm—the veterinarian, delivered by—from Deerfield to Toledo—Good old Toledo—to Detroit to the dizzying heights of Hollywood—from saloon entertainer to the gayest richest and most expensive spots of the entertainment world into radio and movies and television. What a wonderful world indeed, it has been and is.

He has worn the crown of success and fortune and accepted the honors—as many as ever have been conferred upon a working actor—because he never forgot from whence he sprung.

You will find it wrapped up in his own words: "My purpose in life is to propagate the philosophy of man's faith in man—based upon my own belief that, unless man reestabishes faith in his fellow beings, he can never establish faith in God.

"In order that others to follow may be inspired to do likewise, I have to leave something. I'm not so unforgettable I can do it only with words. I must leave something that men can touch, feel and see. That will be the St. Jude Hospital. Me? I'm a philosophizing bum."

And from this philosophy, he has built masterpieces—his own magnificent, devoted family, his monument to the patron of the hopeless, St. Jude's Hospital.

I'm delighted to be in your presence and to join with this gathering to make the wonderful world of Danny Thomas, a little more wonderful for the untold numbers that will enter the doors of an institution that was built on faith—the faith of a wonderful guy.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Death of Thomas Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, we pause in our legislative activities today to pay tribute to the memory of the founder of the Czechoslovakian Republic. Thomas Masaryk, statesman and philosopher, died on September 14, 1937, 25 years ago today. No Eastern European statesman has ever embodied the liberal democratic tradition more effectively. The leader of a small political party, Masaryk succeeded in conveying the ancient tradition of liberty, equality, and equal justice under law, not only to the Czechs and Slovaks, but also to neighboring peoples.

Masaryk was born in 1850 near the Moravian border, the son of a coachman who was employed on one of the Austrian imperial estates. Working as a lock-

smith's apprentice at the age of 14, the young Masaryk later struggled as a poor student. By the age of 32 he had made a major contribution to the field of sociology, and was appointed a professor at the University of Prague. While his sociological work led him to a critical study of Marxism, Masaryk embarked on a political career, crusading for the improvement of the Czechoslovak people. Masaryk was no narrow nationalist; he was deeply imbued with the liberal tradition of Western thought, and all his life advocated "European and world politics." He viewed the complex nationality problems of central Europe from a broad perspective. Freedom, in Masaryk's conception, mut always be based on friendship with neighboring peoples, never on hatred.

This outlook did not keep him from vigorous activity in defense of the subjected Czechoslovak people. During the first decade of the 20th century Masaryk, then a representative in the Austrian Parliament, fearlessly criticized Austria's aggressive policy in the Balkans. During World War I he further revealed the corrupt and feudalistic character of the Austria-Hungarian Empire to the whole world, through his writings, and campaigned in Western Europe, Russia and the United States for Czechoslovak liberation from Habsburg rule. Partly as a result of Masaryk's visit to this country, the United States on May 29, 1918, officially declared its sympathy with the cause of Czechoslovak independence, and the Allied Governments associated themselves with this declaration. The Czechoslovak National Council, of which Masaryk was president and Eduard Benes was secretary, was granted American recognition as the de facto government of the coming Czechoslovák state.

A few months later Thomas Masaryk was elected the first president of the Czechoslovak Republic. He was reelected to the same position three times before his retirement in 1935. After seeing his beloved pupil, Eduard Benes, elected to succeed him, Masaryk died on September 14, 1937, and was mourned by the entire Czechoslovak nation. Throughout his life, Masaryk worked for the liberation of man and for a community of nations based on law. The heritage which he has left the Czechoslovak people, presently suffering under the yoke of a foreign dictator, is a great one, deserving the devotion of freedom-loving people of all nations.

Address by Hon. Robert F. Wagner, Mayor of the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks of the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the great city of New York. Mayor Wagner addressed the fifth annual convention of the New York State Building and Construction Trades Council and pointed out the many problems—both social and economic—facing the city in the coming decade. These same problems will be facing all of the Nation and particularly our metropolitan areas. The mayor addressed the convention delegates on September 6, 1962. The address follows:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NEW YORK STATE BUILDING & CONSTITUTION TRADES COUNCIL

I greet you as very old friends with whom I have worked closely for more than 20 years.

We have worked together on many critical problems through the years—and resolved most of them. We have worked together on many long-range tasks, and have made a great deal of progress toward their fulfillment—a lot more than most people, most cynics ever thought possible.

You as members of the building trades unions—and as builders—have helped give this city a keynote famous throughout the world. The sound of the piledriver, the riveter, the welder, the concrete mixer, and of hammer and saw have become the chief theme and chorus of New York City. In Manhattan, up and down Sixth Avenue and Third Avenue and all over this skyscrapered borough from Harlem to Greenwich Village—and downtown, too—new buildings have been and are springing up in unprecedented numbers, size, height, and suitability to meet the city's need. And the story is the same in Brooklyn, in Queens, and certainly in Staten Island.

We are, I believe, having in this city the biggest building boom in recent times.

Let me say at this point, for the benefit of those who view with alarm and fear that the bubble will break—that based just on our present known needs, and on plans we already have on the drawing board, or are even further advanced, there is much, much more to be done than has already been done.

We have really only begun to build, to restore, to rehabilitate, to provide the homes—and I like that word much better than housing—that the people should have and must have, to eliminate slums completely, to provide the modernized facilities and installations, and structures, to meet the needs of our businesses, our commerce, our industry and our trade, to complete the renewal of our piers and other waterfront facilities—to build the streets and bridges and access roadways and expressways which are necessary to move the traffic into and through and around this growing bustling, dynamic city of ours. And I am sure that the same may be true or can be true in the other parts of New York State.

Here in New York City we need and are planning to build new industrial centers, new amusement centers, new cultural centers, educational centers, world trade centers, market and produce centers, and lots more.

All of this adds up to saying that the prospects for future construction in New York City, based on present plans and on the needs we now recognize are much, much greater than we can possibly hope to fill with even the present great construction resources of this city. Fully to meet these needs, we must show imagination, courage and energy. We must have faith in our future, and in our town and in our State and country.

Of course, I am not saying that we have no problems or trouble ahead. We all know better than that. I want to refer briefly to one of them—the one that ought to be and is concerning us more and more these days.

The chief problem confronting the construction industry, along with many others, is technological and social change. Indeed this is the chief problem of the civilized world today. The world is changing so fast that it will not stand still long enough to be mapped. It is moving so fast that what was practically new only yesterday is practically obsolete today. Machines are replacing men; they are making it possible for fewer men to build more today and tomorrow than more men did yesterday.

This is a very serious problem. All of us had better face up to it.

The problem is especially serious because there is no agreement on what to do about it. In fact, the greatest progress we have made on this problem consists of the fact that today we recognize it as a problem, and are turning to meet it, rather than trying to hide from it, as there was a tendency to do a couple of years back.

Recently the division of labor research of our own New York City Labor Department made and published a very incisive study of the New York City phase of this problem. This study, entitled "The Manpower Outlook in New York City—1960 to 1970," shows clearly that by 1970 totally unskilled manual labor will be in drastically less demand than it is today, when it is already in surplus supply.

By the end of this decade, in 8 years, according to this study, the number of unskilled blue collar jobs will drop by 19 percent from the 1960 level. The number of laboring jobs classified as semiskilled will drop by 8 percent. At the same time, there will be an increase of 20 percent in the number of technical and professional jobs and an increase of 6 percent in jobs for craftsmen, foremen, and skilled workers. There will be a 4-percent increase in service jobs and an increase of 5 percent in clerical positions.

All these changes are predicted as taking place against the background of a projected 3-percent increase in the total number of available jobs.

The implications of these statistics are so clear that they scarcely need to be pointed out or underlined. Our universities, colleges, professional schools, our vocational schools and your apprenticeship programs must assume the responsibility for more training and more specialization.

Of course, this is a long-range approach. It scarcely meets today's problems or tomorrow's, nor does it meet anything but the bare employment problem. It does not face up to the many related social and economic problems which require immediate treatment, action and leadership by government.

We cannot and should not wait to press for action on these vital action fronts. I am thinking, for instance, of action in Washington on medical care for the aged and in Albany for the elimination of the means test under our State's very limited medical aid program.

I am thinking of Federal and State action to establish a $1.50 minimum wage level, not some years from now, but next year. We, in New York City are going to pass a local law for $1.25 this year and $1.50 next year, and I don't see why what is good enough for New York City is not good for the rest of New York State.

I am thinking of action in Albany to do the hundred and one things that need to be done for the people, that have never been done or have been left undone because they were politically hard or embarrassing to do.

As some of you may know by now, an election is coming up in November—a statewide election and a congressional election. In case you haven't heard, I am not a candidate. I had to insist a little, but I finally won recognition of my right, based on some sort of seniority, to work as a campaigner rather than as a candidate.

Not being a candidate, I think I can view this coming election with a certain amount

of dispassion. Even though I will be campaigning, my first interest must and will be to tend to my duties as mayor.

In fact, I really think that my job as mayor—as leader and spokesman of the 8 million people of New York—requires me to take an active part in the campaign. The issues demand it, including the issues I have just been talking about.

The coming campaign will furnish the opportunity to make the issues, to bring home to the people and to bring home to those who stand for election the urgent need for legislative and executive action to meet these and many, many other pressing social and economic problems.

Courageous leadership is needed—the kind of leadership that will stand up and fight for a statewide $1.50 minimum wage, that will fight for the overhauling and replacement of the Condon-Wadlin Act, and that will fight for a fair reapportionment of the seats in the State legislature so that legislative representation will be based on the number of people rather than on the number of cows.

And there are many, many more issues which are vital to the people, including the members of your unions.

We must never lose sight of the fact that one of the great benefits of the democratic process at election time is in the way it brings the great public issues to the fore and provides the mandates that must guide public officeholders between elections.

The leadership and membership of the unions represetned here are going to play a big part, I know, in giving the mandates I have been talking about. I am sure that you will be weighing and deliberating on these matters for the next several days.

I know you are going to have a fine and useful convention and are going to join in a fruitful State convention of the entire labor movement a few days later. I will be greeting you again at one of the first sessions of that convention. I look forward to that, too.

House Resolution 211: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I would like to thank you very much for sponsoring the House Resolution 211, and to urge you to continue your fine work in bringing to light the dastardly condition of the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain. Please enlist the support of your fellow Congressmen to speed the passage of this resolution.

Gratefully yours,

RUSSEL NESWICK.

SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL
COMMITTEE OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., June 29, 1962.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The Shevchenko Memorial Committee of New York City, at its meeting held on June 15, 1962, unanimously decided to appeal to you for a speedy passage of the flood resolution (H. Res. 211), regarding the establishment of a special Committee on the Captive Nation in the House of Representatives. Our committee, founded on February 25, 1961, consists of 70 Ukrainian American organizatons, youth clubs, women's and veterans' associations.

We firmly believe that such a committee, which would be dedicated to the study of the plight of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain, would serve best the interests of the U.S. Government and its objectives in the world. The captive nations, such as Ukraine, home country of our fathers, and many of us, constitutes a weak link in the totalitarian structure of the U.S.S.R. colonial empire, as do some other 21 nations, which are languishing under the direct or indirect control and enslavement of Moscow.

A Committee on the Captive Nations in our Congress would mean that the United States is vitally interested in the plight of the enslaved nations. This may give a pause to Mr. Khrushchev that he should carefully consider his own restless and unhappy captives before he starts "liberating" the colonial people of Asia and Africa. It is with this in mind, sir, that we urgently appeal to you with a sense of our duty as American citizens, to expedite the passage of the flood resolution (H. Res. 211). Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. IWAN KOZAK,
Chairman.
MYKOLA TURETSKY,
Secretary.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I, Alexei Skrilov, a Cossack by origin, and presently an American citizen, respectfully urge you to support favorably the enactment of the Flood resolution to establish a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Very truly yours,

ALEXEI SKRILOV.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 26, 1962.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: While I respectfully request your support in favor of the House Resolution 211, I must state that the State Department's opposition to the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations reflects timidity as opposed to the impudent statement made by Mr. Khrushchev on June 19 in Bucharest, Rumania, about the inevitability of the triumph of communism in the United States.

If we are to avoid war as everyone hopes and prays, we will not do so by way of timidity. While we must avoid the other extreme of seeming to propose attacking the U.S.S.R., we must not let anything stand in the way of our learning as much as we can about our enemy, his strengths and weaknesses alike. To follow the State Department's advice on House Resolution 211 would be to give in to Red blackmail and to encourage our enemy to further adventures which in the long run could only lead to war.

We may recall at this point that in 1950 the vagueness of Secretary Acheson with regard to U.S. policy in Korea led Moscow to draw erroneous conclusions about American resistance and to sponsor a war which led to unnecessary slaughter and hardship. Similar timidity and indecision on the part of our authorities in Europe and Asia could lead not just to another Korea but to a world war, another Armageddon. There is a direct relationship between our tendency to soften our defensive position along the perimeters of Soviet expansion and our failure to concern ourselves adequately with the Achilles' heel of the Soviet Empire—the captive non-Russian nations within and outside the U.S.S.R. For a purely defensive strategy always ends by becoming a strategy of retreat and compromise.

In the present conflict between the free world and Soviet Russia we are not against opponents who are interested in compromise. It is a truism which can never be repeated enough that the Soviet Russians regard every compromise as a stepping stone to final victory. And unless we discard our false notions of compromise agreement with them, final Soviet Russian victory will not be indefinitely delayed.

As a young American student of Soviet affairs without any official or academic position but with a number of contacts among Russian and East European emigre circles, I have come to feel deeply concerned about this problem and about the obvious failings of official U.S. policy in this area not only today but indeed ever since 1917.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. A. WOODBURY.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
June 12, 1962.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I believe your measure House Resolution 211 is the best and the most appropriate one at the present time to wage the cold war against the Soviet Russian colonialists.

Sincerely yours,

VERA PECHENIUN.

How Are We Treating Our Fighting Men After the War Is Over?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the recent furor over the Denton petition to discharge the Veterans' Committee from consideration of H.R. 3745, the bill to give World War I veterans a pension without regard to service-connected disabilities, raises a serious question as to the manner in which we are treating our veterans. A pension for World War I veterans who were not injured has been labeled a "handout" and an act of fiscal irresponsibility. Others claim that it would give World War I veterans belated consideration for their past services in their old age. Most of them are over the age of 61. In evaluating this proposal, consideration of what our Nation has done for the GI of World War II and the Korean veteran is indicated and necessary.

I take this opportunity therefor to review some of the major accomplishments in the field of veterans' benefits which were enacted into law mainly through the efforts of the Democratic Party.

During the administration of our great President Roosevelt, the World War II bill of rights was enacted, providing a comprehensive plan for the rehabilitation and readjustment of returning veterans. Millions of GI's in service at that time looked forward to the utilization of these benefits. They knew that upon return to civilian life, they would have to make up for lost time and the GI bill of rights would help them to accomplish this.

As it turned out, millions of ex-soldiers, sailors, and marines received college education or other types of vocational training which helped them attain the standard of living they now enjoy. Many other disabled veterans also received this training to assist them to overcome their service-incurred disabilities. The compensation awards provided by the GI bill also assisted them in their transition to civilian life.

The home loan provisions of the GI bill were a major force in providing the housing so desperately needed. Whole communities like Levittown, Long Island, were built, permitting veterans to buy a home with little or no downpayment. Many were able to pay off their mortgage on a 30-year basis which meant lower monthly payments.

Thousands of other veterans availed themselves of the provisions of the GI business loan which was of immeasurable assistance in providing the working capital so necessary for the establishment of a small business. Today, these same veterans are prosperous businessmen helping to keep our economy healthy and vigorous. Recently the GI loan program for World War II and Korean veterans was extended by Public Law 87-84 which was approved by President Kennedy. This law gives all World War II veterans 10 years from the date of their discharge from active duty during World War II plus an additional period equal to 1 year for every 3 months of active duty or part thereof during World War II but in no case beyond July 25, 1967, to use their loan entitlement. It also provided that those World War II veterans with service-connected disabilities be given until July 25, 1967, to use their loan benefits. Korean veterans will have 10 years from the date of their discharge from active service during the Korean conflict plus an additional period equal to 1 year for every 3 months of active duty or part thereof during the Korean conflict, but in no case beyond January 31, 1975, to which to use their GI loan benefits. Korean veterans with service-connected disabilities will have until January 31, 1975, to use their GI loan benefits.

The GI insurance program provided a means of protecting the veteran's family at very reasonable cost. This insurance program was the subject of a bill before Congress. This bill permits the reinstatement of national service life insurance up to a minimum of $10,000 in any of the permanent plans. This bill was amended on the House floor and permitted disabled veterans a period of 1 year to take up their lapsed life insurance policy if they could not get a normal policy because of their disability.

Another benefit being considered is the payment of an extra dividend for GI insurance. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, John S. Gleason, Jr., has directed his fiscal experts to review the agency's finances to determine if extra funds are available for insurance policy dividends. The White House is interested in the possibility of extra or accelerated dividend payments for economic reasons. Payment of this extra dividend or paying the regular dividend early would add to the purchasing power of over 5,300,000 veterans. This money is likely to be spent during the Christmas shopping season or if it is received in January most of it would go to pay off debts incurred during the holiday season.

Recently, President Kennedy approved plans for a new Veterans' Administration hospital on Long Island. This will alleviate the heavy loads now being carried by the other Veterans' Administration hospitals in the New York metropolitan area, and will provide a much needed facility for the care of veterans in the Long Island area. In this connection, President Kennedy recently signed a bill providing medical and hospitalization benefits for veterans with service-connected disabilities incurred during peacetime. This important piece of legislation corrects a serious inequity. Previously, these injured veterans could not be hospitalized through the Veterans' Administration.

When danger threatens, we depend upon our fighting men. When danger disappears, we in civilian life, are apt to forget the debts to our men who placed their bodies and lives on the line for their families and those in civilian life, just as we forget the snow in the summer time. We remember on Memorial Day with parades and speeches. But there are 364 other days. Our Democratic Party has not forgetten the GI and Korean veteran. Can we say the same of the veterans of World War I?

Needed: A Radiation Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago our distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable JOHN V. LINDSAY, called to our attention the failure of the administration in adopting a clear-cut policy for the protection of the American people against possible radiation danger resulting from nuclear testing. I was privileged to join with Congressman LINDSAY in his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the Pittsfield, Mass., Berkshire Eagle on Tuesday, September 11, 1962, published an editorial entitled "Needed: A Radiation Policy," bearing on this very subject. I include the editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: A RADIATION POLICY

Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York, was simply stating the truth the other day when he said the administration had failed to establish a clear policy on protecting the public against possible radiation dangers from nuclear testing.

If there is any policy on the matter, it is invisible to the naked eye. The ordinary citizen doesn't understand it. The newsmen and commentators don't seem to know it. And Representative LINDSAY, who devoted 3 months of research to the question, says he still isn't able to figure it out.

Our one approach to a policy is contained in the radiation protection guides established by the Federal Radiation Council. But these are so vague and so hedged about with qualifications as to be almost meaningless. Though the guides are sometimes referred to in discussions of radiation dangers, the Council itself says they apply only to industrial exposure, not to radiation from fallout. For this reason, Mr. LINDSAY rightly characterizes the radiation guides as "some of the most ingenious administrative doubletalk of our time."

Plainly, what is needed is a straight-forward approach to the subject along the lines suggested by the Manhattan Republican. It is up to our Federal Government, which is responsible for national security, to set forth definitions of dangerous radiation levels, countermeasures to be instituted when radioactivity nears those levels, and officials in charge of the countermeasures. Then we would have some idea of where we stand.

That this has not yet been done may be laid in part to honest differences among the scientists. Simple formulations to cover the radiation problem call for compromises, and on those the experts do not readily agree. Also militating against clear-cut governmental action, however, has been an influential minority which maintains that the dangers of nuclear testing are overstated. In this view, fallout hazards are negligible, if not merely scarce talk whipped up by the Communists.

To that argument, a conclusive rebuttal has just been presented by a United Nations committee including representatives of all the nuclear powers. Communist and non-Communist. After an exhaustive review of the literature on atomic radiation, the committee finds that any exposure to nuclear radiation, however slight, is to be avoided when possible.

Warning that further nuclear testing will harm present and future generations, the committee says that radiation even in quantities below those causing acute illness may result in cancer, leukemia, and inherited abnormalities. The report cites evidence that "some genetic damage may follow any dose of radiation, however small."

This is the sober conclusion of investigators with no national ax to grind, with no aim in view save the welfare of mankind as a whole. It should add strength to the movement for a worldwide ban on nuclear testing. It also should lend poignancy to the plea of people like Representative LINDSAY, who call on our Government to plan for the emergencies that will arise if testing continues.

The Nation Needs Wayne L. Hays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am quite proud of my subcommittee chairman and want to especially commend Chairman WAYNE L. HAYS, of the Subcommittee on State Department Personnel and Foreign Operations, for the outstanding job that he and his subcommittee did in handling the legislation before them this session.

I am including with these remarks, Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of June 22, 1962, an editorial from the Lorain, Ohio, Journal, which is not in Congressman HAYS' district, of May 9, 1962, and one from his local paper, the Times Leader, on another subject in the issue of March 30, 1962. The tenor of all of these is the same and that is that Congress needs more people like WAYNE L. HAYS.

The editorials follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 22, 1962]

THE GIMLET EYE OF MR. HAYS

We were sorry to see the State Department walk up Capitol Hill with requests for a $300,000 home for the U.S. Ambassador to Cyprus and a $1,370,000 apartment building for U.S. diplomats in Japan. Because it just got itself kicked unceremoniously down again by Representative WAYNE HAYS, Ohio Democrat, and chairman of a House subcommittee which passes on oversea construction for U.S. diplomats.

Of the Cyprus project, Mr. HAYS said: "Even Billie Sol Estes only lives in a $150,000 house." And: "There are only 587,000 people on the whole island." Of the apartment proposal, he said: "You are going to get that over my dead body." He added that there has to be an end someplace to sending innumerable people to Japan and that this is a good place to start.

The upshot of the Department's collision with the Congressman from Ohio is that the figures for both projects will be reworked without, one supposes, doing U.S. diplomacy irreparable harm.

The taxpayer watching this exchange can't help wondering what would happen to Federal expenditures generally if every congressional committee had on it just one gimlet-eyed HAYS.

[From the Lorain (Ohio) Journal, May 9, 1962]

AN OHIOAN PROTESTS

One Congressman who speaks out bluntly against some of the ridiculously wasteful practices of the foreign aid program is an Ohioan, Representative WAYNE L. HAYS.

Congressman HAYS, whose home is at Flushing, Ohio, represents the 18th District, comprised of Belmont, Carroll, Columbiana, Harrison, and Jefferson Counties. He is a Democrat. He was first elected to the 81st Congress in 1948, and has been reelected in succeeding terms.

Just for the record, it is briefly mentioned that Mr. HAYS has a solid background. He is a college graduate, a former teacher of history, was mayor of Flushing for three terms, volunteered for military service in World War II, served a term in the Ohio Senate, and served as a county commissioner in Belmont County.

In other words, he has adequate educational qualifications and extensive political experience.

Obviously, Representative HAYS can speak with as much authority about some of the flaws of foreign aid as various other Congressmen, bemused with the theory of giving away money to win friends, can speak of its merits.

About a week ago Mr. HAYS declared in a protest to foreign aid officials that American taxpayers are footing the bill for $3,000-a-month Cabinet members in the Congo.

Foreign aid spokesmen offered the usual argument, this being that the funds being supplied by the United States to the Congolese are not the same funds from which the Cabinet members are drawing their exorbitant salaries.

HAYS replied with biting logic that if the Congolese had to pay for the food and other expenses met by U.S. funds, that the officials wouldn't have money available for their fabulous salaries.

"Don't give me that old argument that it isn't this money," said Congressman HAYS. "That is the argument Trujillo used when we gave him $600,000 in 1 year and he gave his son a $600,000 allowance. He said it wasn't the same money."

What HAYS said is clear enough to an ordinary citizen or to a schoolboy. Unfortunately, it does not seem very clear to many other Members of Congress and not clear at all to the foreign aid officials who keep dishing out the money—our money—to other countries. As long as we keep giving, the recipients will remain needy and greedy.

The question is, How can Congressman HAYS retain his clear vision in the Washington atmosphere that seems to becloud the eyes of many of his compatriots on the foreign aid issue?

Whatever the answer to that question may be, Mr. HAYS deserves encouragement from all parts of the State and Nation to continue to fight against foreign aid wastefulness.

Letters addressed to Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, House Office Building, Washington, D.C., will reach him.

[From the Times Leader, Mar. 30, 1962]

CONGRATULATIONS DUE HAYS

We wish to commend Congressman WAYNE L. HAYS for voting against President Kennedy's tax bill.

While there are many of the facets of the bill we don't like—probably more than those with which Mr. HAYS takes exception—that is not the case in point.

It must have been pretty tough for the Flushing Congressman to go against the wishes of his fellow Democrats, even the President, and the fact that he did follow his own convictions demonstrates he has the courage to represent his district to the best of his ability. And it has been our observation that he has always tried to do just that.

We need more Representatives in Washington who put the real interests of the people above political expediency and personal ambition.

FAA Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, some years ago I heard a rather crass definition of politics when someone described it as "the science of who gets what from whom."

This is hardly an ennobling sentiment. Those of us who participate in the political judgments of this country would like to argue that our efforts hardly have the exactness of a science and that they are certainly motivated by loftier sentiments than who gets what from whom.

I mention this because I want to discuss a matter that has occupied the attention of several distinguished Members in recent weeks, namely the merits and demerits of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, Mr. Najeeb Halaby. But first I must disavow and disclaim any desire to take anything from one group of people and give it to another.

The people in the district I represent are not trying to take an FAA facility from the people in another district. Of course, they would like, if possible, to keep the air traffic control center they now have rather than see it move to another district a few miles away. They are not trying to gain a big regional airport that would route another city's traffic to their own. They have not even made a fuss about standing at the bottom of the list when airport appropriations were recently handed out. And I do not know of any of them that are trying to get nonscheduled airline certificates issued or revoked.

In short, the people in my district are not trying to gain a favor from FAA or its Administrator. Yet, they have a quarrel with the Administrator. And I have a quarrel.

Our quarrel is that this man's deficiencies do not dwindle in significance when weighed against his contributions. We do not want to detract from his accomplishments in earning a pilot's license at 17; we do not want to minimize his abilities as a test pilot or a parachutist; we do not pass judgment on him as a lawyer or a corporation official, nor do we say he rendered no service as one of President Eisenhower's appointees to

the group which recommended creation of FAA. We do not doubt that he is eager and on the go, and we think it was proper that he fine himself $50 when his eagerness to move ahead of other planes waiting on the flight apron caused him to collide with another plane.

We agree with the able Member who listed such things as these to his credit. And we certainly agree that Mr. Halaby never hesitates to speak up for what he believes. However, I would hope that all my constituents do not share the view Mr. Halaby expressed when he said I was simply a freshman acting like a freshman. But even such frankness as this serves a purpose, for it gives an insight into the man's attitudes when he is opposed.

We in the 20th District of Texas oppose this man, not for any of the things I have mentioned, but as Administrator of this Agency. In the past weeks I have examined many aspects of FAA's operations that are under this Administrator. Other Members of this House have taken him to task for matters within their knowledge. One of our distinguished and senior colleagues has called on the President to discharge this Administrator.

It is apparent that no one of us here has full knowledge of all that is to his credit or his discredit. We can only speak from our own knowledge independently arrived at.

Therefore, it is good and it is timely that my esteemed colleague from Texas, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Activities, has scheduled next Monday an inquiry into the activities of the Federal Aviation Agency for the purpose of determining its economy and efficiency. This is good, and I welcome it.

Much that has been said, and to which I have contributed, concerns facts that are involved, obscure, and technical. It is well that a regular committee of this House will now take such facts under consideration. No group up to now has done so. The Subcommittee on Appropriations announced that it was not the experts to do this, that the experts in this field were within FAA itself. The Comptroller General of the United States advised me that he could express no opinion on the reasonableness of economic data from this Agency. Therefore, it is good to know that a regularly constituted body of this House will make this inquiry.

This inquiry must surely examine one central question of conflict that bears directly on both the efficiency and economy of the Agency and the abilities of its Administrator. That question is: How many air route traffic control centers are being planned within the contiguous United States?

Mr. Halaby says 21. The experts in his Agency recommend 15. Why should this Congress appropriate funds for new centers, for dismantling centers, for consolidating centers until Mr. Halaby and his own career experts resolve their difference? Not only the number but their location and the configuration of their boundaries must be settled before anyone can determine if it is efficient or economical to close down, move or build these ARTC Centers . This is so elemental, I can assure you the voters of America can understand the necessity of answering this question even though many here would rather it not even be asked.

I urge the subcommittee to put the question.

The Wonder Drugs of Yesterday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the recent furor over the degenerating drug thalidomide has caused the medical profession, the public, and the legislators to pause and pay serious attention to the use and misuse of drugs. I have been exploring the possibility of the dissemination of information obtained by outstanding doctors in the analyses of drugs, their effects, and consequences. The New York Post has commenced a series of articles which are informative, revealing, and horrifying. Everyone who has a headache, a family, or a functional problem should read, study, and beware. The medical profession and the drug industry should reevaluate their practices so that they will carry out their primary function of aiding humanity and not destroying it.

The article from the New York Post of September 11, 1962, follows:

THE WONDER DRUGS OF YESTERDAY

(By Barbara Yuncker)

Where are the wonder drugs of yesterday? What has become of all the miraculous chemicals that were going to conquer resistant germs, halt pain without addiction, tame the dread killers?

Every year nearly 300 new drugs pour through the Food and Drug Administration to the market. They're usually billed as safe, effective, more potent, lower in side effects. What becomes of these marvels?

A few, a very few, are genuine wonders. Penicillin was; cortisone was; the broad-spectrum antibiotics known as tetracyclines were; the potent tranquilizers known as phenothiazines were. Plagued by side effects though they all are, such breakthrough drugs confer benefits which make them well worth the risks. Equally worthwhile are the efforts to fiddle with their structures to maximize benefits and minimize perils.

The bulk of each year's "wonders" are no such thing, of course, and after the first ballyhoo they get pushed to the back of the shelf to make room for the new marvel on the new promotion budget.

But a few (13 in 3 years) are so dangerous that they have to be pulled off the market, the only "wonder" being how they ever cleared in the first place.

Don't these withdrawals represent errors by the FDA? "In a sense they do," concedes Deputy Commissioner John Harvey, who reviews such cases, "though usually they represent widespread clinical use revealing toxic effects which were not anticipated."

The key, he said, is the promptness and the completeness with which FDA gets information. "Some firms cooperate; some obviously do not."

Altafur (Eaton Laboratories) came on the market in 1959 as the bright new star in systemic antibacterial therapy * * * especially effective against staphylococcus aureus, the dread drug-resistant hospital infection, and enjoying a low order of side effects * * * minimal and avoidable.

By late 1960, FDA wanted the drug off the market (on the grounds that it could, indirectly, kill seriously ill patients because it is useless—besides being implicated in blurred vision, gastric difficulties and other side effects). Under fire, it was withdrawn from sale only last November, removed legally only last month; the case may yet be appealed in court.

(One typical piece of evidence on which FDA cleared Altafur was a report of phenomenal success in curing perilous staphylococcus pneumonia. Experts have since demonstrated there was no clear evidence the patients even had staph pneumonia.)

Flexin (McNeil Laboratories) was cleared in 1956 for use as a muscle relaxant and 3 years later, with fanfare from U.S. Surgeon General Burney, for gout. It was advertised as "well tolerated and effective * * * seldom produces side effects."

"In late 1960 or early 1961," says an FDA official, "we became aware that the firm knew of a number of cases of hepatitis, some fatal, associated with the drug. We moved to suspend their right to sell the drug and the company conceded last October 31. It is our information there were 54 cases of liver damage begining in 1956, 15 of them fatal."

This case is of exceptional legal interest. There is now no law that a firm must tell FDA any bad news it gets after a drug clears; however, it must disclose all facts if it comes back to FDA to sell for a new use (in this case, gout) or in a new form. Zoxazolamine, generic name for Flexin, is a major ingredient of McNeil's Flexilon, cleared in 1957, and Triurate, cleared in 1960, both now withdrawn.

Monase, a psychic energizer, represented the entry of the respected Upjohn Co. into the mood drug market. Cleared in April 1961 it was advertised as having only "mild and easily handled effects" with "no evidence of liver, kidney, or hematologic toxicity" in extensive clinical tests.

"In early 1962," says an FDA official, "we learned that some patients had got agranulocytosis [a serious blood—i.e., hematologic—disease] and that this had been brought to Upjohn's attention some time before * * *. We did not get the full story the first time we asked the firm, but our investigation led us to believe that Monase should be taken off the market. The firm acquiesced in April. Our information about the seven fatal cases did not come from Upjohn."

Dornwal (Wallace & Tiernan, Inc.) is a tranquilizer with the same occasional dismaying effect on blood. It was cleared by the FDA in April 1960 and promoted as "particularly well suited for the ambulatory patient (i.e., out of the doctor's close supervision) * * * usually free of side effects."

In January 1961 the Medical Letter pointed out that the claims were based on small, poorly controlled tests. In October, the FDA another doctor at a medical meeting that Dornwal was causing agranulocytosis. We found they had been collecting evidence for some time and knew of 11 cases with 3 deaths." Dornwal was off the market in November.

Mer-29 (William S. Merrell Co.) was cleared for sale as a cholesterol-lowering drug in April 1960. By late in 1961 the FDA learned four patients on Mer-29 had developed cataracts and many more had lost hair and suffered other effects. Because the company fought back the drug stayed on sale till April.

The Post has revealed in its news columns how the firm rushed the drug into human testing after sketchy trials with animals and omitted from its promotion possibly dangerous effects in body metabolism. A U.S. grand jury is now probing whether the firm also violated Federal law. A key question is whether the firm told FDA the truth about cataracts in test rodents and later in dogs.

In addition to withdrawn drugs there are others still on the market which were advertised as unusually safe but which have since been the subject of warnings of scattered severe damage.

Why are not such dangers discovered in advance so drugs can be kept off the market—or at least so that doctors can be warned?

Part of the answer is some companies' haste and carelessness. Part is within FDA, which has only 12 medical officers to handle some 400 new drug applications every year. Part is the still rudimentary knowledge of how drugs work. (We don't even know how that old, old wonder drug aspirin does its job.) Part is the immense variability of side effects.

Dr. M. L. Rosenheim, a London specialist, recently gave a symposium this six-part classification:

Overdose effects: Damage may result from simple excess dosage, or "alterations in the metabolic state of the patient may lead to the normal dose producing an excessive effect." Morphine is more potent, for example, if the liver is impaired.

Intolerance effect: A "lowered threshold to normal [drug] action" is partly due to the natural variety of humans, partly to enzyme defects.

True side effects: "Therapeutically undesirable but unavoidable effects of the [normal] action of the drug." The antimetabolites used to fight cancer are an obvious example; the hope is that they will harm cancer cells more than normal ones.

Secondary effects: Such as a vitamin deficiency or a superinfection because antibiotics have altered the bacterial balance inside the body, or an uncontrolled infection because cortisone lowers immunity defenses.

Idiosyncrasy: An inherent abnormal reaction apparently inheritable. An example is a hemolytic anemia, suffered to excess by Negroes given Primaquine (an antimalarial drug of Winthrop Laboratories).

Hypersensitivity: Conditioned by previous exposure. This allergic reaction explains the fatal shock reactions from penicillin and may explain many blood complications with other drugs.

Allowing for the fact that animals are not men, most of the damage from overdose, true side effects and secondary effects can be anticipated from animal tests if enough species are used, if dosages are big enough and if care is taken at autopsy to pinpoint the clues in subtle damage. The other perils are virtually impossible to foretell.

Dr. V. B. Mattia, vice president of Roche Laboratories (one of the few drug officials who publicly says the Kefauver hearings were a good thing), stressed these difficulties when asked about Marsilid, the first psychic energizer taken off the market last year because of deaths from hepatitis.

It had been tested for 5 years and marketed for 2 more as an antituberculosis drug before it was marketed in 1957 as an antidepressant.

Later that year the company got its first reports of possibly connected hepatitis and says it immediately alerted the FDA. Early in 1958 a west coast doctor publicly blamed a hepatitis death on Marsilid—something he couldn't actually know from one case since all damage to the liver looks a lot alike.

Despite 33 fatal hepatitis cases among some 450,000 treated, the FDA left the drug on the market then because it had no rivals to combat depression; now it does. Promotion stopped in late 1959. Sales were officially canceled early in 1961 in the United States but it is still on sale overseas.

Whatever criticism might be made of the delay in stopping sales, it is a fact that Marsilid's liver damage has not been duplicated in animals. And there is the puzzle that no hepatitis was laid to it in all the years of TB use. Is there a protective factor in TB or a danger-disposing factor in mental illness? No one knows.

Who is to blame for the hard sell, the deliberate effort to make every drug the drug? Mainly the companies, of course, with varying degrees of guilt. But the doctor who writes the prescription must take a share, because sources of evaluation do exist. The AMA's Council on Drugs does a creditable job. And for more trenchant judgments, there are the Medical Letter, an independent biweekly newsletter, and Dr. Walter Modell's biennial "Drugs of Choice." Unfortunately, their sales are small.

Also importantly to blame is the yearning of the public to believe in a miracle and the occasional unjustified enthusiasm of the Government. The history of the miracle painkiller of 1959 is instructive.

In January HEW Secretary Flemming called in the press to make an announcement which he said gave him "more satisfaction than any other I have ever made"—the development at the National Institutes of Health of a new painkiller "10 times as effective as morphine, 50 times as effective as codeine" and with negligible addicting effect. The story of NIH–7519, phenazocine, was widely told, with only Time magazine, in the lay press, skeptical.

Gradually, quietly, the various professional evaluations cut NIH–7519 down to size. In "Drugs in Current Use—1962" Modell identifies it tersely as an "addictive analgesic related to morphine. No advantages * * * have been established."

Though few drugs get such a high-level launching, the NIH–7519 story is repeated again and again.

On the basis of the examples in this article and scores of others, the Medical Letter advises doctors:

"Except in serious disorders where older and safer drugs are ineffective, no new drug should be employed in [private] practice unless controlled clinical trials and extensive experience have clearly established its effectiveness and safety."

"Most drugs clear FDA," the newsletter went on, "on animal experiments, very limited human toxicity studies, physicians' testimonials, and usually uncontrolled clinical trials.

"All promotion statements that a new drug has few, mild, or no side effects should be ignored."

Address of Mayor Wagner at Fifth Annual Convention of New York State AFL-CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include herein the address made by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, on September 10 at the opening session of the Fifth Annual Convention of the New York State AFL–CIO, which was held in New York City this week.

Because of the exemplary and forward-looking program put into effect by the city of New York to assist and safeguard our labor force there, I believe the mayor's address should be given widespread coverage, and for that reason I am taking the liberty of inserting it in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT OPENING SESSION OF FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NEW YORK STATE AFL–CIO, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1962

It is a great pleasure for me to welcome this convention to New York again.

You should, of course, feel very much at home here. With 1 million organized workers in this city, it is widely and wisely regarded as a labor town. We are glad to wear the union label.

But when I say that New York is regarded as a labor town, it doesn't necessarily mean what some might think it means. What it does mean is that here the problems of working people are recognized as being of primary concern to the city government.

New York City cares about the welfare and interests of those who work for a living with hand or brain. With the help of the labor movement, among others, we have been able to translate our concern into programs of meaningful social and economic action. But we still have far to go. And in these times of change, we must look ahead to tomorrow's problems, today.

Here in New York City, we have made an economic study of the shape of the labor market as it will be in 1970. This was undertaken by our city's own department of labor. The results of this study constitute a challenge to us all.

First, it shows a growing need for the training of workers in specialized skills because the demand for unskilled labor will continue to decline at an increasing rate in the years immediately ahead.

Furthermore, this study shows that by 1970 our labor force will include more women, more young people under 25, and more nonwhite Americans.

By 1970, one out of every three workers in New York City will be a woman. Today, only one out of every four is a woman. One of the steps we must take to anticipate this development is legislation requiring equal pay for equal work. I have favored this for a long time. We must also take steps to create additional day care centers for the children of working mothers, under the terms of the Federal Welfare Act of 1962 which extends Federal grants-in-aid for this purpose, but requires enabling legislation by the State.

By 1970, our survey predicts that one in every five workers in New York City will be under 25 years of age. At present only one in seven is in this category. This too represents a challenge.

Every one of these young people should have his chance to measure up to his top capacity for useful work. Discrimination on the basis of race, in regard to both employment and promotion, must go. We can't afford the cost in delinquency and crime which results when talent is frustrated and opportunity is denied.

By 1970, the number of Negro and Puerto Rican workers in our city and State will have substantially increased. According to our projection for New York City, these groups will account for almost 3 out of every 10 workers within 8 years' time. It is in our common interest to see that these new workers are not left on the fringes of our economy. To do so is to invite social and economic dangers of major proportion.

My administration has, I am pleased to say, taken several strides forward to meet our responsibilities. I am sure I need not tell you what we are going to do about minimum wages—$1.25 now and $1.50 1 year from now. And we will have the broadest coverage under any minimum wage law on any statute books anywhere in the country. By thus elevating our wage minimum, we shall be attacking a root cause of misery, crime, and injustice. In this attack, we must succeed.

In this city we believe in the right of collective bargaining. We put our beliefs into action. Under an executive order of mine which has earned the title of "Little Wagner Act," we guarantee to more than 100,000 employees of city agencies directly under the mayor's jurisdiction the right to organize and bargain collectively. Thousands of city workers have availed themselves of the right and now enjoy the benefits of union representation.

Nor do we willingly tolerate abuses which interfere with the legitimate practice of collective bargaining anywhere within our jurisdiction. Thus, we have just enacted a local law prohibiting the recruitment, transportation, or employment of professional strikebreakers to replace employees who are on strike or locked out.

These are some of the steps which we in New York City have been taking. And I don't see why what is good enough for New York City is not good enough for the rest of the State.

I know that since this is a State convention, you will be giving thought to the actions which can be taken in Albany to achieve a better life for the people of this State. I offer you the example of the city of New York. Consider this program: (1) Establish the $1.50 minimum wage on a statewide basis in 1963; (2) overhaul the Condon-Wadlin Act; (3) extend the right of collective bargaining to employees of nonprofit institutions; and (4) ban the importation and recruitment of strikebreakers.

You might use this program as a test to separate those friends of labor who pay lipservice to the cause from those who are really willing to work for the betterment of the conditions of labor.

I am sure that in any event your deliberations will result in a challenging program—a program keyed to the needs of our times.

Cotton Import Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, because of my deep concern with the welfare of the cotton textile industry which is so vital to the economy of my own district and to the national prosperity, I have introduced today two measures which, if enacted, could mean continued survival and growth of a basic manufacturing enterprise, and the stability of numberless jobs of textile workers.

The first of these bills seeks to limit the imports of cotton textiles to the volume imported in 1961—the base year of the short-term Geneva agreement by the major textile-producing nations. The other is a joint resolution which would equalize the competitive positions of foreign and domestic manufacturers of cotton textiles by imposing an import duty so long as we maintain a cotton export subsidy.

To extend statutory protection to our textile industry and its workers is particularly urgent at this time because of the shocking and unexpected unfavorable decision by the U.S. Tariff Commission on the equalizing fee for cotton imports. Too, one of the principal international agreements for the limitation of foreign textiles into the United States expires September 30. It is to be hoped that a new 5-year agreement will be reached before the end of this month, but there is no certainty that it will be done, I am informed.

But even if a new Geneva agreement for a longer term than the present 1-year agreement is reached, the textile industry of this country needs the stabilizing influence which statutory protection would bring. It would certainly encourage modernization and expansion, and it would act as an insurance against fluctuating rates of imports of foreign textiles. The President has assured the industry that he intends to keep the import rate at 6 percent, but it has been at 8 percent during the term of the present agreement.

The American textile industry is and will be at a great disadvantage as long as it must pay high support prices for American raw cotton which foreign manufacturers can obtain for 8½ cents a pound less. This price advantage, coupled with lower wages and often lower taxes, provides a ruinous competitive position for our domestic industry.

This session of Congress approaches adjournment, and if there is no protection available against a flood of cheaply produced foreign cotton products, our own industry faces a highly inequitable and dangerous position in its home market.

The textile mills of the Far East, Europe, and the Middle East are among the world's most modern. In many if not most instances, this modernization has been made possible through American aid. To now deny the American textile industry a measure of protection while it modernizes to meet outside competition would be, in my opinion, exceedingly shortsighted and economically disastrous.

There is, as you know, now a case before the Office of Emergency Planning, in which it is sought to have the textile industry declared vital and necessary to the national security. If such a finding is made, the President would then have the authority to take measures to protect the domestic textile industry just as the mandatory oil imports program is operating to protect, to some extent, the domestic petroleum industry. I have no assurance, of course, when and if the Office of Emergency Planning will make such a finding. Meantime there is little outside of the prospective international agreements which offer the prospect of a reasonable amount of protection.

If statutory protection for the textile industry is not provided by this Congress, it might well be 2 years before such legislation could be made effective. Such a period would prove catastrophic to our domestic textile manufacturers if the flow of foreign cotton products is not otherwise stemmed.

There have been other important segments of American industry which have been threatened by ruinous foreign competition arising from inequities in production costs and failure to impose reasonable and adequate limitations on imports. Some of those industries have not survived.

I think none would seriously debate that the great textile industry is vital to the economic health and the security of the United States. The time to insure its continued existence and to aid toward permanent health and growth is now.

Kennedy Do-Nothing Policy on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is hard for the American people to understand why Mr. Kennedy refuses to face the facts on Cuba. Everyone else in the United States seems to realize that the shipments of military men and material to Cuba are a danger to our national security. Our President fumbles about and says he has no indication that these arms are going to be used offensively. Since when did the Communist stop his offensive?

In yesterday's New York Herald Tribune both Roscoe Drummond and David Lawrence elaborated on Kennedy's appeasement of Cuban communism:

THE BASIC ONE DESCRIBED: MONROE DOCTRINE BROKEN

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—If we are to have a fair chance of lifting Soviet rule—not just Castro rule—from the backs of the Cuban people, the first thing we must do is face the facts.

We are not doing so yet. There is a dangerous tendency to blur the facts in order to avoid facing the consequences instead of looking the facts head on in order to deal with them.

Let me illustrate.

President Kennedy says that "the gravest issues would arise" if Cuba provided Russia with a "military base."

Can anyone seriously question that all of Cuba is today a base of Soviet power and that Moscow will determine how that power will be used? The fact is that the "gravest issues," which the President suggests "would arise" if something happened in the future, have already risen. It has happened. To assume that these "grave issues" lie ahead is, it seems to me, the most perilously wishful thinking. They are here now.

THEORY IS ASSAILED

A number of officials are taking comfort from the theory that, in their view, the massive flow of weapons the Soviet Union is pouring into Cuba does not show "any significant offensive capability."

Can anyone seriously argue that Soviet control of Castro's Cuba does not confront us with "the gravest issues" now because the Soviet weapons do not yet look "significantly offensive"? The fact is that the "gravest issues" are upon us.

To be comforted by the theory that the current flow of Soviet weaponry into Cuba seems to be mostly defensive—a defense against the Cuban people?—is to ignore the meaning of what is happening. The significant fact is that Mr. Krushchev is now in charge of Cuba. If we blink at this fact and wait until his weapons are pointed at Cuba's neighbors, not just at the Cuban people, then we are neglecting the danger.

"To pretend otherwise," writes Washington Commentator Robert G. Spivack—and I believe he is profoundly right—"is to underestimate the dimensions of Soviet ambition, to misread Communist history and delude ourselves about the potential of the Alliance for Progress."

All this easy talk about the Monroe Doctrine and how the United States is just as determined to implement it as ever is buncombe. The commitment of the Monroe Doctrine is that no non-American power should be allowed to colonize or obtain control anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. The fact is that under the statutes of the Organization of American States, the United States while as committed as ever to the purpose of the Monroe Doctrine, has struck from its own hands any certain means of applying it. The guarantee against "foreign intervention" in the Western Hemisphere no longer rests upon the unilateral power of the United States. It has been made the commitment of the 22 American member states—with the proviso that it can be brought into being only by a two-thirds vote of all the governments.

How, then, can we say that the Monroe Doctrine is being used to shield the Western Hemisphere from foreign intervention when there is no means of invoking it without a two-thirds vote by the Organization of American States? People say it by pretending that the facts are different than they are. They say that the Monroe Doctrine will be assuredly invoked if Khrushchev's Cuba turns its guns against any other American state or even threatens to do so.

THE CLEAR PRINCIPLE

How escapist can we get? The clear, undeviating, historic principle of the Monroe Doctrine is that it was to protect against the setting up of a foreign power anywhere on the two continents, not to wait until a foreign power had acquired a hemisphere stronghold and then try to shield the rest from the consequences.

What are the facts? The facts are that the Castro regime now rests on Soviet guns aimed at the Cuban people by Soviet direction. Cuba is today a Soviet satellite as East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia are Soviet satellites. Castro has as much to say about his country—and what is to be done with it—as Ulbricht about East Germany.

The fact is that the Monroe Doctrine has been successfully breached, and many are still talking as though the gravest issues were somewhere in the future, not in the urgent present.

SOVIETS MAKE CUBAN HAY WHILE THE UNITED STATES DOES NOTHING

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Nearly 2 weeks have passed since the news was given out that the Soviets had begun an arms buildup in Cuba. The United States so far as known has sent no protest to the Soviet Government against its flagrant violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Government has taken advantage of America's silence and has filled the broadcast waves of the world with one propaganda blast after the other, characterizing President Kennedy's callup of Reserves as a provocative action. The latest accusation actually turns the tables on the United States and warns the Washington Government that it must not do anything in Cuba to interfere with the Castro government's policy of acquiring Soviet arms. The claim is reiterated that Cuba is arming for defense. President Kennedy thus has given away a propaganda advantage by appearing to accept the Castro and Soviet arguments that the supplying of arms and the sending of "technicians" are simply for "defensive" purposes.

It is a puzzle just why Mr. Kennedy hcooses to forfeit the initiative in propaganda. Time was when the American Government uttered its protests through formal diplomatic channels and made them public in situations comparable to the present controversy over the Soviet buildup in Cuba. The action of the Moscow government not only affects the Monroe Doctrine as a policy but is directly related to America's own security. To place missile pads and missiles in Cuba, which is just 90 miles away from our own shores, is an act that can be construed as hostile to the United States. Yet the administration prefers to say nothing by way of formal protest.

ADMINISTRATION FEARS

The seriousness of the situation is not diminished but actually increased by the failure to make any protest before the world. Unfortunately, the Soviets may come to believe that they have successfully bluffed the United States into silence and they may take further chances in the cold war. Moscow in its latest outburst even hints at a nuclear war if the United States does anything about Cuba.

The impression in Washington is that the administration has all along been afraid of "increasing tensions" by saying anything to Russia about the Cuban buildup. Still, the Soviets do not mind increasing tensions by their propaganda statements. These could be regarded as of little importance if they were merely part of an exchange of words between the Soviet Union and the United States. Unhappily, the propaganda is circulated all over the world. The peoples of allied as well as neutral countries can thus be influenced to believe that the United States is afraid to speak out and is being shoved into a corner by the aggressive pronouncements of the Soviet Union.

The administration has known for a long time about the Soviet arms buildup in Cuba. On September 2, United Press International in a dispatch from Washington said:

"A State Department spokesman said today that the Soviet announcement of arms aid to Cuba 'merely confirms what has been going on in recent months.' The spokesman said:

" 'The announcement doesn't seem to represent anything new. We've been saying right along that the Soviet Union has been sending military equipment and technicians to Cuba.' "

But the American people were not told officially about this until about 2 weeks ago and there is no public record that the United States has filed any protest with the Soviet Government concerning the arms building. Naturally, the Soviets would construe this as an acquiescence and would be inclined to increase their military buildup in Cuba and begin to send arms to other parts of Latin America which they are planning to infiltrate through agents already on the job.

THURMOND COMMENT

Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, Democrat, referring to some of Mr. Kennedy's recent statements, said the other day in the Senate:

"The President's comments indicate strongly that the Monroe Doctrine has recently been reinterpreted with major omissions to the extent that the Monroe Doctrine is no longer a bulwark of U.S. foreign policy which it was for over 100 years."

In Congress, Members of both parties are restive and uneasy about the apparent surrender of the initiative to the Soviet Union. Authority to call up 150,000 reserves has been overwhelmingly endorsed, but this does not overcome the feeling in Congress that the United States is being portrayed over the airwaves as afraid to stand up to the Soviets. Paul Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs, in a television interview over the ABC network Sunday, really summed up the situation. He wasn't trying to be critical of the administration and, in fact, was endeavoring to defend it. But he unwittingly stated the case against the administration's policy of silence when he said:

"I think the grounds for concern are, first of all, that this assistance the Soviets are giving Castro makes it more difficult for the Cuban people ever to restore their freedom and, secondly, this helps Castro consolidate his position in Cuba and thereby might increase the possibility that Cuba could be used as a base for Communist infiltration into the rest of the hemisphere."

Yet nothing has been said officially for the last several months to the Soviet Government in protest about all this.

How To Save Your Life on the Most Dangerous Weekend of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD another timely and wonderful article by our great U.S. Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges. I had the pleasure of putting another one of his great articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which goes to every part of our beloved Nation, and have had so many wonderful letters from every end of the country congratulating us on what Secretary Hodges had to say in his article.

It seems to me that this article is even greater than the last one, and I believe all of us appreciate the great work that Secretary Hodges has done, is doing and will continue to do in the Cabinet of President Kennedy. Secretary Hodges is just a genius in so many ways. He has brains and ability and such an understanding heart, and you will always find him, in my judgment, doing the things that will help all mankind. This article was a timely warning and we know now, since the Labor Day has passed and we have the record, that it was the most dangerous weekend of the year.

God bless Luther Hodges and give him strength to carry on the great work he is doing for this great Nation as Secretary of Commerce.

The article follows:

HOW TO SAVE YOUR LIFE ON THE MOST DANGEROUS WEEKEND OF THE YEAR

(By Luther H. Hodges)

I am addressing this article to you, Mr. and Mrs. Motorist, in the hope that you will not be among the thousands killed or injured next weekend.

All signs point to the fact that Labor Day 1962 could be the worst holiday for traffic deaths in the history of the United States. That's the grim assessment of our U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, which recently completed a study of accident records. Over the years, it was discovered, Labor Day weekend has been the most dangerous holiday of all.

This year's Labor Day is even more ominous because it will be the only long holiday weekend in 1962. Every other major holiday falls in midweek. That means thousands of Americans—perhaps you too—have been waiting all summer for Labor Day to hit the highways.

As Chairman of President Kennedy's new Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board, I've been directed to throw the full weight of the Government's scientific and engineering resources into reducing the staggering annual totals of auto deaths.

DRIVER REGISTER STARTED

We're working, for example, to build into the great new Interstate Highway System lifesaving features that will prevent 2,000 deaths in 1962 alone. And we've started a driver register, a permanent list of drivers whose licenses have been revoked. If a violator tries to get a license in another State, authorities can ask us for his record and act accordingly.

We're sure these new programs will help. But in the last analysis, safety is still your job. You and your fellow motorists are the only ones who can reduce the number of Americans killed and injured next weekend—now predicted at 60,000.

To help you help yourself, we have selected the following 10 watchwords for safety from the research findings of the Bureau of Public Roads. These are the most important things to do. Read them; check yourself against them. Then use them on the road this weekend.

Before you start:

1. Safety-check your car. At the very least, make sure your tires, brakes, and lights are fully serviceable. I've put safety belts in my own car, and advise everyone to do so.

2. Plan your trip. Get good maps and information; lay out your trip thoughtfully. Estimate realistically how far you can go each day by staying within the speed limits. Plan to drive not more than 8 hours a day; if that is impossible, include plenty of rest stops.

3. Safety-check yourself. Too often drivers take better care of the car than themselves. They'll run themselves ragged trying to clear everything up at the office and at home, staying up much too late the night before leaving.

While en route:

4. Stay alert. Some tips: eat lightly so you don't become drowsy. Abstain completely from alcohol at least until you've stopped driving for the day. Stop periodically to stretch your legs.

5. Obey the speed laws. Serious accidents increase drastically at speeds above 65 miles per hour. High speeds pay off poorly for the risk involved. On the New Jersey Turnpike, for example, you can observe the legal limit of 60 and travel its length in 118 minutes. If you gamble and go 70 the most you'll save is just 17 minutes.

6. Use judgment. The law sets limits, but within those limits you have to use commonsense. On a good, dry, 60-mile-per-hour highway, for instance, driving at less than 40 is actually dangerous. But on a wet road at night, you should stay under the legal speed.

7. Make courtesy a habit. Psychological studies show that accident repeaters tend to be overly aggressive. Don't work off your tension on the highway. You'd do better to tell off your boss—it could cost you your job, but not your life.

8. Exercise self-control. We all know the "big George" type of driver who weaves in and out of line, cussing everyone else on the road. Remember you're traveling for enjoyment. Relax.

9. Communicate. We must cooperate with other drivers to stay alive. Let the fellow behind know what you're going to do. Use all four kinds of signals—not just left turn or right turn, but "slow down" and "pass me." If your car breaks down, warn other drivers by tying a handkerchief on the traffic side of the car or, at night, keeping dome and tail lights on.

10. Be imaginative. Imagine yourself in that other car in the next lane, for example. Think what you would do if you were its driver, and guide your own car accordingly. Of course, you can't anticipate everything; expect the unsuspected and be ready to act promptly.

Every driver can and should add items to this list. But I guarantee that if each of us concentrate on these 10, we'll soon make a change in the present intolerable situation, where it's at least 50 percent more dangerous to drive a car than to ride an airliner, where almost 5 million people are injured each year—equal to the combined population of Los Angeles and Philadelphia.

Labor Day is a time to work for safety. Let's put these 10 watchwords into practice then—and every other day too.

Edward E. Ting, Native American of Chinese Ancestry, Flees 13 Years of Captivity in Red China Through Aid and Assistance of High School Classmate, Samuel L. Cutler, of Springfield, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are fully aware of the profound gratification that comes to a Member of Congress upon the successful resolution of casework, particularly those cases we handle involving human beings. I had such an experience recently when a native American of Chinese ancestry, Mr. Edward E. Ting, who grew up in my home city of Springfield, Mass., managed to flee from his Communist Chinese captors after living for 13 years in mainland China under Red oppression. I had worked for several years on this case with Mr. Ting's high school classmate, Mr. Samuel L. Cutler, of Springfield, in an effort to establish Mr. Ting's American citizenship and the fact that he had been issued an American passport to travel to China in 1928. Mr. Cutler is to be commended for his dedication and persistence in trying to help out his old boyhood friend, and his devotion to this cause has paid off for Mr. Ting is now back living in Springfield in Mr. Cutler's household.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert with my remarks the very moving human interest story by Foster L. Spencer that appeared in the Springfield Republican, August 26, concerning the flight to freedom from Red China by Mr. Ting:

TECH HIGH GRAD IS HOME AFTER FLEEING RED CHINA—EDWARD E. TING REUNITED WITH BOYHOOD PAL WHO HELPED FREE HIM FROM TYRANNY

(By Foster L. Spencer)

"I learned in my college days that he who holds your money, holds your freedom; and whoever holds your food, holds your life. Well, my money and food were held for more than a decade by the rulers of that Red hell."

So said Edward E. Ting, a former Springfield resident and Technical High School graduate, who arrived in this city just recently after 35 years in China, the past 13 of those years in what he aptly calls a "Red hell." Mr. Ting arrived safely in the United States from Hong Kong, after a harrowing and dramatic escape from the Communist-held land behind the Bamboo Curtain.

AT CUTLER HOME

Now again in the land of the free, this Chinese-American is staying at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel L. Cutler, 79 Eckington Street. Mr. Cutler, a teacher at Technical High School and a close friend of Mr. Ting during their high school days here, is the man most responsible for Ting's return to the United States. Ever since the Communist takeover in China, Mr. Cutler has made continuous efforts, to get his high school chum out of China. And his unflinching perseverance was duly rewarded when Mr. Ting arrived in Springfield via bus on August 9.

Mr. Ting's story is one of resolute determination and bravery in the face of deprivation, starvation, tyranny and death. But today, at age 61, Mr. Ting actually is living a dream which taunted him for many years when he worked 16 hours a day at forced labor in Red China.

AGAIN IN PARADISE

"I'm once again in paradise," was Mr. Ting's comment on his safe arrival in the United States after enduring incomparable hardships at the hands of the militant, ruthless Red tyranny.

But let Mr. Ting tell his story—a story which needs to be told to freedom-loving people everywhere. It's a dramatic and heart-rending story—but more important—it is a firsthand report by an American citizen about a land where Americans have been forbidden.

ESCAPE FROM RED CHINA

"Repeatedly since the Communists consolidated their position in China, I made application to leave the country for Hong Kong or Macao. I first applied for permission to leave when I was a civil engineer with the Canton and Hankow railroad, stationed at Hung Yang in 1950. My application was denied and so were succeeding applications until I was finally notified by the Red bureaucracy that a person must be at a port city in order to emigrate."

Grew old

"When I learned that I must go to a seaport to apply for emigration, I knew that I wouldn't be permitted to leave Hung Yang without some excuse.

"It was then I decided to 'grow old.' I grew a long beard, wore a long, drab, black habit, carried a cane and crept around while at work. I luckily developed arthritis in one hand as time went on. After I had let myself appear sufficiently old and useless to the Communist bosses, I asked permission to leave for the seaport of Canton, where I said I knew a doctor who could help cure me. This was over 2 years ago—in 1960.

"The authorities eventually allowed my request, and I left for Canton, where I immediately petitioned to leave the country. I was told that I must establish residence in

Canton for 1 year. Thus, a full year went by with no money for food or clothing, and no roof over my head."

Substandard diet

"I scavenged about, making the best of a substandard diet, until my year's residence was up. Then I reapplied for emigration to Macao, but again was turned down. Finally, after five or six applications had been refused, I told them that I had relatives in Macao (the Portuguese peninsula colony on the southern coast of China), and I could get money there to bring back to Red China to help make me well again.

"The lure of money was too great for the Red hierarchy to turn down. In March, I was granted 1 month's stay in Macao, and on April 30 with $1 given me by the Reds, I boarded the bus that carried me once again to freedom.

"My brother, Sui Jun who lives in Hong Kong came across the bay to see me in Macao, and told me of a Portuguese missionary, Father Pires, a Catholic priest, who had all the papers to prove my American citizenship and would allow my entry into Hong Kong. These papers had been given Father Pires by Mr. Cutler when he and his wife, Sara, came to the Orient in 1960.

"After some minor delays in Hong Kong, it wasn't long before I was given my passport and was aboard a Pan-American jet to the United States, my native land—the land I left some 35 years ago. Without the persevering efforts of my great friend, Sam Cutler, I would never have reached this cherished land. He worked many years in my behalf, and underwrote all the expenses for my return to the United States."

EARLY LIFE

Mr. Ting was a victim of hardship in America long before he came under the awful oppression of the Communists in China. Born in San Francisco at the turn of the century, his parents perished in the tragic San Francisco fire in 1906. Besides taking the lives of his beloved parents and forcing him to live with relatives, the great San Francisco fire played another heartbreaking role which almost thwarted Mr. Ting's reentry into the United States from Red China. But that story comes later.

Came to city in 1917

This Chinese-American boy, after his parents' demise, lived with an uncle and aunt on the west coast, coming to Springfield to live in 1917 during his high school days.

Mr. Ting lived with his uncle, the late William Wu, who for 45 years resided in Springfield and operated the Canton Restaurant on Worthington Street. He went all 4 years of high schoo lat Tech, and this is where he and Sam Cutler became fast friends.

"Eddie Ting used to spend countless hours at our house during those days," Mr. Cutler recalled. "We did our homework and played together. And we kept contact through college days, too."

Reserve officer

Upon graduation from Tech in 1921, Mr. Ting went to Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., receiving his degree from that school in 1925. Mr. Cutler, who was graduated from Massachusetts State College of Agriculture, and Mr. Ting were both commissioned second lieutenants in the Officer Reserve Corps, and in 1925 they served the summer together in field training for the cavalry at Fort Ethan Allen, Vt. That summer, too, the two friends further cultivated what was to become a fast and unceasing friendship.

After receiving his diploma from Norwich, Mr. Ting then attended Columbia University where he received his master of arts degree in political science and economics in 1927.

The following year, Mr. Ting, unable to find work in the United States, spent his meager savings to go to the Far East on a tramp streamer to do research on ancient Chinese history.

He arrived at Hong Kong broke, and through comtacts there, he was successful in securing a position on the faculty of Ling-nan University in Canton, teaching English. Little did he realize then that his stay in China was to be a long one—one that was to span a 35-year period, in which the country was to be overrun by, first the Japanese, and later the Communists.

He taught at Ling-nan University for 3 years, the moving to Canton Military Academy, where he taught English and military science. Here, the military education he secured at Norwich came in handy, and in addition to his classroom teaching, he taught equestrianism to aspiring Chinese cavalrymen.

Served as civilian

In 1934 the Chinese nation was attacked by the Japanese, the precursor to Pearl Harbor and World War II. Mr. Ting immediately availed his services to the Nationalist Government, offering to act as an interpreter in a civilian capacity, so as not to jeopardize his American citizenship. He was an interpreter until the end of World War II.

After the war, he went to work as a civil engineer with the Canton & Hankow Railroad, where he stayed until the Communist takeover.

In 1929, Mr. Ting married a Chinese woman, and they had three children. When it was learned that Mrs. Ting inherited land from her father, the Chinese Communists charged her with being a capitalist, took her land and separated her from her husband. She was sent to hard labor, and her children were scattered.

Hasn't seen family

In a manner of resignation which belied the gnawing bitterness in his heart, Ting said: "I don't know where my wife is now. I haven't seen her for 4 years. My children? Who knows? I learned that my daughter was married." His two sons, who would be 17 and 13 now, were separated from their father 9 years ago and Ting hasn't seen either of them since.

His courage faltered at last. Tears streamed uncontrollably down his brave and resolute face. He buried his head in his hands to hide them. Then gathering control once again, he spoke.

"It is heartbreaking for me that I may never see my family again. I could not bring them with me—even if I knew where they were. This is all part of the great sorrow inflicted upon people by the Communists, you see.

"This sorrow I must carry with me the rest of my days, even though I am safe in freedom forever. Yet, it is indeed fortunate that I don't know my family's whereabouts, because the Communists would make them responsible for my escape. This is the Communist way of retribution, you know."

FRIEND IN NEED

Sam Cutler's efforts to bring Eddie Ting back to American soil is a story in itself. Mr. Cutler, who kept tabs on his high school friend through the years of their separation, became greatly concerned over Eddie's safety when the Communists gripped the Chinese mainland.

Curtain up to stay

In 1950, he began sounding out methods to have Eddie returned to his native land. But, alas the Reds had such magnanimous control over life in China that Washington sources said it was impossible to spring Mr. Ting loose from the country. The Bamboo Curtain was up—to stay.

Mr. Cutler wrote Congressmen, Senators, the Department of State and even contacted the Far Eastern Bureau of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) to see if Voice of America could make a plea behind the Bamboo Curtain to learn of Ting's whereabouts. This was, of course, turned down, and all other attempts by Mr. Cutler proved equally fruitless.

Mr. Cutler had to establish that Edward E. Ting was an American citizen, first, then he had to arrange many other papers if Ting were to ever return to the United States. And proving Mr. Ting was a citizen was a chore in itself.

Disheartening reply

Sure, it was just a matter of acquiring a birth certificate from San Francisco's City Hall. But when Mr. Cutler wrote there, he received this disheartening reply:

"This is to certify that all birth records of the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, prior to July 1, 1905, were destroyed as the result of a general conflagration on April 18, 19 and 20, 1906; therefore, this office is unable to furnish a copy of the birth record of any person who was born in this city prior to the above mentioned date."

Success achieved

Not to be dismayed, Sam Cutler was fortunate in securing records of grammar school attendance in San Francisco, along with diplomas from Tech High, Norwich and Columbia. At long last, the passport division of the U.S. State Department was ready to admit that Edward E. Ting was an American citizen.

Largely through the efforts of U.S. Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND, this paperwork was handled. Boland, according to Cutler, was a vital link in clearing the way for Mr. Ting's arrival in the United States. "Congressman BOLAND and his office have been of immeasurable help in bringing Eddie back home," Mr. Cutler said. "These efforts in clearing the redtape of Washington officialdom were extremely helpful."

Congressman elated

Congressman BOLAND and his office, obviously elated at Ting's arrival in the United States, commended both Mr. Ting for his repeated and dogged attempts to flee Communist tyranny and Mr. Cutler's unflinching determination to clear the way for Ting's reentry.

Said Congressman BOLAND: "I am highly pleased that Mr. Ting has returned to freedom. He endured untold torment and hardship at the hands of the Communist rulers in China for the past 13 years, and I welcome him back to his native land.

"This office was only too glad to do what it could to help secure the release of this brave man from the bondage and suffering of communism. The role we played was indeed difficult, and at times, the efforts to free Mr. Ting seemed hopeless. We are glad, however, that these efforts have been rewarded by the return of Mr. Ting to Springfield.

"I want to congratulate and commend Samuel Cutler for his persistent and undiminishing fight for Mr. Ting's cause. Without the inspired determination of this Springfield man, Mr. Ting might still be in bondage in Red China. I look forward to meeting Mr. Ting in the near future."

Actually Congressman BOLAND and his staff had little documentary evidence with which to work. But painstaking research of State Department files resulted in proving Mr. Ting an American citizen.

Congressman BOLAND was instrumental in arranging an interview for Mr. Cutler with the American legation in Hong Kong in 1960, and played a really vital role in asking the Portuguese Government in Macao to hold Mr. Ting until he could travel to Hong Kong for his return to the United States.

Went to Orient

After Congressman BOLAND had supplied the passport division of the State Department with the documents which proved Ting

an American citizen, Mr. Cutler and his wife, Sarah, took a tour to the Orient 2 years ago. On that trip, the couple visited Eddie's brother, Sui Jun, in Hong Kong. There, they found all the letters Sam had written Eddie in care of his brother, which couldn't be sent to him because of Communist postal ban.

Mr. Cutler visited the U.S. legation in Hong Kong and learned that all the paperwork was in readiness for Mr. Ting's coming to the United States. "All you need is a body and we'll send him home," the consulate told Mr. Cutler.

Going to Macao, Mr. Cutler visited a Portuguese missionary, Rev. Benjamin Pires, S.J., a Catholic priest. Mr. Cutler left with Father Pires documents necessary to prove to Macao authorities that Eddie was an American citizen. This evidence was required in order for Ting to get a visa to leave Macao for Hong Kong.

"It was worth it"

Two years have passed since Mr. and Mrs. Cutler returned home, and since then prayers and determination have succeeded in Eddie Ting once again returning to Springfield and his dear friend, Sam Cutler. Mr. Cutler not only spent years of effort in effecting Ting's return, but the enormous expenses were underwritten entirely by the Springfield man.

"It was worth it," the Tech High teacher said, passing off his role in this triumph. "Eddie's like a brother to me, and it's great to have him with us again."

LIFE UNDER REDS

Mr. Ting related many incidents about Communist life which are particularly informative, and rare, inasmuch as they are firsthand reports.

For instance, the standard of living—which Ting says is at the starvation point.

Inflation struck

"When the Communists took over, I was making the equivalent of $40 American a month. This was a good average wage, and I lived in comfort. Just before the Reds took over, the bottom fell out of the economy because the people knew that the Nationalist Government was about to fall. Inflation struck suddenly. It cost $20,000 for a pound of pork, $50,000 for an airmail stamp.

"Then communism set in. My salary, once $40, became 50 cents a month. Food was rationed. All private property was taken by the government. Propaganda became rampart."

Meager allowances

"Now, rationing is such that one person gets 20 pounds of rice, 2 ounces of fresh fish, and one-half pound of salted fish per month. I had meat for the first time in 5 years on Chinese New Year's in January. When the Reds first took over we could purchase 30 feet of cloth per year, now the allotment per person is 1½ feet per year, not even enough for patching clothing.

"They have kangaroo courts in China now," Mr. Ting said. "Workers report on their fellows and charges are trumped up against innocent people. I was grilled for 3 weeks for owning two goats which I tended after completing work. I was told I was a capitalist because I didn't share the milk with the people.

"As soon as the Communists took over, the working day went up from 8 to 10 to 16 to 20 hours for 7 days a week. They tell us there is an 8-hour workday in China, but it's a lie. Quotas are established for each job. In the electrical machine shop where I worked, I had to turn out 300 pieces a day. This was considered 8 hours' work. But it took me double that and more."

People are unhappy

"And there are compulsory indoctrination meetings for every worker. Schoolchildren are fed Communist propaganda.

"The people are very unhappy. They are starving. They are forced to work, yet they don't yield the benefits of hard work. The Communist incentive system is the only reward for a community. That is, if a given community's industry or farms turn out high production, then a Communist movie is sent for the people to see. These are the only movies they see."

Mr. Ting added, "Propaganda is such that it turns your stomach. One day, just to give you an example, I was walking by a school and I heard children singing 'Yankee Doodle' to Chinese words. I asked a young man in the yard about the song and he said, "That's the newest song from Russia. Our teacher, who just came from a Peiping school [Red indoctrination center for teachers] taught it to us.' "

Great leap failing

Asked about the Chinese Communists 5-year plan, the great leap forward, Mr. Ting said it is failing miserably. "It has gone from bad to worse, especially this year, when the government had to take people out of industry to bolster failing farm production."

Mr. Ting reported that China is producing only the crudest of machinery, and now that Soviet technical aid has been withdrawn, little advance is being made.

Mr. Ting said it was rumored earlier this year in China that Russia had demanded payment for arms given China to fight the Korean war. And when China refused, the Soviet Government withdrew its technical experts, taking with them even the blueprints for factories which had been planned.

Story differs

Of course, the West learned that Soviet aid was withdrawn because of an ideological rift between Premier Khrushchev and the sterner, pro-Stalinist Chinese line.

The opposition of the oppressed Chinese people stands out behind the Bamboo Curtain today, Mr. Ting says. Communism has proved itself as an unsuccessful government, and fear of death alone keeps the people from rebelling against this gigantic tyranny.

BACK HOME AGAIN

Mr. Ting, who is amazingly articulate despite not having used the English language for over 15 years, looks young for his 61 years. His hair has only tinges of gray and he stands erect.

He is overjoyed to be back in Springfield, and is literally amazed at the progress which has taken place in this country. "I feel like Rip Van Winkle. Television, big supermarkets, and department stores—these things I had never heard of. And automobiles—well, the Model T was all I ever knew."

Amusing incident

An amusing incident took place when Mr. Ting first arrived in Springfield. Mr. Cutler gave his friend five or six clip-on bow ties to wear along with other clothing. Mr. Ting said: "You know, I spent over a half hour trying to figure out how to put that tie on my shirt. Can you imagine that? And I'm an engineer—supposedly."

He has toured Springfield to some extent since coming "home," and recalled many landmarks in the city he left years ago. What particularly caught his eye, however, was the bust of Andrew Carnegie in City Library, a place where Mr. Ting spent many hours as a student in his high school days. Also, the statue of Deacon Chapin outside the library was a landmark he recalled.

SEEKS INTELLIGENCE WORK

Mr. Ting hopes to land a position in the United States in which he can put his vast experience in China to use. He is among the very few, if any, who have firsthand knowledge of modern-day China who are both well educated and English speaking. He thinks he could be especially helpful in intelligence work.

He hopes to meet with Congressman BOLAND to discuss these opportunities, and further, "to meet another fine American gentleman who was instrumental in making it possible for me to return to my beloved homeland, Mr. BOLAND."

Mr. Ting fondly recalls many of his high school and college classmates and would like to meet and talk with people who attended Tech or Norwich during his schoolboy years. Those who meet with Eddie Ting won't be disappointed. For Edward E. Ting is a fascinating man whose past has been strewn with heartbreak and misfortune—but, most of all, he is a courageous man—whose dedication to freedom and to humanity has few parallels.

A Parkersburg, W. Va., High School Exchange Student Visits the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the student exchange program is every day providing lasting benefits in strengthening the bonds among nations and their peoples. It is heartening to note the experiences and reactions of Miss Louise Callahan, a Parkersburg, W. Va., high school senior, as contained in the following articles from the Parkersburg Sentinel:

[From the Parkersburg Sentinel, July 26, 1962]

LOUISE CALLAHAN WRITES OF LIFE IN PHILIPPINES

Louise Callahan, Parkersburg's first Americans-abroad exchange student has written to her parents, Reverend and Mrs. Griffin Callahan since she arrived in the Philippines and given most interesting accounts of her trip and her arrival.

The following letter, written after she had been there a while, gives a vivid account of her activities.

Louise is typical of the teenage exchange students who become ambassadors of good will wherever they go, and her amazing comprehension and acceptance of people who live in a different environment is well expressed. Not many people, young, or old, can tell of personally embarrassing events with such sincere acceptance that the world really won't come to an end—and immediately puts the events in the background, with the proper consideration, to make way for the next adventure.

"I have been gone nearly a month now. You know, I think of you every other minute but by the time I write everything in my little black book, it is almost torture to take pen in hand—poor excuse, but if our thoughts are of each other then I think we communicate anyway. You must be praying for me because God is always with me. Right now I am in Filipino class (national language.) Needless to say it is one of those that is impossible to participate in. But I do get something out of the first year class—oh! Those kids are so little. You know 'Bing' is only in the fourth grade but she is bigger than the freshmen here at the high school.

You are still in the middle of continual activity and it's the same here. I rise at 6 a.m. on weekends and 5:30 a.m. on school days and my schedule is down to the last hour—especially weekends. I have met several Americans and they have all been different types—the Air Force captain and other Air Force personnel with their young wives.

Then there was a girl from Detroit married to a Filipino in the Air Force who at present is away from her. She has been living here alone for a year and is so lonely for home that to see me brought tears to her eyes. My heart went out to her because when we visited, she hadn't received a letter from home in 3 weeks. But enough of that—there are so many new experiences and new people and Filipino friends—if I get started I can't stop.

I have spoken on two radio programs and one was in celebration of the first Philippine-American Friendship Day—nothing like being historical. It was really an inspiring program and we sang national songs from both countries and I gave a speech and the Air Force captain gave a speech and a Catholic priest and the Governor and the superintendent of schools. I was going to send you my speech but the press (h-mmmm) wanted it—yet, they haven't printed it. We have had surprising good weather so far, but the rains are starting. Anyway, it has made it possible to make outings and although I haven't been swimming yet, I have seen the beautiful ocean twice. Once I went with the foster family of Janet Lake, the first AFS (American field service) here. It was a very successful visit. They love her so she must have been a wonderful ambassador (from Colorado).

I've seen ricefields, carabaois, cornfields, birthdays, funerals, weddings, and one of our neighbors has asked that I be a sponsor at her child's Baptism Buddy. The queen of the May. Everything is new and everything is exciting. I've spoken at Rotary—where discussions got pretty serious—especially on segregation, but I think that it was constructive. I've been to two elementary schools and although it doesn't make too much sense to them when I speak, we become great friends.

I eat about 20 pounds of food a day and it's beginning to show. My hair is really mangy now—but Dahlia's hair is similar to mine—people are always saying we look alike—she's an inch or two shorter than I—we have a great time and it is very often that you will see us doing some kind of comedy act, attracting great crowds—she was elected president of senior class and I was her campaign manager—oh, those memories—but this time victorious. She was also elected president of senior Scout council, which proves she's a high-minded kid, anyway. I've had my little speech at the Girl Scouts and you can imagine how choice that was. Too bad they got such an inferior member of GSA. They gave me a pin and a patch which says 'Ilocos Norte." Next Saturday we are going on a Girl Scout cook-out.

(Later.)

Last Sunday I was supposed to visit the Independent Church—mass at 6:30 a.m. Well—and I almost don't have the nerve to write this—I overslept—they waited mass 15 minutes and they announced my name and oh they had prepared for me. Geeee. Talk about being small. So today after school, Mamma Sagisi and Dellie and Bing and I paid a visit to Bishop Yoro and we were lucky that he and his wife were at home. They have seven children and only one girl. Their oldest son is 23 and all his children are successful scholars—Sadiri is in my class at the high school.

They are very poor in money but that's all. I am tempted to wait till I get a picture before I tell you his age, but it is hard to wait. He is 62 years but looks about 49. And they have good teeth and warm smiles. While we were there he just kept saying "We are one" and "we all believe in the same God and we are one church." No wonder he is youthful. Oh Dad, you would like him very much, I think. He also stressed how wonderful it was to be married and I assured him he had a family to be proud of. They live very humbly. He was supposed to go to Canada to visit or study but he couldn't get the money. Then he was going to go to Switzerland but from his pocket money he sent his boys to college so was not able to go. But he won't die soon.

The skies are more beautiful than "South Pacific" which we saw last week at the movies. I am so glad that you are seeing the A.F.S. people. Please tell them when I write you—there goes the torture of writing letters again. Will you give the local chapter my very best and tell them that they couldn't have given me anything greater than this. It is a privileged dream coming true. I got the letters from Lissa and Christine and they were very good. You know I have so, so much to tell you about but I don't think this letter should be postponed anymore. But before closing I'll add that school is school wherever it may be and the same with world history."

[From the Parkersburg Sentinel, Aug. 7, 1962]

LOUISE CALLAHAN HAS WONDERFUL EXPERIENCE

(By Ruth Morgan)

There are many places in the United States which are unaware of the existence of West Virginia—and of Parkersburg, but we venture to say that Laoag, Province of Ilocos Norte, Philippines, knows all about it.

Letters from Louise Callahan, Parkersburg's first student to live abroad under the American field service program of scholarships for Americans abroad, certainly tell vividly the value of the exchange student program.

There is no better way for the people of the many nations of the world, both old and new, to learn of others than by sending these carefully selected students to live with ordinary families, participating in the events of everyday living as an average citizen.

Here is another letter:

(Letter from Louise Callahan, American field service student to Philippines, July 17, 1962, to her parents, the Reverend and Mrs. Griffin C. Callahan, Parkersburg, W. Va.)

"MY DEAR, DEAR PARENTS: I feel that I haven't been fair to you with my few and far between letters, so I am just taking this time to write before going to bed. Tomorrow is Bing's birthday and I will give her the 'Etch-a-sketch' game. You know what Dahlia really wants—sheet music for piano—especially from 'Oklahoma' and other musicals. Her birthday is the 30th. Maybe you could send some for her? It's just an idea, but it would be perfect.

"You know there is so much news that I'm afraid to begin. * * * went to the 10th anniversary of the Bureau of Agricultural extension today. It deals with 4-H Clubs and I liked that, too. Mr. Saguiguit the foster father of Dial Barnwell, the last AFS'er, is very important with the program and afterwards he took me to his home for lunch. They have eight kids—two girls in college, and six boys ranging from 14–2 years and their family is really nice. There was another American at the meeting, a Dr. Thomas from California. He is doing research this summer for a book about agriculture and environment in Ilocos Norte.

"So far I have been to many parties with the kids, but this last weekend was my favorite. On Friday we went bowling and pingponging at the YMCA and the boys paid the girls way and bought refreshments. It was great.

"Then on Saturday I went to my first 'jam session' which was given by the boys in one of their huge, big Spanish-type houses. It turned out to be a twist party and I went insane and had a blast. Maybe a little too uninhibited for the rest of the crowd. Dahlia refuses to dance but she knows how and it makes me unhappy. She is really good, but too self-conscious I guess.

"I think I will help put on a dramatic production with this club here. Miss Ligot, the adviser, has chosen a choral speaking play which deals with patriotism in United States for World War II. I suggested that we try to rewrite it cause it's a little out of date, etc. So maybe that will be something good. I am learning native dances painfully because of uncoordination.

"Saw first Filipino film yesterday—'El Filibusterismo' based on the book by Jose Rizal. It was so tragic that if it had been in English I could not have stood it. Am reading book now. As result of four centuries under Spain, all literature and songs have been sad up until now.

"Tomorrow an interview on radio and next day speak before student body. Every minute is filled with something new, but it's a month today I've been gone and time has really flown by. Love to all and AFS representatives. We all send our very best."

[From the Parkersburg Sentinel, Aug. 8, 1962]

MISS CALLAHAN GIVES SPEECH

(Louise's note to her parents concerning speech: "This is the only written speech and this is only written so I wouldn't clod up on the radio. Sort of hasty, but an idea of my P.R. and I really mean every word of it. Am also sending one of the pictures—when I was giving this little gem. My foster mom is the head right in front of me.")

Speech follows:

"It is a great privilege to have this opportunity to represent my country, in your country on the first Philippine-American Friendship Day. But even more so because my stay will be extended for 2 months, in hopes of making Philippine-American friendship a lasting thing. This exchange of students from the Philippines to America and from the United States to the Philippines is made possible by the American Field Service, which is one of the projects of the American people to promote better understanding and communication in the world.

"The American field service was originally begun by a group of ambulance drivers in France after World War II. In an effort to work toward peace, through the exchange and exploration of ideas, students were brought to the United States from other countries to study. Later this expanded in the Americans Abroad program, sending U.S. students to study in other countries.

"At first these students were on a college level, but high school students proved more susceptible to new ideas, so that now the exchange sends students in the summer of their junior years in high school. Students from other countries study the whole year in the United States, but the yearly program is just now being introduced for American students abroad.

"I was fortunate enough to be among the 31 students coming to the Philippines; to a country which is a true friend to the United States yet one full of new customs, new ideas, and exciting discoveries in a different culture. Nearly everything is a different experience, resulting in a richer and fuller visit. For the exchange student learns firsthand by living with a family and experiencing their everyday way of life, and by attending school with classmates his own age.

"I am sure that when I return to America, I will have stories and experiences to tell for the rest of my life, and lasting friendships. The American field service is only one of the outward signs being made to maintain and strengthen the ties that bind the United States and the Philippines together. I am only glad that I, too, could be a part of that outward sign."

Rev. and Mrs. Griffin C. Callahan, 1316 Market Street, have reason to be proud of their daughter, Louise, an American field service student in the Philippines.

She has been officially adopted as a daughter of the town in which she is living, and

of the Province in which the town is located.

Louise is the first student to be so honored, and a copy of the resolution was sent by the Philippine officials to the family here in Parkersburg. Copies also were sent to the New York and Philippine offices of the American field service.

Another Parkersburg resident who has reason to be proud of the action is Julius "Jay" Stern, who, as president of the Wood County Bank, provided the AFS scholarship for Louise to spend 2 months in the Philippines this summer. Stern, well known for his interest in the progress and development of the mid-Ohio Valley, has now added to international understanding through the impression Louise is making at her "home away from home."

The resolution concerning Louise's adoption follows:

"Whereas Miss Louise Callahan, charming young blonde of 1316 Market Street, Parkersburg, W. Va., U.S.A., was one of the lucky recipients of the American field service international scholarship summer program and was assigned as Laoag, Ilocos Norte, Philippines, as her home away from home;

"Whereas it is hoped that during her short stay in our municipality, Miss Callahan will actively acquaint herself with our local customs and traditions and share the bounty of our place and the hospitality of our people;

"Whereas the presence of Miss Callahan in our midst is a constructive manifestation of a mutual and intimate understanding and good will between the people of the Philippines and the people of the United States of America;

"On motion by Councilor, Dr. Francisco Ranada and duly seconded by Councilor, Attorney Mariano H. Rabageo, it was—

"Resolved, as it is hereby resolved by the Municipal Council of Laoag in its regular session duly assembled, That on this 16th day of July 1962, Miss Louise Callahan be an adopted daughter of the municipality of Laoag, Province of Ilocos Norte, Philippines;

"Resolved finally, To direct the secretary to deliver a copy of this resolution to Miss Louise Callahan, Panganiban Street, Laoag, Ilocos Norte, Philippines and to send copies to the Reverend and Mrs. Griffin Callahan, Parkersburg, W. Va., U.S.A.; to the American Field Service, New York, 313 East 43d Street, New York 17, U.S.A.; and to the American Field Service of the Philippines, 707–708 Valson Building, Intramuros, Manila, Philippines.

"Carried.

"FLORENDO B. MARTIN.,
"Municipal Secretary."

[From the Parkersburg Sentinel, Aug. 9, 1962]

MISS CALLAHAN ENJOYS LIFE IN PHILIPPINES

(By Ruth Morgan)

Will the letters which the girl from Brazil and the boy from France, American field service students to attend PHS next winter, write to their homes be as enthusiastic about our community as those which Louise Callahan has written from her Philippine home? We wonder.

Is Parkersburg, as a thriving small industrial city, doing all it can to promote international understanding when the opportunity comes to their midst as this will? We wonder.

Ariane A. Cavalcante, of Brazil, will live with the family of Dr. Charles F. Whitaker next winter, and attend PHS as a senior student, as will Gerard Taveau of France, who will live with the Wade W. Trout family.

The Parkersburg-Vienna American Field Service Chapter is requesting the assistance of area industries, organizations, and individuals in making their stay as interesting and educational and as welcoming as Louise has found her life to be in the Philippines.

Here is another letter telling of the life of a typical American high school student who is living with a Philippine family and her exuberant reaction to learning the "hows" and "whys" of their way of living, not critically, but in a way which will prepare her for better understanding of the world problems when the time arrives for her active participation arrives.

"JULY 23.

"DEAR DADDY: Do doubt you must be worried when there is no correspondence from this end. You also know how the Sagisis must have felt last spring. Your big fat letter really did come unharmed and was really appreciated by this family."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Newspaper clippings about Louise and her trip.)

"You know they did a lot before my arrival, and I have made so many wonderful friends that it is really hard to beat. Last night it hit me where I was, but I could not think about it too long for some reason—it was just so thrilling my lil ole nervous system could not stand it.

"You mean the daughter of G.C.C.? Really in the Philippines? That average immature, uninterested in scholastic achievement or higher education, or any education for that matter, Callahan? An AFS scholar?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Louise is too modest, for she is a fine scholar and makes excellent grades.)

"Well, naturally I don't study a bit and gradewise it's really bad, but I'm learning a lot and making terrific good friends and that's what counts. By the way, and one reason I don't knock myself out in schools, is that 'memory work' is the educational system, in a word. They have to memorize all that is dictated in class and say it back in the exact words. Buddy, I'm lucky to understand it. Oh, well, enough of school, for which I will be thoroughly ruined for next year.

"This is the fifth day of the actual rainy season 'cause it's been raining a week straight and we've also had a typhoon with winds up to 160 miles per hour. How exciting—and I've enjoyed every minute of it. Of course, I know now that I should have brought more sweaters and warmer clothes. It really gets a little chilly and I think of you sweltering wid de heat. * * *

"Activities go on as usual even though the streets are flooded. We go wading and waltzing in the rain quite gleefully and I really love it. Saturday we took a bath and washed our hair in the rain and in spite of the typhoon, we went to two parties, one of which really jammed.

"I'll have to send a box home early with all the beautiful things I have so far. My native costumes are indescribably beautiful and it is all really more than I deserve. You probably know by now that I am an adopted daughter of Laoag and the first scholar to be adopted by Ilocos Norte, the Province. When awarded these fantabulous things, I was assured that these things weren't had for the asking and it made me feel pretty good. And pretty unworthy, too.

"No one has given me any 'Yankee, go home' treatment, but sometimes when we are walking down the street people yell 'pura' meaning 'white.' It's the only time I feel different.

"In fact, I hope I don't take things for granted too much, just cause I feel so much at home.

"This letter may be long in reaching you cause every place else has flooded out except here and the rain is still coming down. Lazy weather, you bet, and if we didn't have school we'd simply eat and sleep.

"Really like my family and my foster dad. It is so wonderful to have two good fathers—you can't be beat, though. He is getting me a native hat for Griffin and if he doesn't appreciate it (Like I know he will) I'll keep it, cause it is really tough. Made out of half a big squash and used for rain hat.

"Marion must be growing up too. I have a lot of Girl Scout things for her. Everyone says she is beautiful. You know, like me—Ha. You know what Pop Sagisi said? 'You aren't as beautiful as your sisters.' Then he asked why.

"When the boys (they sometimes come to visit en masse for protection) saw Lissa's picture they were really snowed. She must be having a wonderful summer—I can't help thinking we're about the luckiest family in the world.

"Love to all my family and to anyone who asks about my trip."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Kansas Fourth District Opinion Poll Tabulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, tabulations in my second annual opinion poll of the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas have been completed. Like many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, I have found this sampling of constituent opinion most worth while. It has been especially gratifying to me to note the interest in government which exists in my district.

I believe this yearly questionnaire provides many citizens, who ordinarily might not take the time to write their Congressman, with an opportunity to express their personal views on the important issues of our day.

Many of my constituents included interesting additional comments with their votes in the opinion poll. The two polls which I have taken since coming to Congress have been most helpful to me in my approach to the legislative problems before the 87th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express appreciation to all those who took the time to participate in the 1962 opinion poll of the Kansas Fourth District, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the final tabulations recorded from the questionnaires:

KANSAS FOURTH DISTRICT 1962 OPINION POLL RESULTS

The matter of medical care for the aged is receiving increased attention. Please indicate the system you would favor:

(a) Coverage extended to those within the social security system, and financed by an increase in social security taxes, 24.45 percent.

(b) Federal grants to States, each State to administer the program on the basis of need, 5.28 percent.

(c) Voluntary health insurance for everyone over 65, with Federal assistance where the individual is unable to pay premium, 39.83 percent.

(d) No Federal program in this field, 25.66 percent.

1. Do you favor establishment of a Cabinet post of Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing in the administration? Yes, 33.44 percent; no, 60.90 percent; no answer, 5.66 percent.

2. Do you believe the Congress should grant the President new authority to increase or decrease taxes? Yes, 13.63 percent; no, 82.56 percent; no answer, 3.81 percent.

3. Do you favor the administration's proposals to reduce farm surpluses through stricter controls and marketing quotas? Yes, 29.20 percent; no, 63.39 percent; no answer, 7.11 percent.

4. Do you believe the Federal Government should institute a nationwide fallout shelter program? Yes, 19.95 percent; no, 76.22 percent; no answer, 3.83 percent.

5. Do you believe the Federal Government should expand its responsibilities in education? Yes, 41.45 percent; no, 54.14 percent; no answer, 4.41 percent. If answer is "Yes": (a) Do you favor Federal aid for school construction? Yes, 33.90 percent; no, 6.72 percent; no answer, 0.83 percent. (b) Do you favor Federal aid for teachers' salaries? Yes, 22.25 percent; no, 17.81 percent; no answer, 1.39 percent.

6. Do you favor establishment of a Federal Youth Conservation Corps to offer training in conservation projects or on-the-job vocations? Yes, 52.81 percent; no, 40.29 percent; no answer, 6.90 percent.

7. Do you favor the purchase by the United States of $100 million in United Nations bonds to help the U.N. overcome a deficit caused by special operations? Yes, 38.64 percent; no, 55.65 percent; no answer, 5.71 percent.

8. Do you believe Congress should approve legislation extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and granting the President new authority to reduce tariffs? Yes, 47.67 percent; no, 41.47 percent; no answer, 10.86 percent.

9. Do you favor continuation of present U.S. programs of foreign aid? Yes, 38.16 percent; no, 51.37 percent; no answer, 10.47 percent.

10. Do you believe that U.S. military and economic assistance should be given to Communist nations outside the Soviet orbit, such as Yugoslavia? Yes, 19.85 percent; no, 72.96 percent; no answer, 7.19 percent.

11. Do you believe the United States should provide assistance to the Latin American Republics through a long-term Alliance for Progress fund? Yes, 61.92 percent; no, 27.69 percent; no answer 10.39 percent.

Education: Big and Still Growing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, schooldays are back again. Across the Nation, students at all levels of curricular study are trooping back to our educational institutions.

In Congress, there is still pending legislation relating to further improvement and expansion of our educational system.

Recently, the Wisconsin State Journal published a thoughtful editorial on the educational outlook in Wisconsin. The article deals with problems and progress, not only in my home State, but elsewhere in the Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Sept. 10, 1962]

EDUCATION: BIG AND STILL GROWING

Looking back at a first-day-of-school editorial of only 5 years ago, we learned that in 1957 the Madison public schools expected some 16,000 youngsters to begin classes.

The estimated enrollment for the 1962 school year which opens today is some 27,500 boys and girls.

That enrollment jump in only 5 years—along with rapidly rising enrollments at the University of Wisconsin and the State colleges—is the clue to one of the biggest stories of this decade and the next. Only the kind of words used on a Hollywood spectacular seem to fit what is happening to education these days.

This year in Wisconsin, more than a million pupils will be in school from kindergarten through the 12th grade, about 775,000 in the public schools. There will be more than 31,000 teachers, and literally hundreds of new schools. The enrollment boom is so huge, in fact, that it is estimated about half of all the pupils starting school in Wisconsin this month will use classrooms built since 1950.

But size is not the only significant feature of the schools in 1962.

Courses are tougher, particularly in high school. Standards are higher, with special emphasis on more work and new challenges for the brighter pupils.

And the pace certainly will get faster at the high school and college levels from the pressure of the times and the burgeoning of new knowledge.

This month brings a change of pace for the younger set, back to books and classrooms after a 3-month layoff. It must mean a change of pace, too, for motorists, whether on city street or open highway.

Those school zone signs in every part of Madison will mean a sharp revision in driving habits for many accustomed to scooting by vacant buildings all summer. The limit is 15 miles per hour when children are present, and motorists can expect it to be enforced.

On other streets and highways, watch out for those big yellow schoolbuses. Watch for the flashing lights when the bus is stopped, and remember the Wisconsin law requires a full stop while the lights are flashing.

There was the feel of fall in the air most of last week. Now that school is "in," we know that it doesn't just seem like fall; it really is.

Republican Party of the Sixties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Raymond Moley, noted author,

columnist, and political observer, has offered in the September 10 issue of Newsweek an analysis of the Republican talents and activities in the House of Representatives. Speaking for the Republicans in this body I wish first to thank Mr. Moley for his very kind remarks. Next I wish to urge my colleagues on this side of the aisle to continue to live up to the standard which Mr. Moley has set for us. This is a demanding task, but if Mr. Moley is correct in his evaluation of our talents, and I believe he is, we can meet the challenge it poses. Finally I call upon my colleagues and friends in the Democratic Party to join with us on the Republican side in assuring that there is meaningful and sincere debate on the issues which divide us, that a record of honest controversy is made, first to help us reach the important decisions that face us and second to give those whom we represent and those who will follow us an understanding of precisely what we have worked to accomplish in this Chamber.

Mr. Moley's column, "The GOP's Young Men," follows:

PERSPECTIVE: THE GOP'S YOUNG MEN

(By Raymond Moley)

I wonder if you have noticed that there are fewer and fewer references these days to the GOP "Old Guard"? This is because it is now difficult to make people believe that the Republican Party is a worm-eaten antique when so many of its active and most influential leaders have not reached threescore. This accent on youth is especially notable in the House of Representatives, the port of entry and training ground for party leadership. Witness Messrs. Kennedy and Nixon, who entered that Chamber in 1947 at the ages of 29 and 34 respectively.

This predominance of youth was brought home to me forcefully when I was the guest speaker at the breakfast meetings of two groups of Republican House Members this summer. One, called the 87th Club, is composed of Members elected in 1960. The other, called the SOS Club, is made up of Members elected in the 1950's. The 50 Members of these groups alone have an average age in the middle forties. Some of them are in their thirties.

The younger Republican Members of the House have a remarkable habit of working together. They meet together and develop joint policies on legislation. They specialize. One will concentrate on military affairs, another on the budget, another on taxes, still others on welfare policies, foreign trade, international affairs, etc. They issue interesting and informative policy papers which collectively could constitute a party platform, strong in specifics and marked by constructive alternatives to the policies of the administration and the Democratic leadership.

DOING THEIR HOMEWORK

An examination of these papers, together with the speeches of their authors on the floor, shows that they are not mere criticism of the Democratic opposition. These Members have viable and attractive plans for meeting public problems. They are preparing the way for the time when the country will entrust leadership to a majority of their own party.

Their letters to their constituents, generally issued weekly, and which I receive in considerable numbers, are meaty and highly informative.

In short, these men are doing their homework well. And also they are quite aware of political realities, which means that in forthcoming elections they will be hard to beat.

In their voting record on vital issues, under the leadership of the sage and experienced Minority Leader CHARLES HALLECK, they have shown remarkable cohesion.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD mirrors this new intellectual vigor. Time was when the House section of that daily parliamentary journal deserved little more than a glance from its constant readers. It was full of routine affairs. The real business of the House was carried on in committees. Now, however, there are meaningful debates and speeches which inform and impress their hearers and readers. Democratic sponsors of administration measures are compelled by searching questions to come to the nub of things.

THE PARTY'S FUTURE

This improvement in the quality of the House is the more notable because of the quite apparent decline in the character and quality of Senate proceedings. There, the RECORD is marred by the effusions of demagogs and windbags. A close reader of the RECORD said recently that "the House RECORD used to be the throwaway. Now it is the Senate part."

Capable Republican Congressmen are scattered among the major committees of the House. In some cases they work well with the veteran Democratic chairmen. When they disagree with the majority, their minority reports are well worth reading.

The future of the Republican Party is there among the younger Members of the House. There is the reserve from which will come the Senators and Governors—maybe Presidents—of the future. These young men are the assurance that the policies of the Republican Party will be neither a limp imitation of the liberalism of the Democrats nor mere opposition and criticism. Such policies will generate public support because they will be the assurance of progress through the framework of tested principles—progress that is "never wholly new * * * never wholly obsolete."

The U.S. Supreme Court's Ruling in the New York School Prayer Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the August 10, 1962, issue of the Intelligencer, of Wheeling, W. Va., carries a provocative letter to the editor which is worth reading. The letter is by Lena M. Worthington, of Wheeling, and it deals with the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision on the recitation of a simple nonsectarian prayer in public schools. The editor of the Intelligencer featured the letter on page 10, not only because of space limitations in the usual section of the newspaper devoted to such letters, but because he rightly considered that the writer was making an important contribution to the current controversy engendered by the Court's decision in the New York school prayer case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Lena M. Worthington's letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO THE EDITOR—PRAYER RULING: THE SUPREME COURT HAS OVERSTEPPED LIMITS OF POWER

EDITOR, THE INTELLIGENCER:

A cry of protest went up all over the Nation when the U.S. Supreme Court recently ruled that it was illegal for New York State students to recite a simple, nonsectarian prayer.

Some people argued there should be a new constitutional amendment, to guard against what they called abuse of the judicial power. Your able columnist, Holmes Alexander, was one of these.

Actually, the fault of the Supreme Court in this case is not in their decision, which many people approved, but in the fact they took jurisdiction, when the Constitution so clearly states they had no right to consider the issue at all.

This may amaze many citizens, who are otherwise well informed about government, but careful reading of the Constitution will show the truth of the claim.

Amendment 1 of the Constitution reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech; or of the press; or of the rights of the people peacefully to assembly, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

It will be noted that the Constitution does not forbid the States to have an established religion. Actually, two States had established churches at the time the Constitution was adopted. It is quite probable that these States would never have ratified the Constitution, had they felt the Federal Government, or the Supreme Court, would undertake to limit their power over their own churches and choice of worship.

This will surprise many people. But any good history of the era will confirm the statement. The authoritative "Foundations of American Nationality," for instance, by the noted historian, E. B. Greene, in chapter 25 says: "Complete separation of church and state did not come either in Massachusetts or Connecticut until the 19th century." And in Virginia, a bill relieving citizens from the legal duty to support an established church by their taxes was not passed until 1785.

The illegal prayer case recalls numerous other instances where the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled against the collective conscience of American citizens, and—in the estimation of many thoughtful people—has hurt the Nation.

Practically every Communist who has come before the Supreme Court in recent years has been turned free. The State courts have in effect been denied the right to try cases of treason. So treason flourishes.

Patriotic organizations of attorneys have expressed incredulous amazement at some of the Supreme Court decisions, which have overturned the best legal thinking for more than a century, and have spread turmoil and discord over the Nation.

While there can be little doubt that effective steps must be taken, if the Nation is to protect itself from enemies within and without, there is a quicker and easier way than to ask for a constitutional amendment, which could take years before it is adopted.

This method is fully and clearly set forth in the Constitution, which recognizes that for every wrong there should be a reasonable and quick remedy. The Founding Fathers recognized that the Nation might be threatened by tyranny of the courts.

Article 1, section 1 says: "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time

ordain and establish. The judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office."

Section 2 says: "The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority; to all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdictions; to controversies to which the United States shall be a party; to controversies between two or more States; between a State and citizens of another State; between citizens of different States; between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States; and between a State, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens, or subjects."

"In all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and facts, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

In other words, the Congress has the power to decree that only cases affecting Ambassadors, and those cases affecting a State, may come before the Supreme Court.

If there were no limits to the power of the Supreme Court then its members could claim more and more power until both the President and the Congress became figureheads, without real authority.

Many of the most substantial and respected Members of the Senate and House have complained that the Supreme Court has legislated in its more recent decisions.

Let me explain. If the Congress passes a law meaning one thing, and the Supreme Court, using some plausible excuse, says the law means something different than it originally did, then the Supreme Court has, in effect, passed a new law. This is legislating.

But the Constitution, under article 1, section 1, clearly says: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

When the Supreme Court so twists the Constitution or the law, to compel Americans to do things which the Congress has never decreed, the Supreme Court is violating the first article and section of the Constitution they are sworn to uphold.

This suggests the question: Can a simple and easily understood bill be written, to restrict the power of the Supreme Court, in the hope of saving American liberties from the unreasoning caprice of the group which Franklin D. Roosevelt attacked as "nine old men?"

People with more knowledge and experience in Government than myself can doubtless suggest many improvements, but to get the ball rolling, I suggest the following measure:

"The Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction in cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls, and those in which a State shall be a party, as provided by article III, sections 1 and 2 of the Constitution.

"The Supreme Court, from this time on, until and unless this law is changed by the Congress, shall have no appellate jurisdiction over any decision made by any District Federal Court, a diversity of legal opinions, to conform with the conscience and custom of the people in the various States, being both morally right and desirable.

"All Federal Courts are denied jurisdiction in any case or opinion founded only on such vague and controversial ideologies and concepts as "the general welfare," unless such purpose of prior decision is legally sanctioned by legislation enacted by the Congress of the United States. All Federal Courts are specifically forbidden to exercise jurisdiction to deny the rights of either individuals or States, as provided in amendment IX to the Constitution, which states: 'The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people' and amendment X, which states: 'the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited to it by the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.'

"When offenses, treason being one of many possible examples, are forbidden both by Federal and State statutes, jurisdiction shall not be taken from the State courts, when prosecutions are initiated in such courts. The existence of parallel or similar Federal and State legislation shall never be used as an excuse to deny State courts jurisdiction unless the Congress, by specific mandate, has voted to set aside the State statutes and clearly so states. This prohibition shall extend to civil and labor legislation, and, in fact, to all legislation.

"No precedents established by the Supreme Court in cases which may no longer be brought in Federal courts, or where the appellate rights are hereby abridged, shall be binding upon this Nation, its duty elected lawmakers or executives, or on any political subdivision or its legally chosen officials, or any individual, from this time on.

"It is the purpose of this legislation to confirm the exclusive rights of the Congress of the United States to initiate legislation, and to strike down and rebuke the usurpation of power by any other agency of government, under any pretext, however popular, potentially profitable or plausible."

Even if legislation similar to this is not immediately enacted, the fact it is being discussed will be a powerful lesson to the Supreme Court that they are not all powerful, but should abide strictly by the limits on their authority, as set forth in the sovereign safeguard of our liberties, the Constitution.

LENA M. WORTHINGTON.

WHEELING.

Participation in Our Political Processes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more important to the future of our Nation and to the achievement of our national destinies than the participation by every American in our political processes. Respected leaders in business, in government, in the labor movement, in education and in the professions have exhorted their fellow citizens to support candidates of their choice, but I know of no better demonstration of citizenship than that of the Western Electric Co., which has developed a companywide program designed to encourage individual contributions to political parties. Mr. W. C. Brooks, manager of Western Electric's Merrimack Valley Works in North Andover, Mass., has sent to me a copy of a letter from President H. I. Romnes to company employees describing the program. I congratulate Western Electric on this important contribution to the public good, and under leave to extend my remarks, I submit Mr. Romnes' letter for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

WESTERN ELECTRIC CO.,
New York, N.Y., September 4, 1962.

To All Employees:

Our political parties today are more than just worthy causes. They are the means by which we make our democratic form of government work. But the costs of political organizations and campaigns are skyrocketing.

Unfortunately the number of people who contribute to political campaigns is relatively small. I think you would agree, though, that all of us have a responsibility to do whatever we can to be sure that our personal political convictions are adequately voiced. We can help fulfill that responsibility by contributing to the parties and candidates we support.

Both parties have pointed to the coming elections as important to the Nation's future. Between now and November, all of us will be reviewing the issues and assessing the character and competence of the candidates. We shall make our decisions at the polls. But before that time comes, I hope that Western Electric people will also support their convictions financially.

To that end, the company will conduct its own "back your party" campaign, which will run from September 10 through 28. You will hear further about this from your manager who will be sending you materials that will make it convenient for you to contribute, anonymously, and in the amount you want. I hope you will take advantage of this opportunity.

H. I. ROMNES.

Labor and Steel Persecution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Labor and Steel Persecution," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of September 14, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR AND STEEL PERSECUTION—APPREHENSION FOUND AMONG UNIONS THAT MORE PLANTS MAY BE CLOSED

(By David Lawrence)

Persecution of the steel industry by liberal or radical Democrats in Congress has reached the point where even the labor unions are becoming apprehensive that the end result may be more plants closed down and more jobs lost. If present proposals are carried out, it could mean a form of Government control of the automobile industry, of aluminum, coal, copper, iron ore and other basic materials, and of related manufacturing enterprises.

Some of the radicals have gone so far as to concede that the purpose of their current demand for cost figures the steel companies to be submitted to a Senate committee is to determine whether a public-utility sys-

tem of regulating prices, and perhaps also fixing wages, may be desirable as a public policy for Congress to enact.

A memorandum authorized for distribution by Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, Democrat, to the entire membership of the Senate Judiciary Committee, says flatly that, if a company seeks efficiency through the size of its operations, it may have to pay the penalty for it in a system of public-utility regulation. On this point, the memorandum reads as follows:

"If efficiency is assumed to be closely and directly related to size, the appropriate public policies would include such measures as requiring notification and defense before a public body of price increases, imposing some form of public-utility rate control.

"But if size is assumed not to be related to efficiency, dissolution and companion measures designed to promote competition become a logical course of public policy. Only by obtaining cost data can an intelligent judgment be made on the merits of this difficult issue."

The Senate subcommittee memorandum, in effect, declares war on the steel industry and threatens it either with laws that would establish a public-utility system of Government regulation or a splitup of existing companies into smaller units, irrespective of whether they will be efficient or make a profit adequate to insure further funds for investment in plant and equipment.

All this is being done in the face of statements from steel industry executives that net profits in their rate of return on invested capital have declined in the last 10 years by almost 50 percent. Thomas F. Patton, president of the Republic Steel Corp., said to the committee: "A product-by-product breakdown of the American steel industry's costs, whether published by groups of 3 companies or even 12 companies, would be invaluable to foreign competitors engaged in penetrating our markets."

Mr. Patton testified also that disclosure of cost data would have a serious domestic impact in that producers of competitive products "would have for the first time steel-cost information which could prove of great benefit to them and great damage to us in the steel industry." Describing current conditions in the steel industry, Mr. Patton added: "Wheeling Steel Corp. has reduced its dividend, Lukens Corp. has reduced its dividend, Pittsburgh Coke & Chemical Co. has reduced its dividend, and if you look at the profits of the steel companies for the last quarter, you will see that a number of them did not earn enough to cover their dividend, and I am sorry to have to say that when you look at the earnings of the current third quarter when they are published they are going to look even worse."

Mr. Patton predicted that, if foreign competitors could get the cost figures of American steel companies, they "would be better able to take business away from us—we would have our steel works working less, and more people out of work, and the towns in which our plants are located would be suffering even worse than they are today."

Senators SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, and KEATING, of New York, Republicans, asked whether plants in their respective States would be affected and received the reply that the impact would be serious everywhere if foreign competitors obtained access to the cost data of American companies.

Whether President Kennedy approves of the direction which the Kefauver subcommittee now has taken is not yet known. Last April he supported the efforts of the Tennessee Senator to undertake an inquisition into the affairs of the steel companies. There were reports around the Capitol then that Mr. Kennedy told Senator KEFAUVER bluntly "to go after" the steel companies. But the situation since last spring has changed for the worse. Unemployment in the steel industry has increased, and investors are suffering a loss of dividend as profits have been steadily reduced.

It looks now as if the Democratic Party candidates for Congress generally may be adversely affected if the President continues to stand behind the Kefauver committee's crusade. There have been rumors that the White House and the steel union leaders are taking another look at the whole situation. For it could become a potent issue in the current congressional campaign.

Attacking Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I have a genuine concern for any person who is unemployed despite efforts to find a gainful occupation. It is because of my concern for such persons that I have resisted administration efforts to give away our American jobs to foreigners through tariff cuts leading to increased imports. I have opposed extravagant foreign aid to build new factories abroad, which prevents tax reduction at home. Those individuals who have been displaced as a result of such action need and want jobs, and it is my hope that with the completed action on the depressed-area public works bill and the release of funds for retraining unemployed workers unemployment will be alleviated not only in the 11th Congressional District of Michigan, but throughout the Nation.

I am placing in the RECORD a copy of an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star, September 12, 1962, calling attention to the fact that the inauguration of these programs is a significant step in qualifying and utilizing manpower.

The editorial follows:

ATTACKING UNEMPLOYMENT

Two lines of Federal attack upon the overall unemployment problem made notable headway in recent days. One was the completion of congressional action authorizing a $900-million depressed-area public works bill. The other was clearance by the Labor Department of an initial 70 retraining projects for unemployed workers, the beginning of a nationwide program authorized in the new Manpower Development and Training Act.

The public works bill, for which funds must yet be appropirated, would permit Federal financing of certain types of capital improvement projects in more than 1,000 areas qualifying under the Redevelopment Act of 1961, or in communities that have had 6 percent or more unemployment for 9 of the last 12 months. Administration sponsors of the program have defined water, sewer, hospital, and airfield improvement projects as representative of the qualifying type, with further requirements that they could be started quickly and completed within a year. Testifying in support of the measure before he left the Cabinet, former Secretary of Labor Goldberg said that "no leaf-raking projects" would be approved and he estimated that at least 95 percent of the work would be done by workers employed by private contractors rather than on public payrolls.

Not surprisingly, consideration of this legislation in an election year has prompted charges that it would be used as a vote-getting scheme. For this reason, the Senate went on record as indorsing administration of the program "on a basis that would be free of any partisan favoritism." Certainly, it should be so. As a practical matter, with no funds yet available, there is relatively little opportunity for politicking with the program before election day less than 8 weeks hence.

For the long term, of course, a public works program is not a real cure for unemployment. More far-reaching benefit may accrue from the manpower retraining. Under this program, the first of its kind on a national scale, workers whose jobs have been eliminated by technological developments will be instructed in new or different skills that offer employment promise. Two Federal Departments, Labor along with Health, Education, and Welfare, will collaborate in directing the program. With a first-year appropriation of $70 million, it is estimated that 70,000 workers will be the first to benefit under this effort to combat the chronic unemployment that stems from modern technology. It is a small beginning, but potentially a significant one in the double sense of qualifying and utilizing manpower.

Taxes Weren't Cut but Debate Helped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Taxes Weren't Cut but Debate Helped." The article was written by Sylvia Porter, a highly respected and noted writer and commentator on questions of economics.

The article reminds us that it is healthy for the country to have frank, thoughtful, and meaningful debate over economic policy, particlularly tax policy.

It was my privilege to be one of the Members of Congress who participated in that debate. I had a point of view which I expressed early and often, namely, that I was of the opinion that our tax laws were in need of a general overhauling, in order to provide both equity and incentive—equity, by plugging tax loopholes; and incentive, by recognizing that modern American industry must improve its mechanization, and that that is a costly item, and that therefore in writing the tax laws that fact should receive due consideration.

The article by Miss Porter concludes with the following statement:

Finally, the debate paved the way for the reduction-reform bill in 1963.

The debate over whether to cut taxes has been finished; the answer is "Yes." The debate over when also is finished if the President's stated timetable is accepted. The cuts will be effective January 1, or 130 days from now.

The article was published on August 23.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Aug. 23, 1962]

TAXES WEREN'T CUT, BUT DEBATE HELPED

(By Sylvia Porter)

NEW YORK.—Several significant pluses have come out of the debate over a tax cut to spur our economy. Here are four of them:

The debate focused attention as never before on the extent to which the huge tax load being carried by businessmen and individual taxpayers is retarding our expansion. This new public awareness that our tax rates are, as the President said, "so high as to weaken the very essence of the progress of a free society" marks progress indeed.

Not in memory has there been a debate on our tax systems' defects so frank, so objective, so informed and widespread as this summer. When in January in his Economic Report, the President declared, "Later this year, I shall present to Congress a major program of tax reform" which "will reexamine tax rates" and be aimed "at strengthening of incentives for individual effort and for productive investment," few people heard his promise (and probably fewer remember he made the promise that long ago).

But when in June he said, "Our tax structure * * * exerts too heavy a drain on a prospering economy" and pledged to offer to the next Congress a program for "an across-the-board reduction in personal and corporate tax rates," millions got the message.

And when in his address to the Nation, August 14, rejecting an immediate tax cut but repeating he would offer a 1963 bill to "include an across-the-board, top-to-bottom cut in both corporate and personal income taxes," the entire Nation and free world were listening. We are at last on our way to basic reform.

2. The debate has created some startling new lineups among business and labor leaders, among liberal and conservative lawmakers, and shattered alliances that seemed unbreakable—another good omen for positive action on tax reform in coming months.

On the same day—June 29—that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce called for a tax reduction, Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers came out for tax cuts, too. Their programs are different, but their objectives are the same—stimulating the economy. While the president of Du Pont was urging Congress to give top priority to personal tax cuts, a Detroit union leader was saying, "Business should have some relief too."

3. It has forced thinking people for the first time in years to ask some of the right questions about our economy's unsatisfactory rate of growth in recent years. Only when we ask the right questions will we come to the right answers.

Finally, the debate paved the way for the reduction-reform bill in 1963, a bill which woud slash the top 91-percent rate on individuals, cut the 20-percent bottom rate, scale reductions in between and reduce the 52-percent corporate tax rate, too. The debate over whether to cut taxes has been finished; the answer is "Yes." The debate over when also is finished if the President's stated timetable is accepted. The cuts will be effective January 1, or 130 days from now.

Growth of Misericordia College at Dallas, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] had the honor of presenting the principal address at groundbreaking ceremonies held at Misericordia College at Dallas, Pa., last Saturday, September 8, where construction began on two new buildings for that fine women's college. I understand Mrs. Flood is a graduate of Misericordia and the Congressman a member of the board of visitors.

I was born in DAN FLOOD's district and, therefore, know of the growth and impressive progress of that outstanding institution.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to insert in the RECORD today the address delivered by Mr. FLOOD on the occasion of the groundbreaking.

Address follows:

Today's ground-breaking ceremony marks another milestone in the history of Wyoming Valley's first college. The spadeful of good earth lifted this afternoon by College Misericordia's president, Sister Mary Celestine, is a symbol of the remarkable growth of this institution, as well as of the progress of the educational apostolate of the Sisters of Mercy in northeastern Pennsylvania.

On September 8, 1875, just 87 years ago today, eight Sisters of Mercy arrived from the motherhouse in Pittsburgh and took up residence in the old St. Mary's rectory on Canal Street, now Pennsylvania Avenue, Wilkes-Barre. After a brief month of preparations, this small band of teaching Sisters opened school on October 11 in St. Mary's Church on Canal Street, with 400 pupils enrolled. The rapid, almost ungovernable growth that was to be characteristic of all their institutions began immediately, for the enrollment of old St. Mary's quickly rose to 500, and before Christmas in 1875 two more Sisters arrived from Pittsburgh to assist in the school. The following September, the Sisters opened an academy, with 50 girls registering for classes.

Pupils of St. Mary's Parish came carrying their "dinner cans" from what seems to us now unbelievable distances, since most of them walked. They came from Ashley, Miners Mills, Plains, Parsons, Plymouth, Nanticoke, and Sugar Notch. One young scholar from Parsons, who would become the eminent Dr. James J. Walsh, noted physician, writer, and lecturer, never tired of recalling the excellent foundation he received at old St. Mary's, enabling him to enter Fordham College as a sophomore.

All of this early pioneering in education by the Sisters of Mercy in Wilkes-Barre was in full accordance with the ideals and principles established by Mother Mary Catherine McAuley, who founded the Institute of the Sisters of Mercy in Dublin, Ireland, in 1831. Although Mother McAuley's first endeavors were in the field of social welfare, she soon saw the need for free schools providing education for the poor children and the great middle class. Prior to her time, the Catholic schools that existed admitted rich children exclusively. With her enlightened mind, Mother McAuley saw that the Irish people could not be raised from their degradation unless the masses were brought under the influence of Catholic education. With no models to imitate, no examples to enlighten or encourage, no forebears to consult, this valiant woman devoted her fortune, her talents, and all she possessed to the poor of Dublin. Through visiting the best educational institutions in Dublin and observing their programs and methods, she was able to adapt the finest that she found in the teaching of secular subjects, permeating them with the queen of all studies, religion. "Let us fit our pupils for earth," she said, "without unfitting them for heaven."

Mother McAuley's educational framework was much in advance of her time. After establishing the first purpose of the work of teaching, "All for the honor and glory of God," she next put emphasis on scholarship, requiring that each Sister have a thorough English education, and in addition, specialization. She likewise stressed progressiveness and required her teachers to study to become acquainted with every improvement in the manner and method of imparting instruction. The importance of daily preparation of lessons before presenting them to a class, and the forestalling of discipline problems by giving the children plenty of occupation, were principles instilled into the first teaching Sisters of Mercy—principles which are now accepted practice in any educational system.

As can be seen, the philosophy and psychology which formed the foundation of the earliest free Catholic schools in Dublin can be, and were intended to be, adapted to any conditions under which the Sisters might be called upon to educate the young. Catherine McAuley was not one to rest upon what she had accomplished in the educational field; she stood for progress and fresh ideas. "In the instruction and education of youth," she admonished her teachers, "the Sisters shall be inspired by a sound and modern pedagogy so that their schools will not only be equal but superior to other schools." Here she clearly indicates that she expects her religious to move forward with the times, to keep pace with all that is best in modern methods and techniques, within the framework of a Catholic philosophy of education, and all that is good in traditional learning and culture.

When the first Sisters came from Pittsburgh to Wilkes-Barre, they were imbued with these ideals. Before long, they were working for and receiving their bachelor of arts degrees and teaching college courses in St. Mary's High School. These courses were accredited by colleges and universities, and beginning in 1921, normal school courses were given.

Then came the first great ground breaking for the Sisters' venture in higher education on this beautiful hilltop in Dallas. On June 3, 1921, Bishop Hoban officiated at the ceremony, which was also attended by Mother M. Mercedes, superior, the other Sisters, and a representative delegation from Wilkes-Barre and Wyoming Valley. What is now the administration building of College Misericordia was completed and blessed by Bishop Hoban on August 15, 1924. Among the dignitaries present on that historic occasion were Attorney James W. Stack of Wilkes-Barre, Dr. James J. Walsh, and Mayor Daniel L. Hart, who was also an alumnus of "old St. Mary's" on Canal Street. On Sep-

tember 24, the first academic year began with 50 students enrolled. Mother M. Catharine, the former Delia McGann, of Wilkes-Barre, and the first candidate to enter St. Mary's Novitiate and persevere became the first dean. She, who now had her doctorate, was assisted by 15 fully qualified faculty members and 3 lecturers. Chartered by the State of Pennsylvania on January 31, 1927, College Misericordia held its first commencement exercises in Irem Temple, Wilkes-Barre, conferring bachelor of arts degrees on four young women, and the bachelor of science degree on one. Since that date, the labor of educating the daughters of this anthracite region, and far beyond its limits, has expanded so rapidly that it has been difficult to meet the demands for classrooms, living quarters, and other facilities required by an academic community. Today's beginning toward the erection of a new dormitory and a student union building will help meet the demands of the exploding enrollment.

Never losing sight of their foundress' intention of providing opportunities for those unable to finance a costly education, this institution of higher learning has interested itself first and foremost in the young women of the nearby mining area. About two-thirds of the college population is comprised of day students who travel to classes from all over Wyoming Valley and even from points farther away. Many of these students are studying on full- or part-time scholarships, or by means of some other type of financial aid provided by the college, which tries never to turn away a deserving girl with the aptitude for college studies. Although this has always been a liberal arts college, solicitude for the needs of every type of student has led to the introduction of specialized vocational courses such as secretarial science, home economics, and nursing education. College Misericordia aims to educate girls "for life and a livelihood," and she believes that liberal education cannot be divorced from the practical needs of life.

Besides the students of the valley and its environs, most of whom travel back and forth to the campus each day, the college attracts young women from many other States, as well as from distant parts of this State, and from several foreign countries. Many of these students, too, are assisted by scholarships. For all, there are plentiful opportunities to develop professional and practical skills, if they select a vocational field for concentration; for all, there is provided an atmosphere in which to acquire culture, poise, and self-confidence; for all, there are numerous incentives, through classes, extracurricular activities, and counseling, to live a generous and noble life, so that they may become active, useful citizens in their respective communities, and a positive influence for good as career women or married women in the family.

This work of developing the intellectual, cultural, and moral capacities of young women is spearheaded by a faculty of 11 priests, 52 Sisters, and 40 laymen and women, who teach the 724 regularly enrolled students. To afford educational opportunities for those who cannot pursue a full-time program, there is the extension school, which brings the full enrollment up to 1,103, making College Misericordia the sixth largest Catholic women's college in the United States. In addition, the college now operates an educational guidance clinic in Wilkes-Barre. And finally, since 1960, this college, in cooperation with the University of Scranton, offers graduate study in English, history, and education, leading to a master of arts or a master of science degree. During the past summer, 90 students of both sexes pursued graduate courses on this campus.

The music department and the department of drama, as well as such campus clubs as the literary club and the modern language club, supplement the oportunities offered for cultural enrichment in the humanities program. However, a need for professional entertainment of a high level was felt by the administration, both for the student body and for the people of Wyoming Valley. For their diversion and pleasure, 3 years ago the Theater 3 series was initiated and has enjoyed spectacular success. The three performances of each season by musical groups internationally famous have attracted full houses of enthusiastic audiences at Wilkes-Barre's Irem Temple. This year a fourth attractions, Molière's comedy, "A School for Wives," staged by Players, Inc., will be presented as a gift performance to the patrons of Theater 3. The college, in its role as guardian and mother of the arts, thus serves the community as well as its own student body by providing cultural recreation.

A college may review its lofty purposes and traditions, count the sacrifices of its administrators and faculty, examine its curriculum and campus activity; but its success can be calculated only from the achievements of its graduates. The true luminosity of College Misericordia is revealed in her alumnae, whose impact is felt in many fields, not least of those, the home, and family. To the classrooms of the nation this college has contributed 60 percent of its graduates as teachers on all levels. Seventy-five percent have entered the professions—medicine, law, teaching, and the social services. Not lagging behind in this age of science, the college has sent chemical and biological researchers, not to mention public relations officials and secretarial workers, into such major corporations as Westinghouse, Eastman Kodak, Standard Oil, Merck, Hoffman, La Roche, and Parke-Davis. Misericordia graduates are laboring with the physically and mentally handicapped; they are teaching in American schools overseas; they are active in business administration, advertising, and government. Each year a number of graduating seniors are awarded valuable fellowships and assistantships leading to master's and doctor's degrees.

The growth and progress of this college has been remarkable as it continues to increase in enrollment and to branch out in new ways year after year. To the alumnae, for whom the new residence hall will be named, much credit is due. To the religious women, such as Sister M. Annunciata Merrick, in whose honor the new student union building will be named, and who have worked so selflessly for the expansion of this educational institution, high praise is owed. Continuing the endeavors of the first dean, Sister Mary Catharine, and others who succeeded her, such as Sister M. Pierre and Sister M. Annunciata, are Sister M. Celestine, president of College Misericordia, and Sister Marianna, academic dean. Theirs is a great work, a priceless contribution to American life, for in the words of Orestes Brownson: "The United States is a country of diverse theologies and one creed, of many churches and one temple, of a thousand theories and one conviction. The creed is education, the temple is the schoolhouse, and the conviction is the healing power of learning."

Report to Moose Lodge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, last week the National Baseball Congress tournament was held in Wichita, Kans., and the Alaska Gold Panners, of Fairbanks, Alaska, my hometown, finished second. Arriving in Fairbanks on September 7, the team was given a rousing reception at the local Moose Lodge, a spontaneous expression of public pride in an excellent accomplishment. In finishing second out of a field of 33 teams representing all parts of the country, the Alaska Gold Panners, it should be noted, prevailed over teams having former major league players, such as Enos Slaughter and Dee Fondy.

Having duly noted that many of my colleagues have, from time to time, called attention to the exploits of teams representing their areas, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Alaska Gold Panners have demonstrated that the national pastime is not only popular in the far North, but that we also produce good baseball players.

I submit herewith the September 7 editorial of the Fairbanks News-Miner, which is descriptive of the enthusiastic reception accorded the Fairbanks, Alaska, Gold Panners upon their return to Fairbanks:

REPORT TO THE MOOSE LODGE

Sentiment is still running plenty strong for the Alaska Gold Panners, and the fact they barely missed seizing the championship laurels isn't going to dampen the homecoming festivities.

That 7 to 6 final score was a heartbreaker, especially since the Panners outhit the Wichita hometown champs and had fewer errors. But after all, coming in second out of 33 teams in the National Baseball Congress 1962 tournament isn't exactly what you'd call a poor showing, especially since none of the experts figured the Alaska team would get very far. New to nightlight baseball and facing teams loaded with the top semipro talent in the Nation, the Panners weren't given much of a chance of finishing in the top 20, let alone the finals.

On top of that, the Panners bring home with them a record number of awards. For the first time in the 28-year history of the event, a manager other than the manager of the No. 1 team received the All American Manager Award. This went to Red Boucher, with the same honors going to the Wichita manager.

The Panners received awards as the best dressed team, the team traveling the farthest, the most popular team, the most aggressive team, the team with the best first-time showing in the NBC tournament, the best young team, and the second place trophy. And John Stapp was honored as All American pitcher.

They also return as public relations ambassadors who not only won the hearts of thousands of fans, including those from rival team cities, but performed the sort of publicity job for the 49th State that would be the envy of any chamber of commerce, either on the local or State level.

Nor does it stop here. The Panners are automatically invited to enter the nationwide semiprofessional baseball tournament again next year.

The official homecoming celebration will start at 8 o'clock tonight at the Fairbanks Moose Lodge. This will be a fine occasion for the community to turn out and pay tribute to the team members, who in turn express their gratitude to all Fairbanks citizens and businesses who pitched in to make the Wichita trip possible.

Seems to us this is one time when a mutual admiration get-together is well justified. Let's all turn out for it. See you at the Moose Lodge tonight.

Pressures by Right and Left Discussed by Freedom House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the more scholarly and responsible private groups discussing the political process in our country today is Freedom House, of New York. This group of men and women of both political parties issues policy and study statements from time to time. Since its founding during the Second World War, Freedom House has been a respectable, responsible voice avoiding extremism. The noted columnist of the New York Herald Tribune syndicate, Roscoe Drummond, is the present chairman of Freedom House. In the New York Times of September 7, 1962, there was published an article which discusses the latest Freedom House report on the use of labels, both regarding communism and fascism. As this is a subject about which we can all learn more, I think the new Freedom House booklet, "What's 'Right' and 'Left?'—A Guide for Responsible Anti-Communists," is well worth our study and discussion:

REPORT CRITICIZES "RIGHT-LEFT" TAGS—FREEDOM HOUSE COMPARES COMMUNISM TO FASCISM

Communism and fascism are the same breed of cat, and it creates a false image to call one "left" and the other "right," a public affairs reported by Freedom House asserted yesterday.

The report, an analysis of political extremism, is called: "What's 'Right' and 'Left'?—A Guide for Responsible Anti-Communists."

Freedom House, an organization of liberal, moderate and conservative leaders in public affairs who support democratic principles, said: "We emphasize that the Communist conspiracy is a counterrevolutionary movement on the reactionary right—the totalitarian twin brother of fascism and nazism."

"CONFUSING EFFECT"

In their analysis, the directors of Freedom House also commented:

"We deplore the confusing effect of the 'right-left' image. It is in essence a false representation of the political spectrum to position democracy in the middle, flanked by two forms of totalitarian dictatorship."

Communism and the reactionary right, the analysis said, are basically alike in that their main attack is aimed at democratic institutions, and that they use similar conspiratorial tactics.

Democracy then, the report said, is not cast in the middle role between two kinds of dictatorship; it is clearly the alternative to all forms of oppression.

The report urged believers in democracy to oppose the extremist "irresponsibles" who support communism and the reactionary right, since both represent forms of tyranny.

Freedom House said in its report that its stand for freedom was "necessarily coupled with a strong anti-Communist posture."

It is no easy thing to be responsibly anti-Communist, the report declared because "both extremes harass those who disagree with them, not hesitating to question the integrity, patriotism, or even the sanity of their opponents."

ATTRACTION TO RIGHTISTS

"We believe that rightist groups have attracted many who could not find a firm leadership in the center for effective expression of their profreedom and anti-Communist convictions," the report continued.

"Freedom House believes it is essential to expose and oppose Communist imperialism by education and to counter it by economic, social, and political measures as well as by a strong military posture.

"It [Freedom House] distinguishes itself from the rightists particularly by its support of actions to unite allies, aid and befriend new nations and neutrals, create broader economic foundations for free world progress through new trading patterns such as the Common Market, and foster the wider application of human rights.

"It differs from the left by its conviction that social progress is not enough; that unequivocal resistance to Communist expansion is also necessary, and that this is not only more honorable but far less risky than making compromises that add up to appeasement."

Freedom House, whose chairman is Roscoe Drummond, has its headquarters at 20 West 40th Street.

Political Slush Fund Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Monroe, Mich., Evening News of August 31, 1962:

POLITICAL SLUSH FUND EXPOSED

The sudden emergence of the administration's $900 million public works bill raises questions as to how the proposal will be administered. The anxiety over how the bill will be put into effect is heightened by charges that the administration has used similar programs for partisan, political ends. The public works bill dragged for a while in the House as some Congressmen feared the same thing might happen to the $900 million proposal. This fear was greatly substantiated last week with the revelations made by Republican Congressman DURWARD HALL, of Missouri.

Representative HALL believes that he has caught the administration playing politics with the food stamp program which cost $25 million last year and has $50 million budgeted this year. "The food stamp pilot program being administered by the Department of Agriculture has become a brazen political slush fund," Representative HALL declared on the House floor last week.

Looking into the situation, Chicago Tribune writer Frank Holeman noted that there are two possible conclusions:

"1. Nearly all of the needy, unemployed people in the United States live in congressional districts represented by Democrats, or,

"2. There is some real hanky-panky going on, which should be exposed immediately for the good of the country."

Shortly after he was inaugurated, President Kennedy set up, "on a pilot basis" in eight areas of chronic unemployment, the food stamp program. The areas were picked by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman. All eight areas were represented in Congress by Democrats. Early this month, the Department said that the program had been so successful that the program was going to be expended into 18 new congressional districts. All but one of these was a Democratic district.

In choosing its areas of chronic unemployment, the Agriculture Department somehow slipped up and forgot to include the area which has the highest rate of unemployment in the Nation, according to Labor Department statistics—Johnstown, Pa., with more than 12 percent of the work force idle. This area wasn't overlooked, however, because Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, a Republican, pleaded with Agriculture to include his area and give relief to his area. But his pleadings were ignored, as were other Republican Members from areas of high unemployment.

Secretary Freeman has complete autonomy in picking the test areas. The only criteria are that the test area must be an area of substantial unemployment or eligible for area redevelopment aid and that local officials are willing. Interestingly enough, these are the same requirements for projects to be approved under the pending public works bill.

Rivalry Prods New England Fishermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting article written by a staff writer of the Christian Science Monitor in Boston:

RIVALRY PRODS NEW ENGLAND FISHERMEN

BOSTON.—When Soviet fishing boats appeared on Georges Bank off Cape Cod last year, they dramatically reminded Americans of the foreign competition facing the fishing industry.

The Soviet boats, to be sure, fish primarily for herring and ship them back to the U.S.S.R. (Americans eat very little herring.)

Nevertheless, it emphasized that more nations than ever before are fishing the North Atlantic.

The steady rise of foreign competition has, more than anything else, spotlighted the weaknesses of New England (and American) commercial fisheries. In New England, imports come primarily from Canada, followed by Denmark, Iceland, and Norway.

Danish and Norwegian fishing industries were partially rebuilt with U.S. aid following World War II, and Iceland, which became completely independent from Denmark only in 1944, built its first competitive fishing fleet with American economic help.

OLD U.S. BOATS

These new fleets by contrast point up the antiquity of American boats. The averagp trawler in the New England fleet is 25 years old. The boat presently being built for the Boston fleet will be the first new one in 14 years.

Older boats cost more to insure, repair, and operate. They lack capacity, refrigeration facilities (fish are highly perishable, and are caught a long way from port), and living conditions that would attract new, younger men to become fishermen.

Despite sharply advancing costs, gross revenues and returns per pound of groundfish landed have declined in constant dollars during the postwar period, according to a study done last year by the Bureau of Business Research at Boston College.

American fishermen point out that foreign boats are often (though not always) built

with heavy Government subsidies, sometimes around 50 percent.

FEDERAL SUBSIDY

A 1792 law restricts Americans from building boats overseas, and shipbuilding, steel, and electrical industries and workers oppose any attempt to change the law. A Federal subsidy passed several years ago pays for a third of the cost of contruction in the United States (about $450,000 for a trawler), but owners assert this is not enough and are urging Congress to raise the support.

Supply of fish is another problem. The quantities of haddock and ocean perch, two of the major New England catches, is stabilized with no prospects of increase. Yet an ever-greater number of boats are seeking the fish.

Also, fish on the banks closest to New England ports are not as abundant as before, and boats must go farther north, thus putting Canadian boats at an advantage over U.S. boats.

There are other problems, lack of latest technological equipment aboard the boats, labor problems on the fish piers, lack of quality consciousness among some fishermen (that is, in handling the fish and keeping boats clean), and widely fluctuating prices for fresh fish that make the fisherman's role uncertain.

But looming larger than all other problems and in a sense, causing them all, is the industry's "free enterprise ad absurdum," according to one close observer. Boatowners and fish processors seem unwilling to combine interests.

Most boats are individually owned. In some cases, the crew, not the captain, of a boat determines what fish shall be caught on a given day. (The crew's pay depends on the take, and that day's market prices.)

United Nations Loan

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I was among those who listened with a great deal of interest a little earlier this afternoon when the suggestion was made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], that we might well give consideration to an amendment whereby section 5 of the pending legislation would be amended in order to make it mandatory that the United Nations, before we would subscribe to any of this bond issue, would accept by the necessary two-thirds vote the recent decision of the International Court of Justice.

Mr. Chairman, I also listened to the arguments made by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER], a member of the committee, in which the gentleman stated that he thought this would be equivalent to waving a red flag in front of some of the members of the United Nations. In addition he said that he thought it was unnecessary because he felt that in view of the fact that about 80 members of the United Nations had already agreed to subscribe to this bond issue, that more than the necessary two-thirds could be counted on to accept the decision.

Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I have read carefully the entire hearings—record of hearings—in this matter, and that, frankly, is the only reason that I deign to take the time of the Committee and appear here in the well of the House at this late hour this afternoon. I certainly must respectfully disagree with the very sanguine estimate that has been made by the gentleman from New Jersey as to the likelihood that this decision would be adopted, for this reason: I call the Committee's attention to the very interesting colloquy that occurs, beginning on page 97 of the committee hearings and extending through page 100 of said hearings, between Mr. Plimpton, the Deputy Representative of the United Nations, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], a member of the committee, whom I regret to say is not on the floor at this time. But the gentleman from Ohio points out, in any event, in this very important colloquy, that when the question of Hungary was brought before the United Nations as to whether or not that should be submitted as a question for the agenda of the United Nations, that there are 52 members of the United Nations who are Afro-Asian nations, and that 42 out of those 52 voted against us on that particular issue. This was largely on the question of whether or not this should be on the agenda. Now, I ask the members of the Committee when a vote comes in the General Assembly of the United Nations as to whether or not powerful Soviet Russia shall accept this decision of the World Court or else be deprived of its vote altogether in the General Assembly by the mandatory acceptance of this decision, how do the members of the Committee think those same 42 members of the Afro-Asian bloc in the General Assembly are going to vote? I, for one, am much less optimistic than some about the acceptance of that decision. I see no reason at all why we should not insist that this be made mandatory before we accept this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would also say something in commenting upon what was mentioned by my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]. Some of us who rise in opposition to this bill as presently written are involuntarily cast in the role of being opponents of the United Nations. I do not classify myself in that category. I realize that there is a role for the U.N. in the world, that it is useful to have an international forum for the discussion of peacekeeping tasks which can be safely carried out by a world body but, frankly, I have been sorely disappointed, as I have sat here on the floor throughout most of the debate this afternoon, that we have not heard more discussion about some of these peacekeeping operations of the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, I sat here yesterday throughout an hour's special order and listened to a very well documented suggestion or charge by one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE], that there might well be certain international economic and financial interests that are prompting the strange goings-on that we are sanctioning today in the Congo. Yet I have not heard anything today in response to anything he said in the course of that hour, except that yesterday afternoon one gentleman—I think my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], who went so far as to suggest that this is extraneous and that the issue of Africa has nothing to do with this.

Another man went so far as to say that this $100 million is sort of an insurance premium, that we have to pay this in order to keep the peace.

I wonder why it is that at the very hour, almost, that we are considering this bond issue here, another committee of the House of Representatives is sitting elsewhere in the Capitol deciding whether or not we should authorize the President of the United States to recall 150,000 reservists. Why is it that tonight peace hangs by a more fragile thread than it has in many a year? Why is it that we are threatened by Cuba, 90 miles from our own mainland? Why is it we have a war raging in southeast Asia, if the United Nations has been all that some of these men would lead us to believe it has been? I am afraid there have been some gross exaggerations in the course of the debate. I would suggest we look more carefully at the role the United Nations has been playing in the last few years.

Mr. Chairman, some weeks ago the Nation listened to a very remarkable address by one of our most dintinguished living Americans, former President Herbert Hoover. Mr. Hoover, of course, has a reputation as an internationalist who supported not only the idea of the founding of the United Nations Organization, but also many years ago urged our membership in the World Court in a time when this was decidedly not a popular course of action to advocate. Therefore, when his remarks are viewed against this background I think it is fair to say that they represent the point of view of a man who subscribes thoroughly to the principle of international cooperation. As the members of the Committee will recall, former President Hoover advanced the idea that a Council of Free Nations should be established in view of the inability of the United Nations to carry out its functions in some instances because of the oft-exercised Soviet veto in the Security Council. I wish that today we were discussing an authorization of $100 million for the establishment of such a Council for Free Nations for I think that it would contribute far more to the safeguarding of the peace of the world than the blood transfusion which we are today being asked to administer to the United Nations.

I speak as one who believes that there is a need for an international organization both as a forum for the discussion of those issues which affect the people

of the world and also to provide machinery to safeguard the peace of the world when it is threatened. However, I am also obliged to number myself among those who decry the double standard that has been employed by the United Nations in adjudging the role that it should play in those disputes that threaten the peace. A couple of examples will certainly suffice to illustrate what I mean. The U.N. has cast a benevolent eye and given its blessing to a plan whereby the Papuan natives of West Irian will be turned over after a period of time to the administration of Mr. Sukarno of Indonesia. We were recently criticized by both the Premier and the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, heretofore one of our stanchest allies, for our failure to render them any moral encouragement whatsoever in their initial protest against this forced transfer of sovereignty and control.

Likewise, the U.N. with our assistance and under the urging of the Afro-Asian bloc has engaged in the condemnation of the colonialism practiced by Portugal. However, we fail to hear any urging by the Afro-Asian bloc that there be an equally strong denunciation of the far more repressive type of colonialism carried on by the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Finally, we come to the sorry record that the U.N. has made for itself in the Congo. This is of particular importance, of course, because it has been admitted that the proceeds of this bond issue will be used primarily to support the continued maintenance of the U.N. forces in that unhappy country.

In August 9, 1960, the Security Council passed a resolution which specifically affirmed this principle that "the U.N. forces in the Congo were not to be a party to or intervene in the resolution of any internal political conflicts." Despite that resolution it is a well-known fact that in the so-called December war the forces of the U.N. proceeded to involve itself in an internal dispute in an operation of which Paul Henri Spaak, the Belgian Foreign Minister, was able to say that it had been in certain respects carried out under conditions that were truly inhuman. We are often told that the U.N. is merely a policeman on the beat, and only its presence in the Congo has prevented a confrontation of the great powers, which in turn would lead to the holocaust of nuclear war. It has been pointed out by persons far more expert in the field of foreign policy than I that the suggestion that the Soviets will dispatch troops or otherwise militarily intervene in the Congo in the event of a withdrawal of the U.N. troops is an entirely unreasonable hypothesis. The record conclusively shows that the Sino-Soviet bloc has committed its forces only when it has been in control of an adjoining land mass. This was shown to be true both in the case of Korea and in southeast Asia. Furthermore, at this particular juncture of world affairs there is every reason to believe that the Soviet Union may be so busy in such areas as Berlin and Cuba that the disorders in the Congo have been relegated to a secondary status in their plans for fomenting disorder. Be that as it may, I think that a fiction is being perpetrated upon the American people to suggest that the only alternative to the U.N. operations in the Congo is a military confrontation in that area of the great powers.

House Resolution 211: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BRIGHTWATER, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.,
June 22, 1962.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Pray tell, what does it take to get House Resolution 211 (establishment of a Captive Nations Committee) out of the House Rules Committee?

The Suffolk County American Legion, representing more than 6,500 Legionnaires, 2 weeks ago passed a resolution favoring the establishment of a Captive Nations Committee. Add this to the hundreds of letters entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman DAN FLOOD, of Pennsylvania—from all parts of the Nation, and many of which forwarded petitions representing en toto thousands of aroused Americans—and you must get a picture of an American people who are demanding that this bill get out of committee.

I recently wrote to Congressman H. R. GROSS, who is doing a tremendous job, in my opinion, of trying to hold the line on spending and idiocy in governmental affairs. I asked Congressman GROSS what could possibly be holding up the bill. His reply points out that 10 Democrats and 5 Republicans are on your committee.

It would appear to me, then, that it is the party of Rusk and Kennedy, who have already acquired a reputation of shying away from any action that might embarrass the Communists; it is that party which is responsible for keeping this bill in committee. I urge you to bring it to the floor, where I know it will pass by something like 400 to 2.

You must know this, too. Are you not in favor of establishing a Captive Nations Committee? Who could it possibly harm, other than Khrushchev? And why should we be so afraid to harm him (who has sworn to bury us)?

Sir, I believe that the establishment of this committee can go a long way toward victory in the cold war; victory, that is, without nuclear, or any other kind of war. The people who are now enslaved are our best allies. They know what communism really means; they will not vacillate if given a choice; if they know that we mean business when we say that the United States stands for world freedom.

Yours sincerely,

E. LEE NORTH.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I, Valerian Sksylov, a Cossack by origin and presently an American citizen, respectfully urge you to support favorably the enactment of the Flood resolution to create a special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Very truly yours,

VALERIAN SKSYLOV.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
June 12, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I support your proposal House Resolution 211 to create a special House Committee on Captive Nations. It is the best at the present time to win the cold war against the gangsters of Moscow.

Sincerely yours,

PETER KONSTANTINE.

JUNE 22, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for remembering the Baltic nations on the occasion of the 22d anniversary of the mass deportations by the Soviets.

Also, I wish to express my appreciation for the resolution urging the establishment of the Captive Nations Committee. Let us hope that this resolution is approved without too much delay, so that these nations would not be forgotten.

Once again, thank you for all the interest you show in behalf of the suffering peoples of the Baltic nations.

Yours truly,

HELEN SHIELDS.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
June 25, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I, as a Cuban refugee, am very grateful to you for introducing this measure of the establishment of a special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of

Representatives. At the same time, would like to intercede with you as to include Cuba among these captive nations, for as you know we are at the present time facing the terror and barbarism of communism in our nation.

Let us pray and hope that your House Resolution 211 will favorably be in effect very soon.

Thanking you very much in advance for the interest you are giving to this noble cause.

I am respectfully yours,

MIRTA A. GARCIA.

The John Birch Society in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, a major technique of the John Birch Society is to promote its program through "front" organizations. Sometimes these are Birch organized. More often, they are established groups in which Birch members may exercise some influence.

In this fifth of six reports by Staff-writer Barbara Holliday, some of the inner workings of the John Birch Society in Michigan are revealed:

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY IN MICHIGAN

To gage the strength of the John Birch Society in Michigan by its 1,000-plus members is folly.

This figure may be tripled if strength is gaged in terms of activity.

The John Birch Society is a crusade—and its members are never allowed to forget for a moment that they are fighting the good fight.

In the July-August joint issue of American Opinion, edited by Founder Robert Welch, an annual "scoreboard" of Communist domination in the world was published.

In the section devoted to the United States, it was noted that Communist "control" in this country remained constant during the last year at just below the "critical" 70 percent.

The article continued:

"It must be accounted one of the great feats of our century that a comparatively small, but courageous and resolute band of Americans was able to halt—at least for a year—the Communist advance.

"We have won a delaying action but we have yet to win the victory. * * * There can be no moment of rest or safety until the conspiracy is destroyed. Americans must realize, and we mean this literally, that the alternative to liberty is death."

With this kind of clarion call urging them on, Birchers seldom make waste motions. Wherever they go, whatever company they are in, they are under orders to "spread the words," to recruit, to influence where possible, to "educate."

To follow them through all the areas of their activity is like trying to catch a school of minnows in your bare hand.

But I was able to trace some of the Birch front groups in Detroit by focusing on individual members.

Brian Kelly, whom we met as leader of chapter 69, is one of the most active members of a Birch-front group, Education for American Freedom.

You may remember that in September, 1961, this group sponsored a highly successful 5-day conference called counterattack at the University of Detroit.

This group is still active as an educational force against communism. Its forte is showing anti-Communist films such as "Operation Abolition" and sponsoring anti-Communist speakers.

("Operation Abolition" is a film considered to be slanted and inaccurate, purporting to show the Communist influence in student riots in San Francisco when the House Un-American Activities Committee was meeting there.)

Brian Kelly is also an individual Birch contact for a group called the crusaders which cosponsored a well-attended public meeting late in 1961. "Crusaders" is also an anti-Communist group utilized as a Birch front.

Kelly also recently joined the 17th District Conservative Club which is already overflowing with John Birchers.

Tom Staffin, a member of chapter 69, was one of those who launched the Michigan Independent American Party in 1960 with the late R. Roy Pursell, of Plymouth, known for his anti-Semitism, as a gubernatorial candidate.

Staffin regularly attends meetings of the States Rights' Council whose charter was denied in 1958 by the Michigan Corporation Securities and Exchange Commission because of a stated goal of complete racial separation.

Wilma Oswolt, who was present at a 17th District Conservative Club meeting I attended, and a very active member of Birch Chapter 61, is secretary of the National Civic Association.

The association locked horns in 1958 with the Michigan Fair Election Practices Commission for "injecting racial and religious issues" in an election campaign.

Mrs. Oswolt was instrumental in organizing the Northwest Parents Club to protest busing Negroes to three Detroit schools in her neighborhood.

She also appeared with Donald Sargent, president of the National Civic Association, before the Michigan House of Representatives State Affairs Committee to speak against the fair housing legislation in 1961 with 4,000 antifair housing cards and a petition of 28,000 names.

The pair also met unsuccessfully with Governor Swainson to urge his signing Senate bill 1344, the antirule 9 proposal passed by the legislature. (Rule 9 forbids discrimination on the part of licensed real estate brokers and salesmen on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin.)

Mrs. Oswolt is a member of the States Rights' Council and takes part in Independent American Party meetings. Usually on display at these meetings is racist literature such as Gerald L. K. Smith's "Cross and the Flag," National States' Rights "Thunderbolt," and Conde McGinley's "Common Sense."

Mrs. Oswolt joined the Birch Society last September shortly after she was appointed Michigan representative for the National States Rights' Party.

This spring she was one of the most vigorous picketers in protest of integration at the Post School in northwest Detroit.

Edward A. Kelly, Michigan coordinator of the John Birch Society, is also one of the most active members of Education for American Freedom.

One of his jobs as coordinator is to appear before as many groups as possible with films such as "Operation Abolition."

During the past year Birchers have picketed the Leningrad Ballet when it appeared at Masonic temple and the tractors-for-freedom meeting at which Eleanor Roosevelt spoke.

Ann Byerlein, a nurse, and Don Lobsinger, a student at Wayne State University, are the most energetic picket line organizers. They have also organized protests against Communist speakers on the campus.

Neither of them is identified as a member of the John Birch Society but work closely with members to achieve Birchist aims.

Lobsinger recently reported he sent letters to the board of governors at Wayne and the board of regents at the University of Michigan asking if they were going to uphold the ban on Communist speakers.

The replies from Michigan were ambiguous, he said, and not a single reply had been received from Wayne.

Ann Byerlein is an active member in Education for American Freedom and the Crusaders.

A continuing project for all Birch members is the placement of Birch-approved anti-Communist literature in libraries. This is usually attempted through letters requesting specific books repeatedly or offering the donation of anti-Communist literature.

Birch members in this area are especially aggressive in school board elections, trying to be elected themselves or supporting one of their own.

They apply pressure on school board officials concerning the approved books for school libraries, seeking removal of those the Birchers deem obscene.

Ed Kelly suggests that the best method is to appear at a board meeting with an "objectionable" book and demand to have selected passages read aloud.

The current major local front for John Birch is antifluoridation.

Tabloid-size newspapers with articles on mongoloidism purportedly caused by fluoride and other literature were put into my hands by a Bircher at a 17th District Conservative Club meeting.

A chapter leader, Alma Ambrose, read exhaustively from the paper before a group of about 50 people who were ostensibly there to organize conservative Republicans for precinct work.

One speaker addressing the meeting referred repeatedly to President Kennedy as "our dictator President."

Following the meeting, which was held in a community center, the club president was advised that the center would not permit further meetings of this group.

Political activity by the Birchers has received a remarkable assist through the organization of the District Conservative Clubs which started out as affiliates of the Conservative Association of Michigan organized by Prof. Dan Stewart in Lansing.

I attended the first meeting of the 15th District Conservative Club in the home of a member of chapter 69, Lois M., an attractive young mother of four children, and an ardent Bircher.

The Wayne County Conservative Association has as its Secretary Richard Kelly, a brother of Ed, also a member of the society.

Mailings for the association contain far-rightist literature and American Opinion is displayed on the secretary's desk.

The meetings are attended regularly by a number of Birchers including Grosse Pointe's Richard Durant, the best known member of the society here since the battle for control of the 14th District by the society reached the headlines.

The fight was spotlighted in mid-May when Senator John Stahlin, who was to run unsuccessfully for the GOP nomination of Lieutenant Governor, accused Durant, GOP vice chairman of the 14th District, of trying to take over the Wayne County GOP organization by bribery, intimidation, misrepresentation and threats of physical violence.

Durant retaliated by filing a million dollar libel suit.

On June 15, Governor Swainson ordered an official investigation into the Stahlin charge of unfair election practices.

A major directive to all Birchers this spring was to run for precinct delegate, a minor job that is virtually ignored most election years.

The reasoning: Precinct delegates elected this year choose delegates to the State convention which in turn will name the Michigan delegation to the national convention in 1964.

In a surprise move, Romney met with the 14th District precinct delegates and personally asked Durant and other extremists to give up their jobs in Michigan's Republican Party.

When Durant declined then to withdraw, Romney said that election of Durant would repudiate his party leadership.

With the battle lines clearly drawn, a small group of Birchers retaliated with a drive to nominate Durant as the Republican candidate for Governor.

Spokesman for the group was Mrs. Howard Crawford who recently became a Birch chapter leader along with her husband.

Mrs. Crawford says that more than 10,000 Durant stickers are to be mailed out across the State.

To oppose Durant, a number of prominent Michigan Republicans formed a Republican Action Committee. Among them was Wilber M. Brucker, former Governor and Secretary of the Army under former President Eisenhower, who engaged in the battile to the point of stating his political career all over again by running for precinct delegate.

Riding on the outcome of this factional fight, moderate Republicans felt, were George Romney's chances of being elected Michigan's first Republican Governor since 1948.

In the August 7 primary election, the Action Committee swept all but 2 of Grosse Pointe's 29 precincts, defeating many of Durant's delegates. Brucker was among those elected.

I asked Kelly how well the society was represented when petitions were filed in May.

"We had one to three delegates from every chapter," he said.

"Why, we have one chapter with only six members, three of whom filed petitions. The only reason the other three didn't was because they were spouses. However, that's where we made a mistake.

"We should have had one member of the family file Republican, the other Democrat, and we would have improved our chances."

Kelly says the 14th District is a "shambles" but it still represents the stronghold of Birchism in Michigan.

Kelly also says the society is running into heavy sledding—in the State and especially in Detroit—that a general overhaul is underway and that the rolls are going to be cleaned of discontents and inactive members.

He expects to see a considerable loss of membership in the process.

One gets the feeling that Detroiters are cooling off on the society at the same time that it's making inroads in the suburbs. During the past year new chapters have formed in Birmingham, Royal Oak, Redford Township, Warren and Grosse Pointe.

Apparently the sturdiest growth is taking place outstate where parent chapters are keeping a foothold and are forming new ones.

There are chapters in Lansing, Grand Rapids, Flint, Saginaw, and Benton Harbor and a number have been formed in nearby smaller communities.

A breakdown would indicate that there are about 60 chapters in the Detroit and suburban area and another 35 to 40 outstate.

"What we need," says Kelly, "is working dedicated people. If they aren't, we're better off without them."

When a Bircher makes that statement—to paraphrase Robert Welch—he means business all the way.

Reflections Upon U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the evolution of history, amid changing times and the sequence of events and progress, there is a need, from time to time, to take an evaluative look at significant aspects of our national policy.

Recently, the Wisconsin State Journal published a thoughtful article, by the distinguished commentator, Eric Sevareid, entitled "Our Age of Innocence Ends."

As in all broad-scope evaluations, we find there are, of course, differences of views on significant features of policy. The article, however, I believe, deserves the thoughtful consideration of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR AGE OF INNOCENCE ENDS
(By Eric Sevareid)

If political thinkers find joy and surcease in the sports pages, it is not only because most sports authorities write better than most political writers.

It is because a baseball inning, game, or season comes to an end and you can add up the score. In politics, especially in world politics, all you can do is add gains, subtract losses, and try to estimate the general drift of the contest, which never ends.

For the past month, this reporter has been sitting with groups of public servants, businessmen, writers, and historians engaged in this cosmic guessing game. There was no unanimity; yet there seemed to be a general optimistic consensus about the prospects for America and Western ways of living.

Ruling out a fatal push on the wrong push button, there was a deep feeling that the gathering of Western military, political, and economic strength is now, and is going to be, more than the totalitarian oppositions can cope with.

The rise and thrust of American, European, and Japanese economic power and pressure seemed to most a giant fact, hardly susceptible to overestimation. The irresistible contagion of Western popular arts and materials could only be noted with the inescapable conclusion that in this realm, at least, the West has already won the world.

None thought the Soviet Union is "ahead of us in science," not even in military science, save for rocket thrust. Very few expressed fears that the United States would break its democratic stride and fall under the essential control of any military cum scientific elite, while virtually all accepted that Soviet society has become measurably more liberal, more open to foreign influences.

Most discounted the alleged deadlines of Soviet propaganda, observing that no "newly emergent" people in the world, since the war, had voluntarily chosen the Communist raod.

All seemed agreed, however, that strategic regions of the globe could still be lost to subversion and coup and that still other regions could become unmanageable by reason of population growth.

When we considered the course of American foreign policy in this country, agreement emerged on what seemed fundamental alterations, but other uncertainties remained.

It seemed clear that this Nation has permanently put behind her notions of political imperialism. There seemed agreement that in terms of "economic imperialism" there has been a great change, however, gradually (and imperceptibly, to hostile young idealists abroad) it has come about.

There was a feeling that at long last, for the first time since the days of our somewhat irresponsible meddling in China with the open-door performance, we have come to understand the realities and responsibilities of power and to roughly equate our practical commitments abroad with our military and economic strength. We can back up our alliances anywhere around the globe; we can provide the money we have committed to foreign societies.

But a great doubt remained. It concerns our moral commitments abroad.

We persist in thinking that we know what is best for other people in terms of their own domestic institutions and political mores, and what we think is best is the Anglo-Saxon concept of life.

We can insist on national freedom for any emerging country and perhaps get away with it, because that is the drift of the world; but we cannot insist, or so many of us felt, on internal, individual freedoms. We cannot act as a transmission belt to give virtues that are essentially personal ones to sovereign states, either by imposition or by persuasion.

This Calvinistic approach to a widely varied world is as dangerously futile now as it was in the days when Woodrow Wilson, the "Presbyterian priest," was saying that we would "teach the Mexicans to elect good men."

There was a current of conviction in these discussions that we have hastily, foolishly, and in the face of 50 years' bitter experience morally overextended ourselves; that in this realm our commitments far outbalance our resources.

We can hold up political democracy and the rule of law as an aspiration and help others toward it by many quiet, unofficial actions. What we cannot and must not do is make it a requirement—for our aid, our friendship, or our recognition.

Most of the roundtablers could see no alternative to a frankly pluralistic foreign policy—aiding here, withdrawing aid there, giving de facto recognition to one, de jure recognition to another, intervening where necessary. None could formulate an overall, governing principle, moral or otherwise, that really fits the mosaic of this political world; none argued that our moral responsibilities could extend beyond our practical capacity to implement them.

Some may see in these conclusions the abandonment of the great American tradition; but most of us in the Aspen discussions saw, rather, the end of the age of American innocence in foreign policy.

Congressman Bonner Reviews Merchant Marine Policy at Propeller Club Dinner in Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, Defenders Day, September 12, is observed annually in Baltimore to commemorate

the defense of the city from the British invaders, during the War of 1812. For some years, the Propeller Club, port of Baltimore, has been observing this day with a dinner.

This year we were privileged to have as our principal speaker, our colleague from North Carolina and chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, HERBERT BONNER. His remarks merit careful study by the Congress and therefore I am inserting them in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, DEMOCRAT, OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE PROPELLER CLUB, PORT OF BALTIMORE, MD., WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1962, AT THE SHERATON-BELVEDERE HOTEL

I always find a visit to the port of Baltimore very pleasant because this city is one of the foremost maritime ports in our country. I know this—not only from the point of view of the recordbreaking tonnages passing over your docks—but from the point of view of the recognition and interest of your people in the significance of the port to the entire life of the community.

It is a special honor and privilege to be here tonight as we commemorate the 148th anniversary of the bombardment of Fort McHenry here in Baltimore and the composition of the great and inspiring poem by Francis Scott Key—which is now our national anthem, "The Star-Spangled Banner." This occasion is a major milestone in our precious national heritage.

In the closing days of a Congress—as I hope these are—it is customary to review matters considered by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during the previous 2 years. It is a good time to appraise the status and future of our vital American Merchant Marine, and other major, and related, areas of our committee responsibility such as our all-important fisheries; the Coast Guard; the Coast and Geodetic Survey; the Panama Canal; and finally, oceanography, the new field of activity which means so much to our future economy and security.

In my remarks tonight I have chosen a topic from among all these things that is of the greatest importance to the future of the port of Baltimore, and, indeed, to the entire country. I think my subject is especially fitting when we think of Francis Scott Key watching the "perilous fight," anxiously seeking for "proof through the night that our flag was still there."

I do not refer to the spectacular record being made by the new ships being placed in operation by our subsidized lines, their performance, and the manner in which they are overwhelming their competitors in the shipment of cargo. I could only wish that there were more of them available than there are.

Nor do I refer to our newest bid for peaceful supremacy on the seas, the nuclear ship *Savannah*, which despite an unfortunate series of troubles, both mechanical and human, offers great promise as a prototype for the pattern of the future.

I refer instead to the woeful position in which the United States finds itself with respect to oceangoing bulk carriers—those specially designed vessels needed for the carriage of the critical and strategic ores and fuels upon which our security depends.

Until about World War II, we could probably boast that we were fairly self-sufficient in the matter of raw materials to enable our essential industrial machinery to function.

We had the iron ore from the Great Lakes region. We had our vast American coal and oil supplies.

The end of World War II saw the virtual depletion of the formerly rich Mesabi Iron Range of Minnesota. It is no longer a dependable, major source for iron ore production.

Competent authorities said our oil resources were also approaching the limits of their production. Of necessity, therefore, we had to look elsewhere for our supplies.

You, in the port of Baltimore, have come to realize that we are securing our iron and related ores from such farflung places as Liberia, Venezuela, Brazil, and Peru. As new sources of raw materials are developed, and political conditions change, we may have to seek other, or additional sources in distant oversea areas.

In this connection, the cost and assured availability of ocean transportation are vital factors in the ability of the United States to sell its products and services in the markets of the world. Ore, being a low rate commodity as far as freight is concerned, is particularly sensitive to increases and decreases in cost. As freight rates fluctuate around the world the availability of ships likewise fluctuates.

The depletion of our own resources, and the growing demands of our economy and security have vastly increased our need for specialized and efficient transport of bulk materials. As the needs of the United States—the world's greatest consumer of raw materials—have grown, new technology has led to the development of modern ore carriers capable of serving our vast requirements—as long as our business is more attractive than someone else's. Foreign-flag carriers of 40,000, 50,000, and even 60,000 tons are common sights in our ore receiving ports. Recent figures reveal that some 100,000 tons of iron ore, alone, are daily imported in ships—nearly all under foreign flag. Yet, despite our dependence on foreign ore sources and the need for economical and certain transportation, the U.S. Government has not seen fit to encourage the construction of American-flag bulk carriers.

It is true that a number of conversions of warbuilt ships have been made. They are presently operated under the American flag. But, these have only a limited remaining life, and do not operate with the efficiency of specially designed new carriers.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 contemplates a balanced fleet under the American flag.

There have been drastic changes in the pattern of commerce since World War II. Prior to the war most of our commerce moved in liner vessels. Today, over 70 percent of our commerce moves in bulk carriers—tankers, ore carriers, and tramps. We cannot say, with any truth, that our fleet is balanced.

Our tanker fleet is rapidly becoming obsolete with no particular inducement for its replacement. Rather the contrary. The uncertainties of labor in this field have led to the construction of other means of domestic oil transportation. Foreign-flag ships dominate the movement of our petroleum imports. Our tanker fleet faces a very lean future. Our aging tramp fleet is barely afloat.

With respect to ore carriers, you here in the port of Baltimore are fully aware of the application made for the construction, in American shipyards, of two modern ore carriers to sail under the American flag. You remember the action of the Department of Commerce. Construction subsidy was refused.

Small as the number of vessels proposed, it would have represented more than a 50-percent increase in modern American-flag bulk carriers. It would at least have been a short step in the right direction for the future. Denied subsidy to help offset the unfavorable cost differential between building in the U.S. economy and abroad, the applicant contracted for construction of the ships abroad. Denial of the subsidy not only aggravated the imbalance of our fleet, but hurt our prospects for an assured supply of ore in the future, and deprived our shipyards of much needed business.

In passing, it is interesting to note that the shipyard in Hamburg that received the business has gone into bankruptcy, thus delaying for a further period the addition of two ships to serve the port of Baltimore, and its great steel industry.

While the construction of these two vessels in the overall picture is relatively small, nevertheless, it would have represented an approach to the problem of meeting our woeful shortage in this vital field.

It is well for us to have the finest cargo liners in the world and the finest and fastest passenger vessels. But, unless we plan for the construction of a balanced merchant marine—dry cargo liners, passenger ships, tankers, and bulk carriers—we will find ourselves at an extreme disadvantage, competitively, in peace and in war, by reason of shortages in the various major categories of essential vessels.

In the field of passenger ships we are justly proud of the magnificent SS *United States*. Believing that the national interest and American prestige required it, some years ago we succeeded in having legislation enacted for the construction of a sister ship to the *United States*, as well as a superliner for use in the Pacific. Successive administrations, in their wisdom—or perhaps lack of it—have not seen fit to implement this legislation. The result is that since that time we have seen the new French liner, *France*, go into operation. The Italian Line is building superliners to serve substantially the same trade. Others are active in building their passenger fleets. In this field we are at a disadvantage in having but one fully modern passenger liner to carry the American flag to support the prestige of the United States.

In the dry cargo field, we can be proud of the few vessels recently placed in operation. They are among the finest vessels in the world. But, we should be greatly concerned that a slowdown in the replacement program means that we will be unable to replace our entire fleet in time to reap all the advantages of our present advanced designs.

In my opinion, it is vital that the administration be jolted from its present "penny wise and pound foolish" policy in the conduct of its merchant marine. Too late, we will awaken to the fact that our deficiencies will prove far more costly than any current investment that we might make.

The Propeller Club of the United States can render a great service, not only to the American merchant marine, but to our country in using all its efforts to secure the abandonment of a negative policy in favor of the development of a true awakening to the realities of our needs.

We are all familiar with the various tangible argument for having an adequate merchant marine as a vital element of national seapower—as an indispensable adjunct to our economy and to our defense posture. But there is a deeper reason and meaning for this which is brought to mind by the words of the brilliant Henry Ward Beecher: "A thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag, see not the flag, but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truths, the history that belong to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of liberty and men rejoiced in it."

Let's stand together—all of us who meet here tonight—for the development of a greater and stronger American merchant marine to carry the message symbolized by "The Star-Spangled Banner" on all the trade lanes of the world.

Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to present Congressman BONNER at the din-

ner and my introductory remarks were as follows:

INTRODUCTION BY HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ OF CONGRESSMAN HERBERT C. BONNER, CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, AT PROPELLER CLUB DINNER, SEPTEMBER 12, 1962, SHERATON BELVEDERE HOTEL

I am very honored, indeed, to be accorded the privilege to present tonight's principal speaker on the occassion of this Defender's Day dinner of the Propeller Club, port of Baltimore.

To those of us who are interested in the American merchant marine, the presence of this distinguished Member of Congress with us this evening, is a source of genuine pleasure and an occasion to which we have eagerly looked forward.

A Member of the House of Representatives for the past 23 years, and chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for the past 8, this outstanding legislator has gained the cooperation and earned the respect of Members on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats alike.

His record of progress and achievement in the area of maritime legislation is one which has attained for him a stature that is recognized not only nationally, but—if you please—internationally as well.

To recount all of his accomplishments would require much time; therefore, I shall endeavor to be brief, touching on some of the highlights of his service.

Because of his dedicated interest to, and his keen insight in merchant marine affairs, he has been responsible for and instrumental in the enactment of legislation ranging from the Small Boat Act of 1958—a major contribution in the field of small boat safety—to the construction of superliners and the nuclear-powered merchant vessel.

Also, we can point with justifiable pride that under his chairmanship, we have seen the development of mortgage insurance which is so vital to the rebuilding of our merchant marine. We can likewise point to his sponsorship of legislation for the construction of a nuclear-powered icebreaker.

It is fitting and proper, therefore, that his activities in these varied fields have been recognized by the Ole Evinrude Award and the Robert L. Hague Award, which stand out among the many honors bestowed upon him.

And, I should like to add, that those of us who have had the pleasure of working with him, are the first to acknowledge that these honors are fully deserved. May I say that my personal association with him for nearly 16 years has more than convinced me that he is the "propeller"—the guiding force—in the work of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The American merchant marine and shipping industry are indeed fortunate to have a man of his exceptional caliber and attainments to safeguard their interests in the face of growing competition.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am extremely proud to present to you my respected and devoted colleague, my chairman, and our friend, the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina.

The Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the September 11, 1962, issue of the Vision Letter which is a weekly analysis of Latin American Affairs by Vision, Inc., New York, N.Y.

With the Cuban situation worsening practically daily, and with claims and counterclaims flying through the air, it is time for clear-cut assessments of the Cuban problem as to basically what issues are involved, what the responsibilities are, and what must be done.

I believe the Vision Letter presents a very good analysis of the Cuban problem which should be brought to the attention of the American people.

Of interest is an introductory note to the editorial by the editors of Vision telling of their overall policy with reference to commenting on the Cuban matter and the reasons they feel compelled to speak.

The editors say:

Until today, the editors of Vision have refrained from harsh criticism of the Kennedy administration's handling of hemisphere affairs out of a sense of restraint and the recognition that a new government deserves time to "shake down" its operation. However, the gathering storm in Cuba and the apparent futility of the Government's attempts to cope with it have reached a point where it becomes our duty and responsibility to speak.

The Vision Letter on Cuba follows:

[From the Vision Letter, Sept. 11, 1962]

CUBA, THE HEMISPHERE, AND THE FAILURE OF LEADERSHIP IN WASHINGTON

Candidate John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in 1960, was outraged that international communism had reached Cuba—"just 90 miles off our shores." As an issue, it helped put him in the White House. Today, 20 months after the New Frontier was staked out in Washington, Cuba is still there—still Communist, still 90 miles away, but now armed to the teeth and pointed like a spear at the heart of America.

For more than a year and a half the people of the United States have waited for a straight answer to this one vital question: When are we going to drive the Communists out of Cuba?

Since the failure of the Bay of Pigs landing in April of last year, the administration has given no honest answer. A year ago the word was "watchful waiting." Last week it was "close surveillance."

But what have we been watching and what are we surveying? And what has happened in this hemisphere over the past 20 months while Washington has been focusing its microscope? The answers are shocking.

Important nations, once stanch U.S. friends, have drifted toward neutralism. Despite administration efforts to quarantine Cuba, leftwing elements throughout the hemisphere have continued to receive moral and material support from Fidel Castro. The young in every Latin American country continue to be contaminated by his image and ideology.

The administration's failure to provide its Latin American friends with the leadership they expect has surrendered by default the political initiative to the growing ranks of ultranationalists, leftwingers, and other extremists. Coming at a time of spectacular Soviet political and scientific advances, this seeming U.S. paralysis is driving impressionable Latin American masses first into neutralism and, ultimately, the arms of the Kremlin.

Those who had been our friends in former times—and could be again—are becoming frustrated and disgusted. Unable alone to halt the trend to the left, they are beginning to grow cold to our ineffectual pleading, ridiculing our policies in public forums, and using the threat of closer relations with the Soviet as blackmail to elicit economic concessions.

In this poisonous atmosphere our vaunted Alliance for Progress, which was to have been the salvation of the hemisphere, is "dying on the vine"—a fate which Washington's wishful thinkers had reserved for Communist Cuba.

In Cuba itself, Castro's band of bearded irregular has been turned into a modern army of 300,000 men. The Cuban people are killed and held in a slavery more tyrannical than that of any other Soviet satellite. Russian technicians and equipment have built bases capable of hampering the U.S. radar-defense system, of interfering with our space program, of conducting long-range electronic intelligence, and, if necessary, hurling even medium-range missiles deep into the United States from the comfortable distance of 90 miles away.

This is the factual, undeniable political and strategic picture of our hemisphere today. But incredible as it may seem, some administration spokesmen still proclaim the success of the quarantine policy—because, it is said, Latin America has now seen Castro's true face and will, therefore, not follow Cuba into the Soviet web. Incredibly, too, Democratic leaders are trying to alibi this administration's ineptness by accusing Eisenhower of allowing the Communists to establish a toehold in Cuba.

All this is dangerous nonsense. The time has come for plain talk, not out of political partisanship, but out of due regard for the interests and even survival of our country. In this hemisphere, Kennedy's policies are not winning in Cuba and they are not winning anywhere else. While Cuba is central to the entire problem, it is not the only factor. To see this and why, it is only necessary to review the record of this administration's promise and performance.

President Kennedy came into office at a time when a steadily deteriorating U.S.-Latin American relationship, owing to neglect under both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, was being rectified by President Eisenhower in his last year in office. In successive moves, Ike had already announced a half-billion-dollar aid program for Latin America as a forerunner of the Alliance, had finally installed a brilliant, able Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs in the person of Thomas Mann, and had shown insight and courage by setting the plans for a Cuban invasion.

From the day of his inauguration, however, Kennedy has failed dismally to live up to his promise for new talent and new activity in our Latin American policies. Decisionmaking became a compromise of views among such men as Adlai Stevenson, Chester Bowles, Arthur Schlesinger and, in the case of Cuba, New York Times editorialist Herbert Matthews who, until recently, was still splitting hairs over whether the Cuban revolution was "doctrinally Communist" or merely "under heavy Communist influence". Finally, Kennedy assigned a young campaign aid, Richard Goodwin, as his personal watchdog. Goodwin's credentials: he invented the term "Alliance for Progress".

Fanning out from center, things went from bad to worse: J.F.K.'s brother Teddy, now a senatorial candidate, got a factfinding tour; Jimmy Symington, son of the Senator from Missouri, took his guitar on a food for peace mission; Igor Cassini, a New York cafe society columnist, was a cloak and dagger go-between with the Dominican Republic.

Today, despite the worth of some of the men now at the top, the crisis of leadership continues. Who really runs our hemisphere affairs—Edwin Martin, Teodoro Moscoso, Fowler Hamilton, Dean Rusk? No one man has a final say up to the President himself. But the lack of leadership only underscores a more dangerous failure: an inability to understand our historic relationship with the

Latin American states both singly and collectively.

It is this inability to understand Latin American facts of life that has led to: the complete misunderstanding of the military role in Latin American history, culminating in the fiasco of suspended relations with Peru; the cliche-ridden over-emphasis on miracle reforms—land, tax, etc.—that were to provide an overnight solution to all development problems, but instead have frightened away domestic and foreign investment capital; the naive pandering to Latin American "resentments" as interpreted by leftwing critics; and the weak, hat-in-hand quest for inter-American action to thwart the Communist intrusion into the Caribbean.

Worst of all has been the administration's inability or unwillingness to comprehend that when the chips are down, slogans and airy ideals are no substitute for the reality of power and the will to use it. In a recent dispatch from Washington, New York Herald Tribune columnist Marguerite Higgins wrote that "Americans of great stature, both in and out of government, Democrats as well as Republicans, are now asking whether President Kennedy will preside over the decline of America as a great power".

The future will tell whether this is unduly alarmist, but it is not unduly alarmist to state that the decline of America as a hemisphere power has already set in and that this decline cannot be stopped as long as Castro is in Cuba and Cuba a Soviet base. For what goes for Laos and Berlin goes for Cuba, too; namely, that timidity—or caution as it is referred to among the White House liberals—in the face of Soviet challenge only invites further Communist encroachment, and that firmness forces a Soviet backdown.

Soviet prestige rises at the same rate as U.S. prestige drops. In Latin America today U.S. prestige is dropping rapidly every day that Castro remains in power. The Kremlin and Cuban propaganda machines grind out the same message throughout the hemisphere: that the future lies with the tough-minded Soviets rather than with the decadent and luxury loving Yankees.

In a region that puts great stress on being "muy macho"—very manly—this is a telling argument. We should not forget that the administration was seriously misreading Latin American political opinion when it reached the conclusion that Latin Americans will not tolerate any modification of the principle of nonintervention no matter how politically necessary this may be. Latin Americans, including such leaders as Quadros, Lopez Mateos and Frondizi, were not shocked by the Bay of Pigs—but by its failure. There was no official reaction during the 2 days in which the issue was in doubt. It was only when the invasion failed that the reaction started. And the administration's caution because of possible Soviet countermoves in several other danger spots throughout the world is regarded as plain softness.

At the moment of writing, the Soviet Union is blatantly testing U.S. nerve by threat of nuclear war should we decide to put the Monroe Doctrine and the existing inter-American defense treaties to a test. In this context the solutions offered by the administration in recent days—that is, to isolate Castro even further economically with hopes that the discontent in Cuba will blossom into revolution; to blockade the island; and to convoke another foreign ministers' meeting—are either naive or foolhardy. The first is plainly ludicrous, the second is a case of locking the barn after the cow has been stolen, and the third would only cater to even more irresponsible fence sitting by Latin American governments.

With the Russian threat in the open, it is clearly too late for wordy and meaningless OAS palliatives. Nor can we be cowed into inaction by the possibility that we may have to engage in strategic and political struggles on other fronts. The argument is already being advanced that we cannot address the Cuban problem for fear the Russians will repay in kind in Berlin or elsewhere. This is mealymouthed defeatism. It is patently obvious that if the Kremlin used similar reasoning, it would have had to give up its present incursion into Cuba—for fear of U.S. counteraction in, say, Albania or Germany.

On April 20 of last year, 3 days after the Cuban invasion began, President Kennedy in a speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors stated that U.S. "restraint is not inexhaustible," and that the United States does not intend to abandon Cuba to communism. He said: "Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction if the Nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are the security of our Nation."

We believe the time to meet the primary obligations of which the President spoke has now arrived. Kennedy must make it known to the people of this country and to the Nations of this hemisphere that he is willing to accept the challenge and will now move to reverse the policies of inaction and retreat. He must also state clearly that he no longer considers a Soviet base in this hemisphere a matter for the OAS or a subject for international debate, but one for the United States alone to resolve.

The technicalities—whether to act through the instrumentality of a Caribbean NATO, a Cuban Government-in-exile, or U.S. power alone—are up to the President and his military advisers. But as a first step and without further delay, the President must announce that he is taking personal charge of this threat and that it is his own determination as Commander in Chief to eliminate the Russian beachhead from this hemisphere.

Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Times written by Henry J. Taylor:

PRESIDENT SPOKE STIRRING WORDS ON CUBA, BUT WHERE ARE DEEDS?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

In Washington, the American Society of Newspaper Editors cheered the President of the United States as he finished a speech. The date: April 20, 1961, 3 days after the Cuba fiasco.

The President stated: "On that unhappy island the news has grown worse instead of better. But let the record show that our restraint is not inexhaustible.

"Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction, if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are the security of our Nation.

"Should that time ever come, we do not intend to be lectured on 'intervention' by those whose character was stamped for all time on the bloody streets of Budapest, nor would we expect or accept the same outcome which this small band of Cuban refugees must have known they were changing. There are lessons from this sobering episode for all to learn. Some are clear today.

"First, it is clear that the forces of communism are not to be underestimated, in Cuba or elsewhere.

"Second, it is clear that this Nation must take an even closer and more realistic look at the menace of external Communist intervention and domination in Cuba. The American people are not complacent about Iron Curtain tanks and planes less than 90 miles from our shores. The evidence is clear and the hour is late.

"Third, and lastly, it is clearer than ever that we face a relentless struggle in every corner of the globe. The armies * * * serve primarily as the shield behind which subversion, infiltration and a host of other tactics steadily advance. * * * Our security may be lost without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border. We intend to profit from this lesson."

It was a fine speech. The great applause of the Society of Newspaper Editors spoke the Nation's enormous approval. Those who question whether we know what we should do about Cuba should reread what the President said.

We have the words, we have the policy. We do not have the followthrough. Where is the deed?

Is Cuba farther away than 90 miles today? Are there fewer Iron Curtain dangers there now to let us be complacent? If "the evidence is clear and the hour is late" in April 1961, what would you call the evidence and the hour in September 1962?

Where, oh, where, in our inaction is the "profit from this lesson?" What action was there in the President's statement August 29 and September 4?

The chief decay in any nation's strength is the loss of morale resulting from failing to do what it says (and knows) it must do. Nations can stand many strains, but they cannot stand the loss of moral fiber either in their leaders or within themselves.

Editors everywhere, citizens everywhere, should ask, "What happened, Mr. President, to that speech?"

There is nothing more dangerous for America than to be a paper tiger.

Cleanest City in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is always a privilege to observe development in the areas which one represents, and especially is it gratifying when the leaders of our municipalities and their organizations make monumental efforts to give our people a better place in which to live and rear their families.

Only recently, the city of Jennings, La., has earned a most significant title under the guidance of Mayor John L. Conner and the city council, along with the inspired assistance of civil-minded residents, in that for the third consecutive year—despite hardy opposition from

other cities in the State of Louisiana—Jennings has been declared "cleanest city in Louisiana."

Because over the years of competition this signal honor was accorded to no other city, the Louisiana State Legislature in its regular session this year unanimously passed a resolution declaring Jennings the "world's cleanest cities capital."

Mr. Speaker, this display of community spirit is the type thing that makes America great, and I commend to the membership of this body the following resolution which was unanimously passed by the Louisiana State Legislature:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 73

A concurrent resolution to declare the city of Jennings, La., the "world's cleanest cities capital."

Whereas the city of Jennings, La., has been adjudged the cleanest city in Louisiana for 3 successive years, and

Whereas such consecutive recognition has entitled the city of Jennings to permanent possession of the cleanest city contest trophy, and

Whereas the city of Jennings is believed to be the only city in the United States to have achieved such statewide honor for so continuous a period of time: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana (the House of Representatives thereof concurring), That the legislature does hereby extend its congratulations to the city of Jennings, La., for its achievement in being designated for the third consecutive year as the cleanest city in the State of Louisiana; and be it further

Resolved, That in recognition of the civic pride thus exhibited by the citizens and the governing authority of the city of Jennings and the honors which have been bestowed upon the city, the legislature hereby declares the city of Jennings the world's cleanest cities capital; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution shall be transmitted to the mayor and governing authority of the city of Jennings, La.

C. C. "TADDY" AYCOCK,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

J. THOS. JEWELL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Jennings, La., is certainly to be congratulated for this position of leadership earned through the untiring efforts of a truly American community.

Afro-Indian Ocean Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the transcendent geopolitical event in Asia since the collapse of Japan seapower in 1945 and the withdrawal of the British from India, is the takeover of Indonesia.

Strategically located islands in that vast area dominate the barrier separating the Pacific and Indian Oceans and form an avenue from southeast Asia to Australia. These facts serve to emphasize the importance of the Indian Ocean in the future.

In the July-August 1962 bulletin of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of South Carolina, its distinguished director, Anthony Harrigan, deals with this weighty subject from the naval viewpoint, as follows:

THE AFRO-INDIAN OCEAN AREA

(By Anthony Harrigan)

Until the Second World War the American interest in the Afro-Indian Ocean area was virtually nonexistant. American diplomacy was minimal, for the region was largely under British control. Such economic interests as U.S. citizens had were concentrated in the Arabian peninsula where oil exploration rights had been obtained. Elsewhere, Americans sought no more than the conventional rights of trade, though American churches had missionary activities in some areas. American opinion was profoundly ignorant of the Afro-Indian oceanic region. As a government and a nation, the United States took no stand on the Afro-Indian world and was without a settled policy.

World War II brought the United States into this area of the globe. A supply line to Russia was established in Iran. Military air communications were set up between the United States, Africa and the Indian subcontinent. The importance of oil from the Persian Gulf area was increasingly understood as a result of war operations. With outbreak of the cold war and revolutionary changes in the Afro-Asian world, the United States began to look toward this arena of history. President Truman, in telling Stalin of U.S. resistance to Soviet designs, warned that he "would move the fleet as far as the Persian Gulf."

In the world epoch now emerging, it seems certain that the Afro-Indian Ocean will be the cockpit of history. Along its rim are ancient nations—only now finding a place in the modern world—and new nations that seek both independence and prosperity on a Western scale. Dreams of national destiny are numerous and conflicting. Little if anything unifies the Afro-Indian Oceanic nations except a burning desire to assert a new status. Over these nations—from the countries of southeast Asia to those of east and southern Africa—is the threat of Chinese expansionism.

For Communist China, the Afro-Indian world is the hope of new Chinas beyond the seas—the prospect of outlets for population burdens and for raw materials to create a new Chinese empire.

The Chinese aim of southward and westward expansion is manifested in many ways—in ceaseless pressure on India's northern borders, in guerrilla war drives against the old countries of Indochina, in fomenting of Chinese elements in Indonesia, and in political efforts from Burma to the Horn of Africa.

China's dreams of destiny relate to an historic past. For few Westerners realize that China has played a major role in the Afro-Indian Ocean in centuries past. In the 15th century, China occupied Ceylon—now an independent country. Chinese traders worked up and down the east Africa coast in ancient times.

It is in the interest of all the Afro-Indian nations aspiring to freedom that Communist China not control the ocean on which they are dependent and that ties them together, one to another, by trade. It also is of high importance to free Japan that the Indian Ocean not become a Chinese lake. For Japan's great industrial postwar resurgence is built in large measure upon oil from the Mideast. This oil moves by tanker down the Arabian Sea, into the Indian Ocean, through the Malaccas and north to the home islands. This is an economic lifeline for Japan as significant as was Britain's lifeline through Suez during the years the Indian subcontinent was in British hands.

The interest of the Afro-Indian nations and of Japan also is the interest of the United States. For if these nations were to be overwhelmed by China or another aggressive power, the entire continent of Africa would lie exposed to domination. Chinese activity in Algeria and Morocco is evidence of the sweep of Chinese ambition. The prospect of a Chinese drive from the South China Sea to the Mediterranean is no more fantastic than Portugal's incredible conquest from the Atlantic to the Bay of Bengal in the 15th and 16th centuries. With the Afro-Indian nations and all Africa under its control, the Atlantic powers would be outflanked and Latin America would be imperiled.

It is essential therefore, that the United States help check Chinese aggression on the strategic frontiers. And one of the most important—perhaps the most important—strategic frontier is in the Indian Ocean. It is on this watery vastness of 23 million square miles—14 percent of the earth's surface—that Chinese expansionism can be contained. If the Chinese can be deterred from extending their influence across the Indian Ocean, it will be one of the great feats of modern history—as important as stopping Hitler's drive into Russia or toward Suez.

This then, is the key world area, and it is a strange idea to Americans for they are unaccustomed to think of the Indian Ocean. They are unfamiliar with its world and history. The names on the land of Europe, North Africa—and the island-dotted vastness of the Pacific—are known to the people after two world wars, after struggles in the motherlands of Europe and the coral islands of the South Pacific.

But the Indian Ocean has never played an important part in the national experience of Americans. Throughout the period of our history as a nation the Afro-Indian Ocean has been a British lake. The Royal Navy kept the peace from Singapore to Simonstown, and from Aden to Fremantle, Australia. But the Royal Navy is today gone from that ocean, except for a small force for showing the flag and handling emergency situations. The Indian Ocean is the last remaining power vacuum on the globe. No strong naval forces or air forces stand guard there as deterrent or determinant.

But that day is soon drawing to a close. Communist China already is the third submarine power on the globe. These submarines menace the shipping on which the Afro-Indian Ocean community depends—as much so as German submarines threatened the Atlantic community in World War II.

The Indian Ocean is essential to the Afro-Indian nations. Indian textiles, Japan's fuel, Arabian oil, wool and foodstuffs from Australia, iron ore to Japan, copper from the Rhodesian copper belt, Pakistan's communications between the two areas of her country—all depend upon water routes. The rich traffic of the Indian Ocean feeds the economies of a score of nations. An indication of the extent of the Indian Ocean commerce from east to west may be gaged by the fact that when the Suez Canal was blocked in 1956 approximately 400 ships a day passed Cape Town, South Africa.

It is clear, therefore, that the vast oceanic region must be afforded protection in the form of naval forces against Chinese imperialism at sea. Here is the immediate task for the United States—creation and deployment of a naval force, preferably a nuclear task force—capable of deterring aggression against the free countries of the Afro-Indian world, precisely as the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean has deterred ag-

gression against Greece, Turkey and other lands.

There is, however, a mammoth task before Americans, a task of understanding in the Afro-Indian world. The history of the Afro-Indian Ocean is ancient and complex. It bears lessons that are important to the United States and other free world countries if they are to survive in an age of ruthless aggression.

The basic lesson is that masters of the Afro-Indian world—the dominant powers—have been the great seafaring peoples. While India was strategically located for the domination of the ocean, it was the Arabs who in past centuries controlled the ocean and its trade. Indeed the wealth of the Arab world had its source in seapower in the Indian Ocean.

This Arab seapower continued down to the 15th century when the Portuguese, another great seafaring people, realized that the way to stem Moslem expansion in the Mediterranean world was to deprive it of riches at the source. By projecting Portuguese power around Africa to India and Java and beyond, they showed what comprehension of seapower could achieve for a nation. Indeed this Portuguese development of an empire from Europe to the Orient is one of the incredible feats of history. It should be a lesson to the American nation, whose resources are so tremendous but whose vision is not so wide. If the Portuguese could dominate the Afro-Indian Ocean trade routes in the 15th and 16th centuries, then, surely, the United States can deter aggression in the Indian Ocean without unduly stretching its resources. Moreover, the United States has the tremendous advantage of possessing a strong and utterly reliable ally at the eastern end of the Afro-Indian Ocean in Australia—a land that shares strategic and political objectives with the United States.

From the military standpoint, the advantages are immense. Australia offers a secure storage area for special weapons. Australian naval bases, air facilities and military depots provide the backstop facilities that an Afro-Indian ocean fleet would need. Even more than that, Australia offers a base for all the studies—scientific and cultural—needed for a massive projection of American influence into the Afro-Indian Ocean.

The distances are staggering. From Cape Town to Karachi is 4,693 miles. From Fremantle to Karachi is 4,437 miles. To understand what this means, one should bear in mind that from New York to Southhampton England, is 3,355 miles.

Control of the Afro-Indian Ocean means control along a tremendous perimeter—almost a world in itself. It means, for example, control of key areas, such as the Cape of Good Hope, the Strait of Bab el Mandeb at the mouth of the Red Sea, the Strait of Hormuz, and the Bay of Bengal.

From the purely naval standpoint, a central operating base or anchorage is needed—what has been described as "a pre-World War II Japanese type of Truk Island, if you please."

Such a spot exists. It is the atoll of Diego Garcia in the Chago Archipelago, almost in the center of the Indian Ocean. This atoll, with an anchorage 10 miles by 7 miles and an average depth of 80 feet, has a tiny population of only 900. Most important of all, it is a British possession. The likelihood of political dispute over this atoll is virtually nil. At Diego Garcia, fuel and supplies could be stored and central communications established.

From here could be deployed units of the fleet that would have the entire Afro-Indian Ocean as their operating area in support of cold war missions—guarding U.S. and friendly shipping from submarine attack; providing a strong strategic deterrent against missile attack of friendly nations, buttressing friendly governments threatened by Communist agitation or guerrilla-type wars, and providing a strong force to deal with any of the conflict situations likely to appear on the spectrum of war in this distant arena of world history. An Afro-Indian Ocean Fleet could well be the single most important stabilizing and protective factor in the history of the new nations around the rim of the ocean.

Two generations ago, wise and far-seeing Americans understood the American responsibility in the Pacific. They urged the spread of U.S. influence, diplomacy, and naval activities to the far Pacific. They worked unceasingly for a naval force in the Pacific—seeing the challenge from an aggressive Japan. They saw that the power vacuum required U.S. action.

Japan engaged China in a long war. It is not inconceivable that some similar type of protracted war may be started by Communist China against India, a nibbling war—that would duplicate the situation. Or the Communist assault might come from within Africa and move toward the shores of the Afro-Indian Ocean.

The possibilities are numerous and the threats grave. Time is short for Americans to see the challenge and opportunity posed in the Afro-Indian Ocean in an era of global conflict.

Spy Swatters Under Siege

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I am herewith placing in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer of August 10, 1962, dealing with the speech of W. H. Ferry, vice president of the Fund for the Republic, at the 15-State conference of Western Democratic leaders in Seattle. The Fund for the Republic has temporarily shifted its attack from the Committee on Un-American Activities to the FBI and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover.

The editorial follows:

SPY SWATTERS UNDER SIEGE

For nearly two decades, the anti-anti-Communists in America have been urging the rest of us to leave the internal Communist threat ("if, of course there actually is such a threat") to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Upon this theme, they have based their opposition to the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, the late Senator Joseph McCarthy and every other organization and individual interested in calling our attention to the threat of Soviet subversion.

In so arguing, of course, they ignored the fact that the FBI is, as its name suggests, an investigatory agency. Its agents can amass voluminous material on a suspected Soviet agent (as they did in the case of Harry Dexter White). And they can submit this material to the appropriate authorities in the executive branch of the Federal Government (as they also did in the White case). But unless the executive branch chooses to act (as in the White case, it didn't), the Soviet agent is free to proceed with his malevolent handiwork (as White did).

Nonetheless, "Leave it to the FBI" has been a convenient theme song. And because of the enormous esteem in which the FBI and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, are held by the American people, great segments of the U.S. public have, we fear, allowed their anxieties to be quieted.

Now, curiously, the anti-anti-Communists have begun wearing the shoe on the other foot. They are now besieging the FBI itself.

The first of the siege guns was fired the other day by one W. H. Ferry, vice president of the Fund for the Republic, a subsidiary of the Ford Foundation. Speaking before a 15-State conference of Western Democratic leaders in Seattle, Mr. Ferry spoke derisively of the FBI as an agency of "spy swatters."

And he went on to say that if there are as many "spies and saboteurs percolating through the Republic" as Mr. Hoover has suggested, we can only infer that the FBI "is not up to finding and prosecuting them." Hence, "let us set up an agency that can."

If, of course, there should be any step toward the creation of such an agency, we wager that Mr. Ferry would fight it hammer and tong—just as he battled the recent effort of the New Hampshire Legislature to investigate alleged Communist infiltration into New Hampshire's educational apparatus.

The fact of the matter is that the Ferrys of America have erected every conceivable obstacle to impede the campaign against Communist subversion and infiltration—from trying to abolish congressional committees in the investigatory field to destroying the reputation of individuals who have been alert to the nature of the Soviet threat, and from seeking to destroy the few legal weapons we have to combat subversion to fighting to the death for the "civil rights" of traitors.

We hope that the fact that Mr. Ferry delivered his onslaught under the auspices of the Democratic Party does not mean that his fellow Democrats share his convictions about the FBI. We are confident, in fact, that a vast majority of them do not. Just the same, it would behoove those responsible for Mr. Ferry's address in Seattle to set the record straight just as quickly as they can.

The Golden Eagle: Wildlife Expert Defends This Magnificent Bird

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important bills in the area of wildlife conservation is Senate Joint Resolution 105. The bill which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Texas, the Honorable RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, would extend Federal protection to the golden eagle.

One of the outspoken proponents of the bill is Dr. Maurice Broun, the curator of Hawk Mountain Sanctuary—Rural Delivery 2— Kempton, Pa. Dr. Broun is one of the world's outstanding experts on birds of prey. For the past quarter of a century, he has devoted his life to conservation and conservation education. During that time he has been the curator of Hawk Mountain Sanctuary, one of the most unusual wildlife sanctuaries in the world. Thousands of migrating hawks, as well as other migratory birds, are observed at Hawk Mountain every fall.

One of the most disturbing trends in the migrations observed at Hawk Mountain is the declining number of eagles that are seen each year. It is this decline which, among other things, makes Dr. Broun believe in the urgent need for passage of the bill to protect the golden eagle.

On September 4, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carried an extension of remarks by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], in which he opposed the golden eagle protection bill. In order to assure that the Congress receives the views of an outstanding conservationist on Senate Joint Resolution 105, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter from Dr. Broun to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON and a statement by Dr. Broun in reply to Congressman FISHER's remarks of September 4.

The letter and statement follow:

HAWK MOUNTAIN
SANCTUARY ASSOCIATION,
Kempton, Pa., June 14, 1962.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I am writing in behalf of the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association, a conservation group which embraces a farflung membership of 3,000 persons and 41 affiliated organizations dedicated to the preservation of our natural heritage.

Hawk Mountain is one of the few places in the East where golden eagles may be seen regularly in migration. Thousands of people from all over the country come here every fall, to see the eagles—a tremendous attraction—and to draw inspiration from the sight of these magnificient birds.

During a span of 25 fall seasons we have seen 1,277 golden eagles as against 1,686 bald eagles. Most of these birds, however, were seen prior to 1950. Our data indicate a steady erosion in the numbers of both species of eagles: a 33-percent decline in the numbers of golden eagles, and a 30-percent decline in the bald eagles, during the 7-year period from 1954 to 1960, as against a similar period, 1935 to 1941. More alarming, the decline of immature birds during this same period has been over 50 percent. These figures are in accord with the findings of field biologists everywhere. We are deeply concerned over the decline in reproduction of these birds.

Both species suffer persecution because of the unprotected status of the golden eagle. Both species are up against tremendous odds in the battle for survival. Both species must be given rigorous protection, if they are to survive, since hunters and trappers are unable to tell apart the two species in the immature stage.

We are grateful for your interest and concern for the future of the golden eagle. And we are hopeful for prompt, favorable action on Senate Joint Resolution 105.

Sincerely yours,
MAURICE BROUN,
Curator, Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association.

DEFENSE OF THE GOLDEN EAGLE

(By Maurice Brown, curator, Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association, Kempton, Pa.)

I have read, with dismay, Representative FISHER's attack on "The Golden Eagle—A Predatory Bird" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, A6611). This attack is pure propaganda; it is unfair, biased, designed to defeat any legislation sorely needed to save this magnificant bird from extinction.

In my opinion, the "eyewitness accounts" of eagle depredation in the ranchlands of southern Texas are unconvincing, grossly exaggerated. All wildlife experts with any familiarity with the golden eagle admit that occasionally eagles do attack larger animals, and domestic lamb as well. There is no question that in the area discussed by Rep-representaive FISHER, the golden eagle is a serious problem for those individuals whose livelihood depends upon sheep and goats.

But consider the area. I have traveled through Alpine and adjoining areas of southern Texas, and I have been appalled to find nothing but wasteland—an enormous area denuded, devastated by overgrazing. Here the ruined range, with too many sheep and goats, points up the basic problem. As Ian McMillan, a cattle raiser of California has pointed out: "As overgrazed land deteriorates, perennial vegetation gives way to annual, seed-producing shrubs and weeds. Rodents multiply on the abundance of seeds, bringing an increase in the predator population. Ranchers are then quick to blame the predators for their troubles whereas the vasic cause is their abuse of the land"—(Audubon Magazine, March–April, 1962).

Granted then, the golden eagle may do considerable damage to flocks of sheep and goats. But why condemn all golden eagles when the problem is strictly local? It seems to me that if the Texan sheep ranchers were "conservationists" as Representative FISHER would have us believe, they might turn their energies from eagle killing to developing cover which would give protection from the eagle.

The argument that the eagles have been responsible for the depletion of the antelope ignores the fact that antelopes, eagles, all forms of game and predatory creatures lived together on these ranges, before they were disturbed, for millions of years. Impoverishment of the range by overgrazing, and overshooting by hunters, have alone caused the declines in the antelope population. There are plenty of authentic cases where antelope and eagles have raised their young in close proximity, in undisturbed country.

A cattle rancher in the Texas Panhandle, interviewed by Lee W. Arnold, biologist for the Fish and Wildlife Service, had this to say about a pair of golden eagles that nested near a cattle watering trough: "The birds have been there for 5 or 6 years. Year before last I destroyed their eggs in an effort to discourage them, but last year I let them raise young so I could see for myself what they were doing. During the season every time I checked the nest there were rabbit feet under it. In all, I would say they had a barrel full. I did not find any parts of antelope even though I was looking for them. I have heard that sometimes they eat calves, but now I am beginning to wonder if perhaps they do me more good than harm."

If Representative FISHER would get out to see for himself the deterioration of the land wrought by his constituents, and open his mind to ecological principles which govern the role of predators, he might find it in his soul to be less cynical and hostile toward a bird that no true outdoorsman wishes to see exterminated.

The Boom in Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, not long ago President Kennedy asked his Council of Economic Advisers to study the reasons for the remarkable economic advance of Western Europe during recent years. The President's hope was that we could learn something which could be applied to the task of speeding up our own economic growth.

There are many persons who expect and, indeed, hope that this study will show that the conscious use of heavy Government budget deficits and central economic planning were largely responsible for the boom in Western Europe.

I am confident that an objective study of recent Western European economic history will lead to different conclusions. On July 27, an article, entitled "West Europe's Boom," appeared in the Wall Street Journal. The article convincingly demonstrated that the key to recent economic advances in Western Europe has been government-business cooperation which has led to heightened business confidence and a surge of economic activity.

As the article says:

Europeans discussing the causes of this success talk of adequate depreciation allowances, taxes geared to promote expansion and exports, sound fiscal policies, government stands against big wage hikes and, above all, business confidence that governments are really trying to encourage free enterprise.

It is also useful to note that the economic planning in France, which is of great interest to our own would-be planners, was designed not simply to stimulate consumer demand, but rather to encourage business expansion and investment.

Interestingly enough, the article also points out that such budget deficits as have been incurred have been held within the limits of national savings in order to prevent inflation. Furthermore, interest rates have been about 2 or 3 percent higher than in the United States—a fact which has lead to the attraction of both foreign and domestic investment funds.

I should add that we could also learn something from the remarkable economic recovery of Japan. An article in the Wall Street Journal of July 24 discusses this recovery and points out that:

No heavy Government spending—deficit or otherwise—lies behind the boom.

It does, indeed, appear as though there are useful lessons to be learned from both the European and Japanese experiences. I only hope that the economic theorists of the New Frontier can lay aside their bias long enough to draw the proper conclusions.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles from the Wall Street Journal be included in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 24, 1962]

BRAKING A BOOM—JAPAN'S DOLLAR DRAIN, INFLATION SPUR TIGHTENS CONTROLS

(By Igor Oganesoff)

TOKYO.—Japanese officials, worried about some recent turns in their roaring economy, are now trying to take some of the zoom out of the boom.

While Americans are debating ways to stimulate economic growth, Japan is wrestling with the problem of sharply reduced holdings of dollars and concurrent spurt of inflation.

Both problems reared their heads late last year. Exports, one-quarter of which go to

the United States, leveled off at just under $4 billion, but imports of raw materials and machinery for new plant expansion continued to expand rapidly. The result was that Japan spent $1,085 million more for foreign goods and services than it earned from exports. The other danger sign was a 10-percent rise in consumer prices in 12 months, the first touch of real price inflation in more than a decade.

U.S. BANKS HELP OUT

Japan's dollar position, of course, is important to American producers, who find a $2 billion annual market here, second only to U.S. exports to Canada. American banks last year lent Japan over $600 million in short-term credits to help offset the heavy trade deficit and keep Tokyo's monetary reserves—and public confidence in Japanese economic stability—high. The Japanese Government, for its part, is trying to place some kind of checkrein on the economy without antagonizing the people or bringing on a recession.

Some of the measures taken by Tokyo thus far appear to be loosening the country from its financial bind—but it's still to early to be sure. One such measure was action taken by the central bank of Japan a few months ago to reduce its loans to commercial banks, which in turn have tightened credit for businessmen. Too, Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda's Cabinet members and other top aids are doggedly cajoling and pressuring big firms to hold back on expansion programs and on imports of capital goods.

Thus, prices have leveled off in recent months, largely due to a drop in business spending. Reflecting slackened investment, steel, paper, and truck makers made production cuts of 10 percent or more this month. Heavy machinery producers report new orders are down substantially from last year. All this, Japanese economists say, will soon reduce imports of iron ore and other basic materials and help balance the foreign accounts.

RETAIL BUSINESS BRISK

But, in some respects, the Japanese economy seems to be hurtling along as fast as ever. Downtown Tokyo streets are clogged with cement mixers and giant cranes at the sites of rising office buildings. Eager shoppers continue to throng to Tokyo's 10 big department stores for kitchen appliances, television sets, colorful summer kimonos and the latest Tetoron synthetic fiber suits. And downtown traffic congestion seems to grow almost daily.

Statistics seem to bear out this impression of continued brisk commerce, at least on the level of consumer goods, and cast some doubt on the extent of the slowdown and perhaps on the impact of the monetary measures taken so far. Department store sales are running 20 percent over last year and overall industrial production in May was still up 2.3 percent from the previous month, a nonseasonal rise.

Though slimmer, the trade deficits continue ($45 million in the red in May) and American banks are still helping to balance the Japanese accounts (with loans in May amounting to $33 million). Gold and foreign exchange reserves, however, are holding fairly steady at around $1.6 billion.

"This is a real balancing act," observes an American bank representative here. "A little too much pressure from the Government and the economy could go into a tailspin. Not enough and Japan will run out of dollars to cover imports."

Though Japan's trade accounts are still deep in the red, the Japanese Government hasn't even hinted at anything resembling an austerity program. Premier Ikeda hasn't yet seen fit to clamp down hard on imports, restrain installment buying or discourage wage hikes. He's counting on the slowdown in heavy industry and construction to spread gently and moderately through other industries.

Should the current measures prove inadequate, the Japanese Government still retains a full arsenal of postwar economic controls which could be applied in an emergency. They range from full authority to halt any imports down to a system of rice rationing and price control. The Government can, if it desires, curb credit drastically. And a structure of industrial cartels functioning under Government supervision, which was resurrected after the American occupation, gives the state enough levers to enforce its demands on business.

So brisk was business and so high were profit expectations last year that an increase in the Bank of Japan's rediscount rate (the rate at which it lends money to commercial banks) from 6.57 to 7.3 percent failed to discourage borrowing significantly. It took the present loan ceilings to do the trick.

Japanese authorities are counting on the heavy industry slowdown to bring their international commodity and invisible trade accounts into rough balance by early autumn. And exports to the United States and other markets are up around 15 percent in the last couple of months, compared with a year earlier. Japanese steel makers the other day won a 57,000-ton contract to supply India with steel plates, their second biggest foreign order to date.

Some officials, however, are also concerned about the effect of the Common Market on Japan's European sales. In addition, the "Buy American" policy for U.S. economic aid to underdeveloped countries has slashed such offshore procurement of equipment and materials in Japan from $147 million in 1960 to half that figure last year. This purchasing will probably vanish completely this year, depriving Japan of an important source of dollars. And many Japanese businessmen fear a rise of protectionist sentiment in the United States could lead to import restraints and diminished earnings for their industries.

MAY DRAW ON IMF

Adding to the normal burden of balancing monthly trade, Japan this winter will have to start repaying foreign short term loans granted to tide the nation over its financial crisis. For example, three American banks, First National City Bank of New York, Chase Manhattan Bank, and the Bank of America, provided a joint loan of $200 million last November, to be repaid 12 months later. Seven other U.S. banks opened credits totaling $125 million early this year. But if dollars are still scarce Japan can utilize a "standby" credit of $305 million from the International Monetary Fund to pay off the foreign banks.

However the Japanese economy may fare in the months ahead, its record in the postwar years is truly remarkable. In fact its climb from wartime devastation to prosperity may even outshine West Germany's economic miracle.

Japan possesses no iron, coal, or oil resources to speak of. All rubber, cotton, and wool, and great quantities of food, must also be imported. Yet today Japan is the world's fourth largest steel producer and ranks third in petroleum refining capacity.

In the last decade manufacturing production has more than quadrupled and the gross national product has risen 2.7 times, with prices remaining fairly level. And at the expansion rates of recent years, Japanese industrial output and national income would double every 5 or 6 years. The Labor Ministry reports that not only is the country enjoying practically full employment (just over 1 percent jobless out of a labor force of 45 million), but that there's a shortage of 1,260,000 skilled factory and construction workers.

GOVERNMENT DEFICITS BANNED

No heavy Government spending—deficit or otherwise—lies behind the boom. Japan's defense expenditure is extremely modest and deficit Government spending is actually forbidden by law, except for bonds issued to cover specific development projects, such as highways. The major factor was a great expansion in the volume and range of Japanese exports, now running at $4 billion yearly, which permitted import of all the raw materials and machinery Japan needed. Pepped-up wages and consumer demand did the rest—and a bit more than the straining economy could handle.

"Our expansion really reached a limit last year," declares scholarly Okita Saburo, a top economist of the Economic Planning Agency, which plots the nation's business course. "The economy was getting out of balance," Mr. Okita continues. "We saw prices going up, foreign deficits growing, a labor shortage developing. Private companies last year invested $11 billion in new plants and equipment, 30 percent more than in the previous year. And we felt we had gone a little too far."

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 27, 1962]

WEST EUROPE'S BOOM—BEHIND IT LIES BROAD GOVERNMENT-BUSINESS COOPERATION

(By Ray Vicker)

PARIS.—At a time when the U.S. economic slowdown is being blamed in some quarters on the Kennedy administration's "anti-business" policies, Western European industries are demonstrating the validity of an old success formula: government-business cooperation.

In recent years, the economic gains of West Germany, Italy, France, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg have shown that when a state takes measures to increase business confidence, there follows a surge of commercial activity that has a marked and almost immediate effect on the national prosperity. The six member nations of the Common Market, aside from the historic move of forming the Common Market itself, have employed a variety of measures calculated to stimulate competition and investment. As a result, nobody here or in the United States seriously doubts that the Common Market nations are going places.

There are, of course, reasons other than favorable government attitudes and arrangements for the boom in West Europe. There is, for instance, the fact of pent-up demand for consumer goods which Americans have long enjoyed but which have still been beyond the reach of Europeans. Too, most European manufacturers have not yet been caught in the profit squeeze that bedevils many U.S. firms. But the chief reason the Continent is prospering is that climate has been created which entices businessmen to unlease their capital, energy, and ingenuity.

OPTIMISM IS THE RULE

Business confidence is practically ubiquitous in West Europe, with recent signs of some tapering off in the boom spurring only isolated pockets of caution amid the general optimism.

True, some West Germans complain about wage-price inflation, while a few Italians are wondering if their country's economic upsurge is cresting. Yet the Common Market growth rate—forecast by its authorities at "under 5 percent" for 1962—still is high enough to attract envious attention in Washington.

And there is no doubt about the lusty gains already achieved by the Six. In the 4 years since the European Economic Community, or Common Market, became operative, the gross national product of the six nations has risen 21 percent, or better than a 5-percent-a-year rate.

Europeans discussing the causes of this success talk of adequate depreciation allowances, taxes geared to promote expansion and exports, sound fiscal policies, government stands against big wage hikes and, above all, business confidence that governments are really trying to encourage free enterprise.

"You don't get record growth unless people who contribute to that growth are confident that they can sell what they produce," says J. Downie, assistant secretary general of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, a multination group with headquarters in Paris.

NEED FOR COOPERATION

"Cooperation between business and government is necessary to stimulate growth," says Cesidio Guazzaroni, vice director for economic affairs in Italy's Foreign Ministry. He adds, "The economic dynamism of the Common Market has helped create a psychological reaction, too—a spirit of confidence in the future. And the Common Market, of course, represents a positive example of how governments, industries, and other segments of the economy are cooperating to build something new and better."

"Economic environment is dependent not only on circumstances but also on policies of governments and on attitudes of businessmen," says Rene Sterkendries, economic adviser to giant Societe Generale, the big Belgian banking and holding company. He emphasizes how even such government programs as France's national economic plan depend upon willing cooperation of private business for success.

An analysis of France's economic planning shows it was not designed to pump more money directly into the hands of laboring men to try to stimulate consumer buying power. It was and is designed to encourage business to invest and expand. The reasoning is that if business expands, more jobs will be created, incomes will rise and the whole country will benefit.

The French experience, moreover, provides a concrete example of how to stimulate an economy. In 1950, industrial production was scarcely higher than the 1929 level. Monetary and political instability prevented solid growth.

The French economy started to move when Paris joined the Common Market in 1958, and De Gaulle put Parisian politics on something resembling an even keel. French businessmen at first lobbied against the Common Market and cried for more protectionism—they had scant faith in their own resourcefulness.

But De Gaulle, anxious to streamline France for Common Market competition, swept away centuries of protectionism. The franc was devalued by 17.5 percent. Currency convertibility was introduced for nonresidents. Quota restrictions on imports were drastically reduced.

Elimination of protectionism hit French industry like a pail of cold water. For the first few months industry stagnated, nearly paralyzed by the thought of sudden robust competition. But spurred by faster depreciation allowances, capital expenditures began to rise. Machine tool sales soared. Advertising campaigns were greatly beefed up to ballyhoo French products in export markets, and the whole complex of French business undertook internal reforms to increase efficiency and capacity.

The French experience is dramatic but hardly exceptional among Common Market countries.

West Germany allows certain tax exemptions to promote investment. Holland permits manufacturers in some cases to figure depreciation allowances at higher than costs. Italy's generous corporate tax treatment has led to the erection of dozens of new plants, equipped with modern machinery, which can turn out autos and TV sets at prices far lower than an American producer can meet.

Although payroll costs have begun to edge upward, plants in Europe until recently had clamped a lid on wages and, with government support, kept pay increases behind productivity gains.

SOMEONE HAS TO PAY

Prof. Glauco Della Porta, mayor of Rome and chief economist for the Banco di Roma, one of Italy's biggest banks, declares: "Somebody must pay for growth. In Europe, growth was paid by workers. Until recently, workers have held wage-increase demands below increases in productivity. This has permitted large investments in industry, and has contributed to monetary stability.

With productivity savings going into lower costs, European plants were able to capture foreign markets. Moreover, Europe has been placing much heavier stress on exports than has the United States.

"Our whole mental outlook is geared to exports," says Pierre Cabon, a prominent French economist. Exports represent around 15 percent of the gross national products of France, West Germany, and Italy versus only about 4 percent for the United States, he adds. Netherlands exports amount to over a third of its GNP. Belgium exports a quarter to a third of its national production. Some 85 percent of its glass production, 80 percent of nonferrous metals, 75 percent of its steel, and 40 percent of its engineering industry now go into export markets.

Here again government action plays a part. Taxes on various commodities are rebated to exporters, and sometimes exporters receive a better tax depreciation formula.

It is in the realm of fiscal policies that governments have made their most direct contribution to Europe's prosperity. Generally budgets, even if unbalanced, have been held within limits of national savings, so inflation has been contained. Interest rates have been around 2 to 3 percent higher than in the United States, so domestic savings and foreign capital have been attracted.

RISE IN EMPLOYMENT

Prof. Rudolf Meimberg of Mainz University, economic adviser to the Deutsche Bank, Frankfurt, West Germany, says: "Experience has shown that this policy of monetary stability could very well be combined with a high level of employment. Since 1950, the number of employed persons (in West Germany) has increased by 6.8 million, or 49 percent."

Economists don't agree on the part the Common Market has played in Europe's prosperity. Some declare the internal tariff slashing has stimulated trade, and business generally. Others claim economic benefits of the Common Market still are to be realized. But, nearly all agree that formation of the European Economic Community has set loose a psychology of expansion.

"Factories started reequipping for the Common Market as soon as it was formed. Moreover, management people in the different countries began to trade ideas and technology, improving managements in all countries," says Mr. Guazzaroni in Italy's Foreign Office.

There are differences in the causes for prosperity in various European states, of course. All the countries of the Common Market have had comparatively low defense budgets, except for France. This has permitted more money to go into productive purposes.

SUPPLY OF CHEAP LABOR

West Germany's economy was devastated by war, with reconstruction playing a big part in its boom. Moreover, 10 million refugees poured into West Germany in the postwar period, expanding the population by 30 percent, and providing an enormous supply of cheap labor. Construction of the wall in West Berlin, however, has stopepd the influx, a factor now contributing to some of West Germany's economic problems.

Italy has a big reservoir of unemployed labor in the southern part of the country. This helped manufacturers to contain wages, and to keep products highly competitive in world markets. Now the steam generated from this boom is heating workers' wage demands, and labor is beginning to share increasingly in the prosperity.

Sums up one German banker: "In a free world, business and development go where they can make money easiest, fastest, and safest."

Western Europe has found it's just about as simple as that.

Joe Helfert and the Open Eye Club for Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to see a recent feature article in the September 1962, Wisconsin AAA Motor News which described the Open Eye for Safety Club founded by Joe Helfert, editor of the Beaver Dam Daily Citizen.

Joe Helfert's Open Eye Clubs have preformed a wonderful service. Through the clubs, many parents and children really learned the first principles of safety. Indeed, I owe a personal debt of gratitude to Joe Helfert, for when I was a youngster in school in Beaver Dam, Wis., I was a member of the Open Eye Club.

Mr. Speaker, all too often people make important contributions to their community with all too little recognition. Far too little has been done to show the appreciation and recognition of Joe Helfert's contribution. Though much more ought to be done, I think it would be fitting for the readers of the RECORD to be acquainted with the dedication and service of Joe Helfert and I am honored to include in the RECORD the following article:

BEAVER DAM CITIZEN, JOE HELFERT, CONTRIBUTES TO CAUSE OF SAFETY

(By Arthur Wichern)

If our Nation ever gives an award to a newspaper for the most beneficial continuous safety promotion program, it will, in all probability, be given the Beaver Dam Citizen.

And, if such an award is ever bestowed upon a Wisconsin newspaperman for the most significant contribution to the cause of safety, it will have to go to Joe Helfert, editor of the Citizen.

STARTED OPEN EYE CLUB

Back in March of 1928, Helfert started the Open Eye Club for Safety. At the same time he started a daily column by the same name in the Daily Citizen. Thanks to his dedicated interest and untiring efforts over the years both are still going strong.

It is a question if even Joe knows how many members there are in the Open Eye

Club. A conservative estimate would be well over 1 million. That many membership cards have been distributed in schools throughout the United States, Canada and other parts of the world.

Open Eye Club members have to abide by four rules, as follows:

1. Never to play in the street or cross it without stopping to look both ways. Then I will walk, not run, across.
2. Never to ride with nor accept favors from a stranger.
3. Never to play with fire in any form.
4. Never to be disloyal nor disobedient to mother and father.

HOW IDEA ORIGINATED

Joe's interest in safety started back in the 1920's when he was a reporter in Milwaukee. On a fire-chasing assignment one day, he nearly struck a small child with his car as the youngster darted out into the street.

Helfert, a little shaken, continued on his assignment. But in the back of his mind, as a result of the near-accident, an idea formed. And it wasn't long after he became editor of the Citizen that he put his idea into practice. He started writing about something he called the Open Eye Club. His idea was that even though drivers may be as careful as possible, the small fry would have to be taught to look out for themselves.

He had "Open Eye" buttons made, knowing there is nothing which impresses a youngster so much as a button. Later, he substituted membership cards.

DEDICATED HIS LIFE

He talked to children and parents. He taught the young people a set of rules, as listed above. He dedicated a lifetime of service to a cause in which he believed wholeheartedly.

Nobody can estimate the number of lives he has saved or accidents he has helped prevent.

Helfert's idea, starting as it did in Beaver Dam, has spread throughout the world. Today, the first members of the club are adults. Many have children of their own, and entire families are pledged to safe habits through the Open Eye Club. Anyone can join the Open Eye Club. Everyone does.

His daily column in the Citizen has pounded safety lessons into receptive minds. When he felt the community was 100 percent behind his program he took to the road, visiting rural schools, selling safety to teachers and pupils alike. He expanded his visits to all parts of the State. Even today, he is available for safety talks or participation in safety programs of all kinds, regardless of where it might be in Wisconsin.

Cooperating with Helfert are individuals, civic groups, and local, county, and State organizations. The American Automobile Association, Wisconsin division, is one of these, making available hundreds of thousands of safety lessons and safety posters for schoolchildren in the State each year. The Wisconsin AAA has been proud to help Joe explain the reason for greater emphasis on safety while walking or driving.

The John Birch Society in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the John Birch Society has several projects lined up for fall. Midwest coordinators and chapter leaders heard plans outlined at a recent closed meeting in Chicago. Detroit Free Press staff writer, Barbara Holliday, on assignment as member of the society for many months, but not identified as a reporter, tells in this last article of a series what the Chicago meeting means to the Birch movement in the Midwest.

In closing this series of articles, I would like to express my appreciation to Mrs. Holliday for her work. In my judgment she presented her story in a straightforward and factual manner, with little if any editorial comment on propaganda. This series exemplifies intelligent journalism at is best.

The locale of the meetings was my own congressional district; the subject was of tremendous local interest; but, judging from the response I have received I would say that it is of interest throughout this hemisphere.

The article follows:

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY IN MICHIGAN

On June 30, several members of the council of the John Birch Society and Founder Robert Welch met in Chicago at a closed meeting for midwest coordinators and chapter leaders.

The pressure was on. Welch wanted to know personally how the political picture was shaping up in the Midwest, how many Birchers were running for precinct delegates and what the chances were for conservative candidates.

Two major announcements were made:

1. The big project for the next 12 months—the establishment of reading rooms across the country under the name, American Opinion Libraries.
2. A council decision to publish "The Politican," by Robert Welch, the book which first brought notoriety to the society for Welch's denunciation of former President Eisenhower and others as "conscious agents of the Communist conspiracy."

"Our goal for the reading rooms," said Welch in Chicago, "is to have 1,000 of these established within a year."

AGENT ASSIGNED TO LEASE STORES

Michigan Birch coordinators learned that a staffman from Belmont, Mass., John Zimmerman, would be in Detroit early in August to start leasing space for the "stores." Plans call for incorporating under the name "American Opinion Libraries of Michigan."

Welch's plan for such reading rooms will apparently be executed just as he outlined it in 1958 when the John Birch Society was founded. He listed it then as project No. 1.

Here's how he put it in the "Blue Book," bible of the society:

"We would establish reading rooms, somewhat similar to Christian Science reading rooms, but small and inexpensive, just as rapidly as we could.

"They would be manned, utilized and promoted in every feasible way by volunteers who were local members of the organization. The space would either be contributed or obtained at a very low rental.

"How many books each of these reading rooms would have, especially which books, and under what arrangements, would of course have to be tightly controlled from headquarters."

Birch members hope to locate the first of these in the neighborhood of Wayne State University.

As of December, Welch reported that only about a dozen such reading rooms across the country had been started through the initiative of individual members.

ONLY TWO GENUINE BOOKSTORES IN STATE

According to Edward A. Kelly, of Roseville, Mich., coordinator of the society, there are now only two bookstores in the State, which handle conservative literature exclusively, one in Grand Rapids, the other in Flint.

Another bookstore in Plymouth he discounted as being a combination party store and bookstore, although it is a source for a volume of conservative literature.

The council's decision to publish a new edition of "The Politician," or "Black Book" as it is also known, is a reversal in position for the society.

This is the book written by Welch before the society was formed.

The politician of the title is Dwight D. Eisenhower, "the most completely opportunistic and unprincipled politician America has ever raised to high office."

Welch also wrote: "In my opinion, the chances are very strong that Milton Eisenhower is actually Dwight Eisenhower's superior and boss within the Communist Party."

"I defy anybody who is not actually a Communist to read all of the known facts about his career and not decide that since at least sometime in the 1930's George Catlett Marshall (Chief of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II), has been a conscious, deliberate, dedicated agent of the Soviet conspiracy."

"POLITICIAN" SPURNED BY FIRST BIRCHERS

When the John Birch Society was formed in 1958, the 11 men who met with Welch turned "thumbs down" on "The Politician" and it was withdrawn from circulation.

It has since become almost impossible to obtain a copy and the Birch Society disclaimed it as having any official connection. It is not registered with the Library of Congress since Welch had it printed privately.

The council's decision to release the book indicates it thinks the society has suffered as much as it will from this document and that John Birch may as well capitalize on public curiosity.

The council is convinced this curiosity is great enough to put the book on the best seller list.

But just to avoid taking too many chances, publication is to be held up until after the fall elections.

As a corollary to this major factor to "educate" the American public, Welch made a rather extraordinary request in the July Birch bulletin.

Members of local chapters have been instructed to estimate how many drugstore stands and other newsstands there are in their vicinities where each month they can personally place 6 to perhaps 50 copies of American Opinion, Welch-edited magazine.

For reasons he doesn't detail, Welch said that it was utterly out of the question for us even to try to obtain distribution through the national or large wholesale distributing agencies.

Members were urged to place a standing order for copies of the magazine, but to underorder rather than overorder, as "we simply must ask each member-distributor to be responsible for and thus eventually to pay us for all of the copies shipped and billed to him."

Goal: 1,000 members to become the means of distributing an average of 100 copies per month per member.

The projects are becoming more demanding, the message more urgent.

What, then, are the chances of John Birch for survival? Has the society reached its peak or is its well-oiled machinery just beginning to click? What are the odds on the society exercising real pressure as a minority political group by 1964?

At the moment they look substantial. The patient is thriving, and it is taking on new blood, and its founder can match Khrushchev in determination and energy to establish a Birch republic.

Until the United States begins to see the scales weighed more heavily on our side in

the cold war, thousands of restless and jittery Americans will continue to eye the far right with favor.

In Michigan the society is brash and lusty and is unquestionably the most virile element in conservative Republican circles.

Except for chapter 290. With Les Crane moving, this chapter has again fallen on evil days.

I suppose it is fitting, as I close my John Birch file, that I write off my own name as the last surviving member.

It is of interest to know that a John Birch bookstore has been opened in Detroit.

A Recipe for Peace: Garnish With Nuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arthur Hoppe has written an article on how peace may be obtained through food, which was published in the San Francisco Chronicle, September 12, and under unanimous consent, I insert the article in the RECORD:

A RECIPE FOR PEACE: GARNISH WITH NUTS
(By Arthur Hoppe)

I guess we all agree no more gracious hostess has ever graced our White House than Mrs. Kennedy. She's attractive, charming, and knows her salad forks. I'm glad she's won the highest accolade any gracious hostess can get.

"No other First Lady in history has sparked such international interest and enthusiasm," enthusiastically writes Miss Clementine Paddleford, "in food."

Miss Paddleford's enthusiasm stems, presumably, from her position as food editor of This Week magazine. But gracious food is very important these days. Because, says Miss Paddleford, "Mrs. Kennedy believes that the dinner table, whether at the White House or your house, can do its part in bringing 'peace in our time.'"

It just goes to show you. All along I've secretly felt that Mrs. Kennedy, while most charming, might devote a little less attention to the gracious affairs of the evening and a little more to the grievous affairs of the day. And it turns out she's really been struggling to bring us peace in our time. I feel awful.

The way Mrs. Kennedy is bringing peace in our time, says Mrs Paddleford, is by serving delicacies from 60 different nations. Which is unquestionably a new path to peace. Through the esophagus.

Miss Paddleford, despite the Secret Service, has ferreted her way into the White House recipe files and has reproduced the specific plans for five of Mrs. Kennedy's weapons for peace. Like "broiled fish a la Grecque."

Because of national security, Miss Paddleford is necessarily vague as to exactly how Mrs. Kennedy employs these weapons to achieve peace. I assume she must pore over her husband's diplomatic dispatches before announcing the evening's menu.

"So Austrian elements are flirting with the Comintern," she will say thoughtfully. "Never mind, I shall cement Austro-American bonds tonight with a strawberry mousse." Or: "Aha. De Gaulle is threatening NATO, is he? Hand me a quarter cup of leek strips and I shall brew some consumme Julienne."

Of course, the question arises: What is Mr. Kennedy doing for peace in our time? I hate to tell you. Miss Paddleford dismisses his contribution in a paragraph. "Mr. Kennedy," she says, "is a soup drinker." And New England fish chowder, at that.

But there are hints of worse. For Mrs. Kennedy's two strong right arms are her French chef and Italian assistant chef. Absolutely indispensable to world peace. And "perhaps," says Miss Paddleford darkly, "these two ambitious chefs find their most difficult task is to reproduce the Kennedy's favorite New England dishes, and do it without a continental flair."

Not even a pinch of tarragon in the New England boiled dinner? It could drive a French chef mad. And who in the White House demands New England boiled dinners? Not Mrs. Kennedy. But let us not talk of impeachment. Yet.

So hats off to Mrs. Kennedy for sparking the world's interest in food. It's about time as two-thirds of the world goes to bed hungry each night. Some say this is due to a shortage of bread.

Nonsense. Let them, I say, eat strawberry mousse.

The Bookies Close Up Shop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Sports Illustrated which tells of Attorney General Kennedy's success in wiping out illegal gambling under the "package" of anti-gambling laws passed last year:

THE BOOKIES CLOSE UP SHOP
(By Robert H. Boyle)

In 1951, after all the whoop-de-do kicked up by the Kefauver investigations, the House of Representatives and Senate passed two antigambling laws. One required a bookmaker to buy a $50 Federal wagering stamp; the other called for a 10-percent tax on all bets. But inasmuch as few bookies either paid the tax or bought the stamp, the laws were a joke.

A year ago this month Congress, under prodding from Attorney General Robert Kennedy, took another crack at gambling. This time Congress passed three more bills. Altogether, they could be described as a Mann Act for bookmakers. They prohibit the sending of odds, wagers, or gambling paraphernalia across State lines under maximum penalty of a $10,000 fine and/or 2 or 5 years in prison.

In view of the tax-stamp fiascos, it would have been reasonable to expect the Government to come up a loser again. But the truth, as a Sports Illustrated survey shows, is that the new laws have succeeded surprisingly well. This is not to say that illegal gambling is dead—during the football season it is still possible to get down a $5,000 bet on a game if you know the right person. However, bookmakers all over the country are up against it as they never have been before.

In the first 10 months since the laws were passed, the Federal Bureau of Investigation looked into 4,000 possible violations. Of these, 809 cases were forwarded to the Department of Justice for further study. So far, 95 persons have been indicted and 11 convicted. Eleven out of 4,000 may seem a small number, but the key figure is 809; the FBI does not send agents on a case unless it is considered "hot."

KEFAUVER put the Continental Press Service, which furnished results to bookmakers, out of business. Now the new laws have put an end to Continental's illicit successors. Chief among these was Nola News in New Orleans, which closed down for good last fall. This year the Federal Government charged Tom F. Kelly, Tom F. Kelly, Jr., and George Kelly, of Chicago, scratch-sheet publishers, with shipping gambling information across State lines. The Government argued that 80 percent of the sheets were going directly to bookmakers, and on July 31 the Kellys were convicted and fined $5,000 each in Louisville. They are appealing on the grounds that the new laws specifically exclude "newspapers and other similar publications." The Kellys are also fighting a Government attempt to cut off their race-result telephone service, which has handled up to 60,000 calls a day.

While off-track betting has declined, at-the-track betting has increased. Frank Pape, former Chicago police lieutenant, now chief of the Arlington-Washington Park police, says, "I think the lack of wire services has curbed activity. The old days of the big bookie giving you the call of the race to determine how you would bet the next race are over. It has made a big crimp in the operations, and, as a result, our mutuels are up considerably even though attendance is about the same."

Other sports betting—baseball, football, and basketball—has been cut sharply. Gil Beckley, the No. 1 bookmaker in the country for the last few years, was reduced to operating out of pay phones in Miami hotel lobbies last winter. This winter may be more confining: in October he goes to trial in Federal court in New Orleans. Beckley's chief rival for bookmaking honors, Maurice (Red) Dodson, is wandering around seeking haven. He has left Birmingham and last week was in Las Vegas, where gambling is legal, looking for a home. One vendor of football parlay cards has already been sent to prison; Richard A. Styles of Toledo drew 3 years for transporting them across State lines.

The leading sports handicappers in the country are, shall we say, handicapped. Leo Hirschfield, president of Athletic Publications, Inc., in Minneapolis, has quit. The so-called Minneapolis line is no more. Hirschfield is using the company presses, which used to churn out football and basketball schedules, to print hunting and fishing books. The other top oddsmaking firm, Angel-Kaplan in Chicago, is about to go out of business. Bill Kaplan, the Runyonesque founder of the firm who goes by such pseudonyms as Pigskin Pete, Patrick F. Gilhooly and Coach Goldberg, suffered a heart attack recently, what with all the wear and tear, and Don Angel, his partner, says he is putting out a daily baseball line "just to keep in." Says Angel, "We're just going to stick around for the World Series to make a price for some guys, then we're going to quit. You can't cross a State line, and it doesn't pay us to operate locally." There are simply not enough bookmakers in Chicago to make oddsmaking worthwhile.

In Miami, Chief Investigator Mike Peyton, of the Dade County State's attorney's office, says, "One thing you can say about the law, and that is that it really struck fear into the bookmakers." A year ago a sport could walk into any one of a hundred Miami stores or hotel cabanas to get down a bet. Now it is difficult to find a bookie. Only a few will take more than $100, and horse odds have slumped from 20, 8 and 4 to 15, 6 and 3. That is, the bookies will pay no more than 15 to 1 for a winning horse, 6 to 1 for place and 3 to 1 for show—alltime lows. Round

robins, parlays, and even the daily doubles are out.

Miami bookmakers have declined in quality as well as quantity. Says one bettor, "There used to be, well, call it a sense of honor among bookmakers. But now there are nothing but rats left. If you do win, you take a chance on not collecting." This bettor is owed $9,000 by two bookies. "This couldn't have happened a few years ago," he says. "If they didn't pay off then, there were people who would see that they did. Now there aren't."

Throughout the South the refrain is the same. Only a few bookies in New Orleans will take a $100 bet on a horse, and in Hot Springs, Ark., the bookies operate on the sneak. This in a town with two gambling casinos, the Vapors and the Southern Club, running wide open.

Up North the pattern persists. New York bookmakers have taken to using telephone answering services to avoid tapped wires. In Washington it is possible to get a bet down across the street from the Justice Department, but the police keep bookies on the run. "Anything is possible, but these operations are not as big as anyone would like to believe," says Deputy Chief Roy E. Blick of the Metropolitan Police. Recent raids have included a big one at the Pentagon, the Navy Department, Walter Reed General Hospital, and the Old Soldiers' Home.

A bookie isn't even safe these days in the traditionally wide-open towns in the Ohio River Valley. Evansville, Ind., which nurtured such gambling celebrities as Ray Ryan, the oilman, and Jimmie (the Greek) Snyder, the Las Vegas handicapper, is dead, or close to it. In the late 1940's Evansville had 48 books handling anything. But that was all B.K.—Before KEFAUVER, Before Kennedy. After KEFAUVER, the number of books dipped at 20, but you could still get a sizable bet down. With Bobby Kennedy, the number has been cut to 10, all furtive "two-bit operations."

* * * * *

Says an involuntarily retired bookmaker, "This Bobby Kennedy is doing the job. Without a wire service, without a telephone, how can you make it? Everybody's afraid to call across the State line into Kentucky. Sometimes I've needed a result in Louisville. Well, I'd drive over to Henderson and call Louisville. But that's a 30-, 40-minute round trip. I had to have my information quicker than that.

"It's not like it was before the Kennedys put through that interstate law. Listen, Dan Topping, you know, the guy who owns the Yankees? Yeah, well, Topping had a friend in Evansville. Every day Topping used to call this friend and give him some horses. He played pretty good, I'm telling you. But no more. I guess Topping is afraid of the interstate law."

Evansville is so bad that during a recent card game at the Elks Club, a former golf pro said he would give any one of his brother Elks $200 as a gift if he could make a $200 bet on a horse for him.

"Here's $400," said the pro, laying the money on the table. "You book me $200 on a horse here in Evansville, and you can keep the other $200." A brother Elk tried to book the bet. It was late evening, and every bookie he called begged time until morning. They needed the time to lay off. Finally, not one would book his bet, and the golf pro wound up with the $400 back in his wallet.

The ex-Evansville bookie has been looking for work in the Newport area, just across the river from Cincinnati. But there, in addition to Government heat, George Ratterman, the ex-Notre Dame quarterback, is in office as reform sheriff. It is indicative of Newport's present moral state that the Club Flamingo, a gambling joint run by "Sleep Out Louis" Levinson, is now a twist parlor. Unemployment among gamblers is so rife that several months ago, the local fathers of Newport and next-door Covington went to Washington to ask for assistance as a depressed area. Of all things, they asked the Government to locate an income-tax processing center in the vicinity.

"I tried to get on in Newport," says the bookie. "It was laughable. I tell you the town is dying. You think Evansville is clean, Newport is in a coma. I saw this friend up there. He used to be in the numbers racket. He's out on bail now, but he's gonna do at least a year.

"The only action in town was a bingo game. It was going crazy with people, but it was for charity. I saw a sign in Newport. I swear to it. This big club was for sale. There's a sign on the front that read, 'For Sale—See George Ratterman.'

"They got big hotels in Newport worth maybe $800,000. You can buy 'em today for $200,000, but what would you do with 'em? You see, Newport depended on its out-of-town business, the business brought there by gambling. The shutdown has hurt everything in the town. Business people are screaming, everybody is dying. You heard of the Glenn Hotel? That's the place where Ratterman was framed with that stripteaser April Flowers. The Glenn has burned down. How lucky can they get?"

Internal Revenue Service figures bear out the clampdown on Newport. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, Kentucky bookmakers reported accepting $7,650,000 in bets. In the fiscal year ending last June 30 that figure was cut to $2 million. The drop can be directly attributed to Newport, whose bookies took in almost $6 million of the $7,650,000.

In Seattle, "nickel-and-dime town," the situation is worse than ever. One horseplayer, trying to make a bet on the Kentucky Derby, couldn't find a bookie. He had to trust a friend to take the cash down to Portland to bet it. Clifford Winkler, Jr., a Seattle horseplayer, says, "Suppose a fella came to town and said, 'Here's $200 on a horse at Longacres (the local track). I'll give you $100 of it, but I want you to bet it off the track so I can get a better price.' Well, buddy, there's no place to take him."

Of course, it is possible to bet legally in Nevada. But despite the clampdown elsewhere, betting on sports or horses will not grow appreciably in Vegas; the bettor must pay the 10 percent Federal tax. Business is so bad that Jimmie the Greek, the last of the oddsmakers, plans to quit at the end of the year. There is not a book in town that isn't up for sale or losing money. One bitter Vegas bettor says, "They lost in Laos, they lost in Cuba, they lost in East Berlin, but they sure are giving the gamblers a beating."

In Memory of Thomas Masaryk—1850–1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago on September 14 Czechoslovak people lost their Founding Father and the first President of their Republic, Thomas Masaryk.

Even at the time, his grievous death was seen as a great loss to the Czech people, but today we are all much more aware that in the death of this elder statesman, great teacher, eminent philosopher, illustrious man of letters and wise leader, freedom and democracy lost one of the stanchest champions in Central Europe.

Thomas Masaryk was the greatest Czechoslovak of modern times. As the unrivaled and beloved leader of his people during the last quarter of the last century and the first third of this, he did more for his country and his people than any one man, or group of men. This gifted-born teacher was destined to be the liberator of his people, and the real architect of the Czechoslovak Republic. He was elected to the Presidency of the Republic in 1918, which position he then held through four successive elections. In 1935, at the age of 85, he resigned, and died 2 years later. Today we pay our respects to the memory of this great and good man, Thomas Masaryk of Czechoslovakia, whose long, arduous and fruitful life was an inspiration to all.

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues, and with freemen everywhere, in paying tribute to the memory of a great man and a true champion of liberty who passed away 25 years ago today.

I am referring, of course, to Thomas G. Masaryk, philosopher and statesman, who contributed probably more than any other single individual to the founding of the modern Czechoslovak Republic.

His name, his writings, and his concrete achievements in establishing working democratic institutions in prewar Czechoslovakia should be known to all freemen. He stood as a giant among men. It was most fitting, therefore, that the U.S. Government, in recognition of his achievements, has honored his memory by issuing a commemorative stamp in the Champion of Liberty series. It is equally fitting that we here today pay tribute to his works.

It is with profound sadness that we must reflect on this occasion upon the current tragic plight of the Czechoslovak people. Of all the once-free nations behind the Iron Curtain, Czechoslovakia is probably the one which has been least affected by the passing away of the Stalinist era. Stalinist methods of overt repression are still being inflicted upon her people by the Soviet-supported Communist regime of Dictator Novotny. Her people live in dire bondage, denied their inalienable rights and freedoms, cut off from all effective contacts with the West. Their plight is indeed tragic.

On this occasion of the 25th anniversary of Masaryk's death, we should, and

we must, reaffirm our determination to continue to support the legitimate aspirations for self-determination of the Czechoslovak people. We shall not rest until freedom and liberty are once again restored to them.

Radio Stations Salute Congressman Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, radio stations throughout the South this week have broadcast a tribute to my military procurement study that I find gratifying and humbling. Under the title, "We Salute Indiana Congressman EARL WILSON," these radio stations have again called attention to the fact that millions are wasted each year in buying military hardware.

Mr. Frank B. Best, of Orangeburg, S.C., wrote the radio editorial and it was supplied to stations throughout the South by Broadcast Editorial Service.

The editorial shows the concern of the Nation's communications media with the continued squandering of tax dollars.

WE SALUTE INDIANA CONGRESSMAN, EARL WILSON

In June, an Indiana Congressman, EARL WILSON, was making national news by his disclosures of Defense Department contracts at excessive cost to the Government. Congressman WILSON was explaining to the people of the United States that there are two kinds of defense contracts—those that are placed by competitive bid and those that are placed with "sole source" contractors. A "sole source" contract is one in which there is no competitive bid. The Defense Department places the "sole source" contract because it is in a hurry for delivery—or, because the contractor has developed an idea—or, because only that one contractor can best provide that particular item. That makes him a "sole source" contractor to the Defense Department. What did Congressman WILSON show? He showed that in contract after contract when he forced the procurement officer to get a competitive bid, the product cost about a third less than the "sole source" price. In a few months, with the help of the watchdog of the Treasury, the General Accounting Office, Congressman WILSON showed the Defense Department and the Congress where the taxpayer was being imposed on for $6 million in six little contracts. At the rate of these savings, Congressman WILSON was showing that instead of $46 billion a year for defense, maybe all we need is $30 billion.

You would think that Congressman WILSON would be praised by the Pentagon for his devotion to duty. Here he was, scrutinizing these procurement notices about what the Defense Department was buying, the specifications and the prices they were paying and he was showing them where they could save about a third of the money they were spending.

This would seem a most laudable thing for Congressman WILSON to do. But, no. The Defense Department cut him off the list to receive the procurement notices. Secretary of Defense McNamara said the "administrative burden" was too great to mail Congressman WILSON the procurement notices.

We encourage Congressman WILSON to procure the unprocurable procurement notices and to continue to show the Congress that procurement by "sole source" instead of competitive bids is costing the taxpayer billions and billions of dollars.

We salute Indiana Congressman, EARL WILSON.

Farm Debts, Time Deposits Hit Peak in 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article from the September 7, 1962, issue of Washington Financial Report:

FARM DEBTS, TIME DEPOSITS HIT PEAK IN 1961

Farm debts rose to a record high $27.7 billion in 1961 but liquid financial assets of farmers, after dropping steadily for 2 consecutive years, leveled off at $13.3 billion.

This improvement in the financial condition of the American farmer was due to a rise in farm receipts, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. "Although expenses rose, the realized net income of farm operators increased by more than $1 billion, or close to 10 percent," USDA said in its 1962 Balance Sheet of Agriculture.

Here's the complete picture, as drawn by USDA:

Time deposits owned by farmers rose by $100 million to an alltime record of $3 billion but were offset by a corresponding decrease in U.S. savings bond holdings. Demand deposits held steady at $4 billion and currency at $1.8 billion. The rise in time deposits hiked total farm deposits from $8.7 to $8.8 billion or 1 percent.

Half of the $2.2 billion increase in farm debts in 1961 reflected a sharp rise in the volume of mortgage lending. Real estate values, boosted by the improved income situation, rose 4.7 percent, from $131.8 to $138 billion.

However, USDA reported, there "were some indications of a slackening" in this high level of mortgage lending in the first quarter of 1962.

All farm mortgage lenders participated in the accelerated business of 1961 but the bulk of the loans were made by private and cooperative lenders at rates ranging between 5½ and 6 percent. About one-half of the total amount lent was for refinancing mortgages or other indebtedness; about one-third for actual purchases of real estate.

The outstanding farm mortgage debt at the yearend rose 8.5 percent to $14.2 billion. The dollar increase, $1.1 billion, was the third largest on record and the second time since the close of World War II that it exceeded a billion dollars.

Farm debt not secured by real estate increased 6 percent, or $673 million, in 1961. The same moderate rate of increase carried over in the first quarter of 1962. Excluding Commodity Credit Corporation loans, farmers owed $11.6 billion on non-real-estate debt at the end of 1961. Of this, 45 percent was owed commercial banks and 35 percent to merchants, dealers, and similar sources.

USDA reported regionally above average increases in non-real-estate loans in the Central and Western States and scattered States in the South and East. Increases ranged from 36 percent in Delaware and 21 percent in Florida to no change in Nevada and a drop of 12 percent in Massachusetts.

From 1955 through 1959, bank non-real-estate loans increased 64 percent or about 10 percent a year. Over the same period, loans by production credit associations rose 136 percent, or about 19 percent annually, while Farmers Home Administration non-real-estate loans declined by 5 percent.

But in 1960 and 1961, the situation reversed: production credit associations had annual increases of around 10 percent, banks around 5 percent, and the Farmers Home Administration gains of 6 percent and 18 percent, respectively. This additional loan activity reflected both an increase in funds appropriated to FHA and a strong demand by farmers for loans.

The year 1961 also saw a continuation of the trend toward loan renewals. In 1954, the renewal rate was 25 percent. This rate dipped to 23 percent in 1957 and 1958 but has been rising ever since, reaching 28 percent in 1961. According to USDA, no overall information on renewals of farm loans at banks is available but scattered reports indicate the trend is similar to that for production credit associations.

Two causes were advanced by USDA for this growth in renewals: (1) farmers' use of longer term credit is increasing more rapidly than short-term credit and part of the increase is being supplied by an increase in renewals; and (2) some farmers are experiencing increased difficulties in meeting debt obligations.

The overall farm debt—$27.7 billion including Commodity Credit Corporation loans and $25.8 billion excluding them—is at its highest point in history. It represents an increase of 158 percent over the debt in 1950 and an 8-percent increase over 1960.

The rate of rise of mortgage debt has been more rapid than that of non-real-estate debt but the difference has not been great. On January 1, 1962, total farm debt equaled 13.4 percent of the value of farm assets, compared to 9.5 percent in 1950.

Kennedy's Fateful Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article appearing in the September 17 issue of the U.S. News & World Report, entitled "The Inside Story—Kennedy's Fateful Decision: The Night the Reds Clinched Cuba."

THE INSIDE STORY—KENNEDY'S FATEFUL DECISION: THE NIGHT THE REDS CLINCHED CUBA

Look at Castro's Cuba now: a Communist base. To see how it got that way; look back to 1961—to an invasion that failed and left Castro even stronger than before. The story of that invasion, as revealed by insiders, shows the far-reaching effect of a President's decision.

A fateful decision, made by President Kennedy on Sunday, April 16, 1961, is rising now to plague the United States.

On that Sunday evening, an armed force of Cuban refugees, trained by the United States, was at sea, sailing secretly to invade Fidel Castro's Cuba. The American President, a few hours earlier, had given final approval to that invasion.

Only the day before on April 15, a surprise attack by B–26 bombing planes belonging to the invaders had knocked out all but seven planes of Castro's tiny air force.

A second air strike was scheduled for Monday morning, April 17. It was to coincide with the landing of the invaders. It was supposed to finish the job of wiping out Castro's planes and to provide air support for the invasion.

Secure in this assurance of air support, the invaders went ashore in the early morning darkness of Monday, April 17. Their landing was successful: 1,400 armed men reached the beaches of a place called the Bay of Pigs.

In the battle that followed, Castro's troops suffered heavy casualties. Castro's tanks, coming up to the battle, were sitting ducks for an attack by air. Confidently, the little invading force waited for its air support to arrive. Its leaders had assurance of that support. It was provided in the preinvasion planning.

Hours before, on Sunday evening, a small but potent force of B–26s was sitting in readiness on an airfield 500 miles away, waiting to take off for the Bay of Pigs. Those were planes of the invasion force, with Cuban pilots.

But those planes didn't take off.

The reason: President Kennedy forbade their use.

That was the fateful decision President Kennedy made on that Sunday evening. He decided that the anti-Castro Cubans could not have the support of their own air force during the invasion. Without that support, the invasion failed.

When the invasion began, in the predawn hours of Monday, the need of air support became apparent. Worried, the nonmilitary officials in Washington who were running the invasion went to President Kennedy for a new decision. They suggested that U.S. Navy planes from a U.S. aircraft carrier be used to fly air support for the invaders.

Two U.S. carriers, their decks loaded with fighting planes, were standing by not far away throughout the entire invasion. Their planes were readily available.

In the planning of the invasion—planning begun under the Eisenhower administration—the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff had recommended the use of U.S. air support. President Kennedy vetoed the idea. He insisted that there was to be no direct American participation. Now, with the outcome possibly hanging in the balance, military and nonmilitary men joined in renewing the plea.

ANOTHER "NO."

Once again, in the early morning hours of Monday, April 17, President Kennedy made a fateful decision. He said "No" to the use of U.S. planes.

On the beaches, in the Bay of Pigs, the invaders fought on. They did not know that an American President in Washington, 1,400 miles away, was in tight control of their every military move. They were not aware that President Kennedy had taken away their air cover.

With no air support, the invasion soon began to run into trouble. Castro brought up the few planes he had left. Castro jets—made in America—bombed and sank two of the five ships of the invasion fleet. One carried most of the invaders' reserves of ammunition. The other was their communications center. Castro tanks, safe from attack by air, moved into effective action.

In the face of this situation, President Kennedy took the wraps off the Cuban fliers. On Monday noon he said they could go into action. But bad weather interfered at first. Finally, an air strike was set up for early Wednesday.

On Tuesday, however, the situation continued to deteriorate. The invaders, fighting without air support, were driven back under pressure of Castro's superior numbers.

By Tuesday night, April 18, a crisis was clearly at hand. Once again there was an appeal to President Kennedy.

On this night the President, in white tie and tails, was playing host at a congressional reception in the White House. He left the party to confer with his advisers—both civilian and military. Again it was proposed to use U.S. planes to save the invasion.

This time the President relented slightly. He consented to using one carrier's planes for just 1 hour on Wednesday morning—just long enough to provide cover for the invaders to land some supplies and for the planes to make a quick strike. U.S. planes, still, were not to attack land targets.

Even this limited plan for U.S. aid went awry. There were communications mixups. The Cuban fliers mistimed their strike. The U.S. planes never got into action. And anyway, it developed, it was too late.

By sundown of Wednesday, April 19, the invasion was a failure. The invaders inflicted close to 2,000 casualties on Castro's forces, suffered only a hundred or so casualties of their own. But without air support, the invaders could not hold out. Most of them wound up as Castro captives.

American military officials who followed this operation closely say that it came within a hair's breadth of success. They say: Given early air support, the invaders could have destroyed Castro's air force and tanks. Defections from his militia, which had started, would have spread. Underground forces, waiting for word of success before rising against Castro, would have sprung into action. When that word did not come, they remained underground.

It was in the White House that the decision was made that guided the course of that unsuccessful invasion.

Out of that fateful decision of the President have flowed many of today's problems. Soviet Russia today is entrenched in Cuba, a few miles from continental United States. Some Members of Congress charge that the Monroe Doctrine, which guided U.S. policy in Latin America for 139 years, is now, in effect, being turned into a scrap of paper. With a base in Cuba, Communist forces are penetrating deeply into the Western Hemisphere, building up their base for more takeovers.

What lay back of that fateful Kennedy decision?

The record suggests: An important factor was a fear of offending public opinion in Latin America and in the so-called "new nations" of the United Nations.

Throughout the discussions of invasion policy, the idea was put forward repeatedly that the United States must not place itself in the position of using force against a smaller neighbor. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, strongly backed President Kennedy in his decisions.

WHAT MILITARY RECOMMENDED

The U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Nation's top military experts, had no part in the actual military operations. Those military leaders had recommended early that, to insure success, some U.S. Armed Forces should take part in any invasion, and that air cover and support should be supplied by the United States.

The recommendations of the military leaders were rejected. It was the Central Intelligence Agency and the White House that finally ran the show and fixed the terms on which the anti-Castro Cubans could fight.

The fateful decision was a political decision—not a military decision.

One civilian official who was close to the whole invasion operation now makes this judgment:

"In retrospect, the political decision was wrong."

A military man, also close to the operation, said this:

"If you go back to that time and look at the whole problem, you find that this country faced one fundamental question: Can we permit a Communist country in this Western Hemisphere? Now, if the answer is 'Yes,' then you do one thing. If the answer is 'No,' you do another.

"But if you weasel on that answer, start compromising, then you wind up in confusion—with no real answer. One thing we should have learned from this Cuban fiasco is this: You can't run a military operation that way."

TWO OTHER U.S. DECISIONS ON TROUBLE SPOTS

LAOS

The decision: After saying on March 15, 1961, that the United States was determined to defend Laos against Communist rebels, Mr. Kennedy, on March 27, agreed to seek a deal with Russia for a "neutral" Laos.

Today: United States has pulled its Marines away from the Lao border; U.S. military advisers are leaving Laos. But Russia shows no sign of taking Communist North Vietnamese out of Laos as agreed. A Red takeover of all Laos behind the screen of "neutrality" is feared.

BERLIN

The decision: When East Germans, at dawn on August 13, 1961, completed barriers cutting Berlin in two, President Kennedy decided against using U.S. troops to knock down these wire barriers by force.

Today: Red barriers dividing Berlin have become a wall of concrete and steel. Some East Germans escape over, through or under the wall. Others die trying. United States, early in September, found the Berlin crisis warming up over the Communist shootings of East Germans at the wall.

After reading of these bungling decisions which have endangered the security of the United States, it is more than ever apparent that the President should not have more "rubberstamp" Congressmen in Washington. We must have a Congress made up of Members of faith, vision, and wisdom, men who will think for themselves and will place the security of the Nation about the desire of personal universal popularity.

Effect of Davis-Bacon Act on Operation of Texas Distributors, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a good personal friend of mine, Mr. Jack B. Lowe, president of Texas Distributors, Inc., of Dallas, has written me concerning the Davis-Bacon Act and its

effect on his company in their contractual relations with the Federal Government.

I am including Mr. Lowe's letter in my remarks, as I believe it will be interesting reading to the Members of this body:

EFFECT OF DAVIS-BACON ACT ON OPERATION OF TEXAS DISTRIBUTORS, INC.

Texas Distributors, Inc., operates as a distributor and contractor in the field of air-conditioning, heating, refrigeration, and ventilation. We have approximately 135 permanent year round employees in Dallas, Fort Worth, Longview, Tyler, Waco, and Wichita Falls. About 40 of these employees are construction mechanics who actually do installation work.

We operate entirely on a nonunion basis but have what we believe to be probably the most highly skilled group of mechanics in our field in this region. Our men are paid at various hourly rates dependent entirely upon their skill and productivity. These rates are based upon the recommendation of their superintendents who are thoroughly familiar with the work done by each mechanic.

After being with Texas Distributors 6 months, our employees are all eligible to participate in a profit sharing plan under which the company contributes 28 percent of its net profits before Federal income taxes.

After being with Texas Distributors 2 years, each employee participates in a retirement plan. The entire cost of it is borne by the company in an amount equal to 5 percent of each employee's total compensation.

Each of our employees receives 2 weeks paid vacation each year, and, after 10 years of service, 3 weeks paid vacation each year.

Due to the nature of our company's operation, we guarantee our employees full year-round employment. They are not laid off when it rains and the construction job they happen to be working on is closed down. They are not laid off during slack periods. We believe we have probably the highest employee moral and the lowest employee turnover of any company in our field in this region.

Texas Distributors would be perfectly happy to quote on Government projects based upon our standard pay rate and so would our employees. However, we are forced by application of the Davis-Bacon Act to figure on a substantially higher hourly rate on any Federal projects on which we quote. If we are the successful bidder, we complicate our pay records so that we pay the designated rate to our mechanics while they are working on the Government project. The same mechanics doing the same type of work are paid a substantially lower rate with which they are perfectly happy and well compensated on private work.

As far as Texas Distributors is concerned, this results in a complete and ridiculous loss to the taxpayer at a time when our country is straining every ounce of its strength to meet its necessary commitments.

You will perhaps be interested to know that there has been a strong trend toward open shop contracting in the commercial and industrial field in the Dallas area within the last 2 years. Residential contracting is and always has been virtually 100 percent open shop.

It seems to us that it is unrealistic and unfair to the taxpayer for the Labor Department to designate the highly inflated union scale as the prevailing rate in the Dallas area. I do not have statistics to support this statement, but it is my belief that there is a great deal more dollars worth of construction put in place in the Dallas area by open shop labor, skilled as well as unskilled, than by union labor.

J. B. LOWE,
President.

Dr. and Mrs. George A. Denison Cited for Achievements in Field of Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 29, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, September 7, 1962, Dr. and Mrs. George A. Denison retired from active work with the Jefferson County Department of Health. Dr. Denison has headed the health department for 21 years. Mrs. Denison is director of the bureau of public health nursing.

They will be sorely missed by all who have had the opportunity to work with them and to know them. Hundreds of their friends in Birmingham joined in paying tribute to them and I would like to insert the following article from the Birmingham News of September 8, 1962, and the editorial from the Birmingham Post-Herald.

The article and editorial follow:

[From the Birmingham News, Sept. 8, 1962]

HEALTH OFFICER HONORED BY MANY FRIENDS

(By Jo Ellen O'Hara)

Imagine yourself in this situation:

You attend your weekly civic club luncheon which turns out to be a program in your honor attended by 150 persons.

As a part of the program, your son, whom you haven't seen in 6 years, walks in.

Later you are invited to a small dinner party which turns out to be a testimonial dinner your honor with 350 persons there.

Such was a day—Friday, September 7—in the life of Dr. George A. Denison, county health officer.

The veteran health officer and his wife, who directed the bureau of public health nursing, were retiring Friday from a combined 76 years with the health department.

The plans the Denisons had made for Friday were simple. The plans their friends and longtime associates had made, however, were elaborate.

The Civitan Club presented a "This Is Your Life" program.

Former employees, friends, associates, and a very special guest were the "parts" of Dr. Denison's life that appeared on the program.

The special guest was George A. Denison, Jr., the health officer's son, who is a general contractor in Soldotna, Alaska. The last time Dr. Denison had seen his only child was in 1956 when young Denison left for a career in the Far North.

Tears filled the eyes of the 63-year-old veteran health officer as his son appeared on the stage. And as soon as the program ended, the proud father seemed to forget the honor that had been his and hurried to talk with his son.

But that was just the first half of the day.

Dr. and Mrs. Denison had been invited by the board of health to a "small" dinner party that evening by Dr. Donald A. Sweeney, board chairman.

Dr. Sweeney and his wife, after picking the Denisons up for the "small" party, then ushered them to Mortimer Jordan Armory where 350 persons awaited the arrival of the health care couple for a testimonial dinner in their honor.

As they entered the auditorium, they were awarded a standing ovation, one of four they received throughout the evening.

Tributes, resolutions, momentos and gifts abounded at the dinner.

Dr. Denison became the second man ever to receive the Heacock Medal from the Alabama Tuberculosis Association for "distinguished service in the crusade against tuberculosis."

The only other medalist is Senator LISTER HILL.

Lt. Gov. Albert Boutwell, who presented the medal, pointed out Denison's many contributions to the crusade against TB.

And there to see the medal awarded was the man for whom the high honor was named—Dr. J. D. Heacock, sole living founder of the Alabama Tuberculosis Association. The snow-haired physician, now 93 years old, retired from active practice of medicine earlier this year.

Denison was credited with coordinating the work of the Health Department, tuberculosis sanitorium and the association. He also founded the office of TB controller in his department and triggered work on the chest X-ray center in the medical center.

Many awards came to this outstanding statesman of health: They included:

A portable typewriter from the Board of Health; Birmingham Chamber of Commerce certificate of merit; 40-year service pin from Jefferson County; key to the city of Birmingham, Jefferson County Medical Society distinguished service plaque; parchment scroll with signature of all Health Department workers (scroll was attached to rollers made of walnut salvaged from old city hall); honorary membership in the Birmingham District Dental Society; medallion mounted on marble from American Cancer Society; a book including some 75 resolutions from local, State, and national organizations.

Mrs. Denison was presented a bouquet of red roses from the Public Health Council, a scrapbook from the Alabama Nursing Bureau, a 35-year service pin, and other gifts for both her and her husband.

Mayors of many county municipalities, county officials, leading medical names in the city and State, and fellow workers filled the auditorium for the occasion. Maurice Bishop, county attorney, served as master of ceremonies.

Dr. J. Carroll Chambers, who succeeds Dr. Denison as county health officer, said upon his taking over the position, "For us who are in public health, the path has been well paved."

The health officer, filled with emotion and humility, quietly explained why he chose a career of public service in health at the evening's conclusion:

"If you would like to know why we have spent our entire professional lives in Birmingham, just look at yourself and the person next to you. That's why."

[From the Birmingham Post-Herald]

DR. DENISON'S SERVICE

Twenty-one years as head of the Jefferson County Health Department lie behind Dr. George Denison, who is retiring from that post today.

It will be generally agreed, we believe, that he leaves the patient in a "good state of public health."

Dr. Denison has worked diligently at this job and the public has benefited. In enforcing health regulations he has stepped on some big toes. But that has not de-

terred him from taking action which he believed to be in the public interest.

In a metropolitan area such as Jefferson County, this position is a major one. It is also proof of the effectiveness of having one governmental organization for the whole county, instead of dividing it between city and county.

Dr. Denison's retirement is well earned. We salute him as he steps out of office.

Meet Mr. Pearson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, each of us remembers a teacher who marked our lives with his or her wisdom, a rare and precious gift to our education and our growing up. Dracut High School students are fortunate in having as the chairman of their social science department one of these memorable persons, Whitman Pearson. Pat Collins, Lowell Sun feature writer, recently did a splendid story on him.

The article follows:

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, Sept. 7, 1962]

MEET MR. PEARSON—EDUCATOR SAYS, "OLD PRACTICES GIVEN NEW NAMES"

(You're in a classroom at Dracut High School and you are lucky enough to be in Mr. Pearson's class. He is not only the chairman of the social science department, but brings with him to the classroom the experience of a onetime principal (at Tewksbury High School) and an administrator (for the Air Force dependent schools in several foreign countries), a superintendent (in Acton and North Reading) and a student (at Lowell High School, where he was captain of the track team), Worcester Academy, University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School and Boston University.)

(By Pat Collins)

PELHAM, N.H.—Educating and being educated over the span of 30 years in the countries of Japan, Germany, England, France, Holland, and the United States, would be an accurate, yet superfluous thumbnail sketch of worldwide traveler, educator, former administrator and athlete, Whitman Pearson.

Here is a colorful personality that must be explored beyond the impressive, one-sentence introduction.

Speaking of his familiarity with the field of education "I haven't seen any radical changes, but old practices given new names." There will be those who challenge this statement, but I believe I have many reasons for this theory. I am a great believer in H. G. Wells' idea that our future will either be education or catastrophe. Our young generation faces the biggest hurdle, but the most exciting challenge the world has seen. They face the keenest competition within their classroom and around the world. Is there pressure? Of course, and, in many ways, it may be unfortunate. However, other people in other times have to confront obstacles. This seems to be it for our younger generation. In a matter of fact voice that projects an opinion that has been the result of much thought and not a casual remark, Mr. Pearson interpreted the competition in education as a struggle for survival. We are threatened by Communist forces, pledged to defend our American way of life as well as preserve peace and extend democracy. That won't be easy.

How many parents have you heard say that "nothing is too good for our children?" asked Mr. Pearson. This is all part of the slogan mania because, in effect, a man of means doesn't hesitate to bestow a new Cadillac on his 16-year-old daughter, but when he finds out that to educate her is an expensive proposition, he shrugs it off with a "Well, she's only gonna' get married anyway." (Most college educations cost a Cadillac and a half.) "It's the same old theme—a sense of values. Perhaps sometime, and I hope it's soon, it will have more prestige to have a son at MIT than a four-car garage. It may be interesting to know that it costs more money to keep a boy in a speedboat all summer than it does to keep him in school. But when the town needs more money for better teachers and equipment, what a hue and cry. We need a respect for mental and not material possessions."

On the subject of the degree phobia currently sweeping the country, I have to agree with whoever said that Americans are degree conscious and not knowledge for knowledge sake conscious. This has relegated the gaining of masters and doctorates to the scoreboard realm.

This is an age-old subject, said Mr. Pearson about athletics versus scholastics, but one that is, because it still applies that most communities support the sending of a football team to Florida but squelch any idea of the debating team doing the same thing. This is the fault of the older generation. The younger set is more education conscious, more realistic about the threats that the future contains, and respect the scholar as well as the athlete—and they are smarter too. Not that they have more native intelligence, but it's cultivated at an earlier age, they are exposed to educational TV, etc.

Responding to another question, Mr. Pearson stated, I disagree with the child psychologists and parents who say junior will get an inferiority complex because he is categorized in school. The boy in the B or C history group knows he is there, accepts it as he would the fact that someone in his gym class can run faster than he can. But parents have a fetish about their children's abilities, thinking all of it has to measure up to their preconceived ideas.

I encourage my pupils to think—not to be parrots. Copying information out of an encyclopedia and handing it in, only proves that a child can write. There's more to education, the classroom, the development of the mind, than forcing it into a cataloging of facts and figures. To quote former President Hoover. "Education is what remains when you've forgotten what you learned."

The Other Side of the U–2 Story: Soviet Union Spies in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article by columnist Victor Riesel entitled, "The Other Side of the U–2 Story: Soviet Union Spies in America."

It is important for all Americans to be aware of the massive Soviet espionage effort in the United States and I believe Mr. Riesel has performed a very worthwhile public service in discussing this serious problem:

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE U–2 STORY: SOVIET UNION SPIES IN AMERICA

(By Victor Riesel)

Moscow's shrillness over U–2 spies in the skies is matched only by our stillness over the Soviet's massive espionage in the United States. Someone should lay it on the line. There's enough to be revealed—without exposing our counterintelligence—to prove that the Red bloc has sufficient agents operating in the United States to man a vast fleet of U–2's.

It was none other than J. Edgar Hoover who reported late in January that the FBI had 84 wiretaps operating strictly in defense of the internal security of the country. All were approved by the Attorney General—in advance and in writing. Naturally, the FBI Director would not discuss them. But the revelation of the wiretaps means that at least 84 important Soviet agents or spy rings were operating inside crucial areas in the United States this winter.

Many of these are Soviet bloc diplomats.

Hoover and his counterintelligence agents have evidence that some 70 to 80 percent of the Soviet officials in the United States have some type of intelligence assignment. It can be assumed that the FBI knows the real names, military and intelligence agency rank, and special assignment of most of these Communist bloc diplomats. Hoover has said that his estimate is based on the reports of a high Soviet counterintelligence agent who defected to the United States.

Obviously, the Russian apparatus has considerable manpower. Not only are the Iron Curtain nations' embassies involved, but, according to the FBI Director, "with privileges and immunities, Soviet-bloc personnel attached to the United Nations are becoming increasingly more active in Soviet-bloc intelligence operations."

"These countries," Hoover said, "are expanding their representation on the U. N. Secretariat, Soviet representation alone having jumped from 30 on July 1, 1957, to 72 on January 1, 1962."

The Soviets take no chances on their satellites' astuteness, proficiency, and perhaps, loyalty. The Russians not only have automatic access to all data obtained by the so-called peoples democracies but Moscow also maintains an adviser system at satellite headquarters level.

There is positive evidence in FBI records that the Soviet diplomats are regularly organized into mobile task forces to scour the United States.

For example, during 1961, Soviet officials alone made more than 14 intelligence and reconnaissance trips across the United States. They visited areas of strategic significance. They noted military installations. They mapped industrial facilities. They collected maps, photos, and other detailed data on powerplants, transportation systems, missile bases, and space shooting gallery operations.

Not only does the FBI have evidence of attempted infiltration of "our most critical intelligence and counterintelligence organizations"—and here I use Hoover's own words—but also Red operatives have sought entry into the secret headquarters controlling codes, the latest scientific developments in the electronics, jet and missile fuel and atomic energy fields.

Their agents have been busy gathering information on U.S. industrial facilities, political and economic data, and "material with which they can compromise American Government officials." Meaning blackmail.

Deep in the heart—literally and figuratively—of the Soviet strategists, is the dream

of piercing more than 3,000 American defense facilities—many of them factories almost impossible to protect against infiltration.

Up front in the Soviet industrial espionage network, according to a special report to Congress by Hoover, is the Amtorg Trading Corp. It represents 25 Soviet trade organizations behind the curtain.

Despite Hoover's outright charge that Amtorg is part of the Communist international industrial spy network, it operates freely out of New York City.

The only way to stop this activity is to dissolve the 38-year-old Amtorg Trading Corp. and send its agents home.

They, and their diplomatic colleagues—not to mention the anonymous undercover agents—really outnumber our entire batch of U–2 pilots.

Secretary Freeman Asked To Study and Act on National Farmers Organization Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the so-called farmers' strike, led by the National Farmers Organization, has aroused considerable interest among consumer groups in my area. After some study, I sent the following letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, which I hope will result in a thoughtful and constructive review of the important problems raised:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1962.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reports of the "farmers' strike" led by the National Farmers Organization in the Midwest disturb me greatly. If the strike is a success, it will raise the price of pork to consumers by at least 16 percent, and the price of hogs to processors by 22 percent or more. The price of pork is reaching the highest level in several years. A further increase—set artificially by a small group of producers—would put a tremendous burden on the food budgets of millions of consumers.

Such an increase—made even heavier by processor kick-ins and checkoffs—endangers as well the future of hundreds of small independent meatpacking concerns which could become the innocent victims in a pitched battle between the organized producers and the giant packinghouses.

It is still too early, it appears, to make an accurate judgment on the success or failure of the effort. But whether it is a success or failure is not really the point. What is the point, it seems to me, is whether or not any group of individuals can be allowed to arbitrarily dictate the basic price at which America's 180 million consumers will be allowed to buy their food.

Certainly the problem of farm income is a difficult one. And it is unquestionably true that the farm population, in general, has not shared with other segments of the American economy the unsurpassed prosperity of our age and time. But unilateral action by a small group of producers, unsupervised in any way by any representative of the public interest is not, in my opinion, an acceptable solution.

As a result of my fear of the long-range implications of this movement, I urgently request that you study the matter carefully and report to the President, the Congress and the people of the United States on what action the Department is taking to assure that this and any other similar movements are properly administered and supervised by public representatives, acting in the public interest, and that no individual or group of individuals will profit unreasonably from their position of potential power.

The National Farmers Organization is trying to insure the withdrawal from the market of a number of important consumer and commercial food products until it has signed contracts with major processors of these products guaranteeing minimum prices which they, the producers, have set arbitrarily and without any apparent consideration of interests of the millions of consumers who must eat these products.

These figures were set without the supervision or influence of any representative of the public. I have no way of knowing whether or not the prices now demanded by NFO are "reasonable" or not. But assuming they are, what assurance have the American people that they will be reasonable in the future?

While this kind of bargaining does allow farmers to arbitrarily set their own prices for these products, there is serious question about whether this short-term road to self-enrichment might not turn out to be a long-range trail to disaster for these same producers. Studies of meat retailing operations show that there is, for example, a 1-to-1 relationship between pork and poultry. That is, retail studies show that when poultry becomes cheap in relation to pork, people will buy poultry instead of pork. When pork becomes cheap in relation to poultry, people will substitute pork for poultry. There are other substitution ratios for other meat products. As a result, unless NFO can gain control of the price of all meat products, NFO members may find themselves getting a high theoretical price for hogs which few consumers will buy.

NFO says its contracts with processors will go into effect when they control 60 percent of the market. This would mean that a relatively small group of producers would have a readymade market for the things they produce. But what of non-NFO members? And what of small independent packers who cannot afford to sign? Presumably, many of them would be frozen out and they would have little recourse but to the Federal Government.

At the same time, economists have estimated that in order to reach the 16 percent increase in consumer pork prices the NFO group is after, there will have to be a 12 percent or more decrease in the number of hogs brought to market. In order to finance the "disposal" of the excess of its own members, the organization is demanding a percentage checkoff from the purchase price. But, again, what of non-NFO members? What are they to do with their surplus? And how do small packers afford the extra money? Again, the Federal Government will be the answer.

In short, I submit that this matter requires careful and thoughtful study quickly by those of the administration who are charged with assuring the Nation of a steady supply of the food it must eat, with an eye toward maintaining reasonable prices to consumers and the economic well-being of independent meatpacking operations.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Member of Congress.

The Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Cuban problem continues to exist, and recent activities in that area have reawakened America to ask, What ever happened to the Monroe Doctrine?

With Russia announcing that it has entered into a military aid pact with Castro, it is our duty to reaffirm our faith in the sage principle laid down by our fifth President and to announce to the world that the Monroe Doctrine, after 139 years, still represents our official position with respect to any invasion of our hemisphere from abroad.

The Lowell, Mass., Sun, in an excellent editorial appearing in its issue of September 10, has stated this so well that I am pleased to insert that editorial herein.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Russia's announced military aid pact with Castro's Cuba has brought the famous Monroe Doctrine down from the history book shelf and into the active foreign affairs arena.

What is it, and what meaning does it have for us today?

In 1823, at a time when it was feared European nations were intending to reimpose colonial rule over Latin American lands newly independent, President James Monroe decreed: "We should consider any attempt on their part to extent their system to any portions of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety."

He added that any European effort to control the destiny of Latin countries in any fashion would be taken by the United States as an unfriendly act.

This doctrine in subsequent years was restated by Presidents Polk, Cleveland, Wilson, and others. Most diplomatic historians regard it as a cornerstone of American foreign policy, substantially effective in warding off foreign intervention or control in this hemisphere.

Yet, when put to the severest test, we did not implement the doctrine with military action. While distracted by the Civil War, we watched three countries intervene in Mexico and did not go beyond verbal protest. France even set up a puppet regime.

We seem to have regarded the Monroe Doctrine as a big stick which we have been willing to brandish but have hoped we would not have to use. Even decades ago, we showed signs of discomfort that our Latin neighbors' hands were not gripping the stick with us.

Often U.S. leaders said we would welcome adoption of a similar policy by the other American nations. President Wilson once sought to give nonintervention substance of the doctrine a worldwide application.

Grover Cleveland's top diplomat, Secretary of State Olney, went to great pains to affirm that the doctrine did not establish any general U.S. protectoriate over Latin America, or justify interference with any Latin nation's internal affairs.

Later Theodore Roosevelt modified the polcy to embrace such interference, but in 1933 this country scrapped that idea in signing the so-called Montevideo Declaration.

During and after World War II, we finally allied ourselves with the other American Re-

publics in compacts which assert our joint purpose to defend the hemisphere against external threat or attack. Since then we have preferred to rely on these pacts rather than the Monroe Doctrine.

Yet both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy have seen fit to reassert the living character of that policy.

Kennedy intimated recently that it is an implementing of the doctrine to work with other Latin lands to isolate the Communist menace in Cuba. Historians like to point out, however, that in purest sense the doctrine is a national policy.

Are we ever likely to act under it, unilaterally, to the extent of using force—against Cuba or any other?

Many Presidential utterances, including one by Kennedy after the Cuban fiasco of 1961, suggest we might—but only in the last extremity of national danger.

A Way To Stop the Reds in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in addressing the House at the opening of the session today, I am including for the RECORD an article by Prof. Samuel Flagg Bemis, which appeared in the December 28, 1959, issue of U.S. News & World Report.

The article follows:

A WAY TO STOP THE REDS IN LATIN AMERICA—A NOTED HISTORIAN SETS A COURSE FOR QUICK ACTION BY THE UNITED STATES

(By Samuel Flagg Bemis, professor of diplomatic history and inter-American relations, Yale University)

(NOTE.—Communists are marking up gains in the Caribbean, just off the U.S. coast. How can the United States move to checkmate a Red takeover before it happens? A course of action is laid down by a distinguished historian, a Pulitzer Prize winner who has made a specialty of inter-American relations, in this article contributed to U.S. News & World Report. What happens if international communism leaps the Atlantic and emerges in control of one of the nations of this hemisphere? The author suggests a formula for stopping the Reds now, before it is too late.

(Samuel Flagg Bemis, 68, is widely recognized as an outstanding historian and authority on the diplomatic relations of the Americas. Professor Bemis, now Sterling professor of diplomatic history and inter-American relations at Yale University, has taught at many of the leading universities in the United States and in Latin America. Among his many books is "Diplomatic History of the United States," which is regarded as a classic on the subject. Professor Bemis won the Pulitzer Prize in history in 1927. His "John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy" received the Pulitzer Prize for biography in 1950. He has been described as a scholar who has "developed a continental and hemispherical, and finally a world outlook on American history.")

Prof. Arnold Toynbee, in a recent, 1958, brilliant study of "The Eve of War, 1939," has called attention to the fact that in 1940 no power was threatened on more than two fronts, east and west, whilst now, 1959, each of the two surviving power groups—United States and U.S.S.R.—is threatened on three fronts, east, west, and north, "a first-class revolution in international affairs * * * that is not easily grasped or taken into account."

Now suppose the United States should be threatened on all four fronts, including south as well as north, from the Caribbean, as well as the Arctic? Instead of an expansive and friendly ally like Canada stretching for thousands of miles between us and Soviet jet, submarine, and missile bases, with a double line of distant early warning trips, we suddenly become exposed to such bases almost within sight of our southern coastal cities, and right athwart our naval communications from Atlantic to Pacific by the Panama Canal. Would this not tip the balance of power fatally against the United States in the present deadly crisis of power and politics which we call the cold war?

Since 1934, the first line of our defense has shifted from Panama to Europe and Asia. In this geopolitical framework, the strategical paths over the Arctic regions have indeed become of more immediate significance than the Caribbean. It has even been argued by some strategists that, in the atomic age, the Panama Canal is no longer a lifeline for the defense of this country; that we could well afford to have it neutralized under an international authority, so great is the danger that one atomic bomb could neutralize—i.e., paralyze it by knocking it out.

Scarcely anything short of withdrawal of American forces from Europe and the Asiatic littoral, or the dissolution of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization), or SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) would please the Red imperialists more than the neutralization of the Panama Canal or the transfer of its control and defense to the Republic of Panama, like the Suez Canal to Egypt. It would split our present global strategy into a two-ocean strategy and prevent the Panama Canal's being used by the West as a substitute for a blocked Suez Canal, or to relieve the burden on our flagging railway system in case of war.

The Communist conspiracy is on its toes today in Panama trying to dislodge the United States from control of this still-vital American lifeline.

The United States should make it clear to the world that in the Panama Canal Zone it will continue to act as if it were sovereign, as, indeed, it has an explicit treaty right so to do, and to stick beyond any cavil to the military defenses of that waterway.

MORE THAN THE CANAL CAN BE LOST

Much more than the canal, and all that it means to American defense, can be lost. If international communism is allowed to jump the Atlantic and set up a rule in a state of the New World, the way it recently tried to leapfrog over Turkey into Syria and Lebanon, it would mean not only effective neutralization of the hemispheric lifeline in a strategic sense; it would create an active fourth front for the defense of the United States. We simply cannot allow that to happen.

Latin-American Communists schooled in Moscow have studied just how to set up their system in the Americas. They tried it once already in Guatemala, while the United States stood by with arms folded around the doctrine of nonintervention, awaiting the uncertain action of a conference of foreign ministers which, thanks only to the counterrevolution of Carlos Armas, never had to meet.

When, finally, the diplomatic doctors did an autopsy on the fallen Arbenz regime in Guatemala, they found the disease of international communism to be far more deep-seated than they had suspended. In fact, it still lingers as a cancer in the body politic of honest liberalism, not only in Guatemala but in all the States of Central America and the Caribbean. It is festering now in Cuba, in Panama, in Venezuela where they spat on Vice President Nixon. The cancer is spreading.

What is there, within the inter-American peace system—pledged as it is to the doctrine of nonintervention—to prevent such a disaster in the New World?

Nonintervention is the keystone of the inter-American peace structure, put into place by the good-neighbor policy. In numerous treaties since 1933—subject to honorable denunciation by any of the parties on 1 year's and, in some cases, 2 years' notice—the American republics have declared inadmissible the intervention of any one of them (1933, 1936) or group of them (1948) directly or indirectly or for whatever reason, within the internal affairs of another American State.

There is, however, one outstanding exception to this sweeping pledge: It does not affect existing treaty obligations. For example, it would not affect the existing treaties of the United States with Panama or Nicaragua by which the United States guarantees the protection of the Panama Canal and the Nicaraguan canal site; it would not affect our treaty with Cuba giving us the naval base at Guantanamo; it would not affect the provisions of the Inter-American Treaty or Reciprocal Assistance, of Rio de Janeiro, of 1947.

The Rio Pact—the first regional alliance of the diplomatic revolution which now binds the United States to defensive alliances today with some 46 countries of the globe—provides for joint intervention, if two-thirds of the American States shall agree to assist in meeting an armed attack against an American State—the group acting within the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. The treaty also provides, article 6: "If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independenec of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack, or by an extracontinental or intercontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation (of the Organization of American States) shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent."

The Rio Pact of 1947 is the same bond which brought inter-American diplomatic intervention to stop local wars between Haiti and the Dominican Republic, and between Nicaragua and Costa Rica. It is the same bond and principle which animated the meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs last August, in Santiago de Chile, invoked by four Republics, including the United States—that gentle Pan-American huddle which weakly empowered the Inter-American Peace Commission to watch and study military movements in the Caribbean and report to the next (11th) Conference of American States at Quito, Ecuador, in February 1960.

This is the same casus foederis (a case within the provisions of a treaty) to which appeal had been made, upon the insistence of Panama, in the case of Guatemala in 1954, for a meeting of foreign ministers of American States to consider the crisis of Guatemala, but did not meet because of Carlos Armas' successful counterrevolution.

Today it is very doubtful whether the Organization of American States, through its Organ of Consultation, could muster the necessary two-thirds majority of the high contracting parties, quickly enough to give a mandate, under the terms of the Rio Pact of 1947, for joint intervention to suppress a Latin-American government gone Commu-

nist by infiltration of a popular-front government or capture of a liberal revolution, and thereby threatening the peace and security of the American Continent.

It might be tried, but, if it failed, what then?

There remains the Monroe Doctrine, which declares that interposition by any European powers to extend their system to any region of this hemisphere is dangerous to our own peace and safety. There remains the inherent right of self-defense, both individual and collective, even if it is not agreed on by a two-thirds majority of American States.

"We owe it [therefore] to candor," pronounced President Monroe in his famous message of December 2, 1823, "and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those [European] powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety—we could not consider any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States"—which would induce measures on the part of the United States "indispensable to their security."

An important corollary to the Monroe Doctrine since its origin—indeed, a vital dictum of the doctrine since 1869—prohibits the transfer of any colony in the New World from one European sovereign to another—lest such an occurrance upset the balance of power against the security of the United States in this hemisphere.

This "no transfer" principle has been bound up in the Monroe Doctrine throughout its history. President Grant officially proclaimed it a part of the doctrine in 1869.

A 1940 PRECEDENT FOR ACTION

As Hitler's armies were overrunning Western Europe and threatening to take over French, Dutch, and British colonies in the Western Hemisphere—i.e., Guadalupe, Martinique, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Trinidad, British Honduras, the Guianas, Aruba, etc.—a joint resolution of the U.S. Congress of June 18, 1940, signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, implementing the sense of an earlier declaration by a meeting of the foreign ministers of the American republics of Panama in September, 1939, at the beginning of the war, stated: "(1) That the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer, any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power; and (2) That if such transfer or attempt to transfer should appear likely, the United States shall, in addition to other measures, immediately consult with other American Republics to determine upon the steps which should be taken to safeguard their common interests."

Shortly thereafter, a special conference of foreign ministers of the same republics, facing the danger of Nazi conquest of Europe and England, gave a mandate to any one or more American republics, in case of the imminent danger of transfer of colonial territory in the American continents from one European sovereign to another, to step in and act quickly to forestall such a transfer. A special convention provided for an inter-American committee to administer the government of the rescued region, pending its restoration to its inhabitants upon the return of peace.

But the Havana mandate of 1940 looks only to the actual transfer of an existing colony in America from one European sovereign to another European sovereign. It does not explicitly envisage the case of a European sovereign in fact, if not in name, extending its Communist system to a republic of the American system à la Guatemala—and will it be à la Cuba, à la Panama, à la Venezuela?

The Pact of Rio of 1947 does anticipate such a fact or situation endangering the peace and security of any republic of the New World, but it requires a two-thirds vote of the 21 Republics to give a mandate to 1 or more Republics to act in time to stop the danger.

It would be nice if there could issue from the 11th meeting of American states, to meet at Quito, Ecuador, in February 1960, a declaration on the lines of the act of Havana of 1940, giving a mandate for individual or joint action to prevent the international Communist system of the Old World extending itself to an American state, directly or indirectly, and thereby threatening the peace and security of the American Republics.

It is not known whether our Department of State is endeavoring to put such a business on the agenda for the Quito Conference. It ought to be a major goal of our Government to secure this kind of declaration. Such a proposal, incidentally would be a touchstone to reveal the degree of Communist power within the various delegations.

However, it is not likely, in the present condition of inter-American relations, that such a declaration would be accepted by even a bare majority of the states—and the emergency may be upon us even before the meeting at Quito next February. Already, the Cuban dictatorship has announced its intention to buy jetplanes from inside the Iron Curtain.

The dilemma of our Latin American policy today is whether, on the one hand, to interpret the inter-American doctrine of nonintervention so as to permit a non-American power to extend its revolutionary system to the New World by capturing a republic in the Caribbean or Central America, now within easy bombing range of the United States and of the Panama Canal; or, on the other hand, to prepare some anti-interventionist action within the framework of the inter-American peace structure that would really prevent the intervention of international communism. That is: inter-American intervention to prevent non-American intervention, one horn of the dilemma; or the other horn of absolute nonintervention to permit the intervention of international communism to establish its system in the Western Hemisphere.

In 1940, the Congress acted promptly in the face of the danger arising from the war in Europe. Let it now pass an analogous resolution, to make it clear to our friends and enemies, all over the globe, that this Government is determined within its inherent right of self-defense, and within the purview of the pristine Monroe Doctrine, and indeed of the Pact of Rio and the inter-American peace structure, not to permit the intervention of international communism to endanger the peace and security of the United States, and of all the republics of this hemisphere—indeed, the balance of power for freedom against slavery in the entire globe.

Such a resolution again the intervention of international communism-couched in the language of the Monroe Doctrine, the Rio Pact, and the nonintervention declarations of Washington (1951) and Caracas (1954), and the recent Declaration No. XI of Santiago (1959)—should provide for the administration of the state thus defended or rescued, by the same inter-American authority and machinery set up in the Havana Convention of 1940 for the provisional administration of European colonies and possessions in America threatened by a transfer of sovereignty.

Thus stipulated, there need be no apprehension on the part of our good neighbors that the United States would be reverting to the old system that characterized the interventions against European imperialist intervention in this hemisphere during the first quarter of our century.

Such a policy would protect the doctrine of nonintervention against the new technique of intervention by international communism, and would do so within the spirit of the inter-American peace and defense treaties. It would not wait for the accomplished fact of a leap of the Communist revolution across the Atlantic to uproot the Monroe Doctrine in the New World, as it has already destroyed the "open door" policy in China. By thus assuming the initiative in the new world, we can also defend the global balance of power on which the pecae and security of the United States and of our sister Republics of America in the world most depend during the coming decade.

WHY "WAIT FOR THE BLOWS TO FALL"?

It is too much the practice of the United States, in the continuing world crisis of our time, to let the initiative rest with the enemy, to wait for the blows to fall and only then endeavor to improvise some action to fend them off.

Let something be done now, before it is too late, to deter the action. Congress ought, at the beginning of the next session in January, immediately, on the eve of the Quito Conference, to pass a joint resolution analogous to that of June 18, 1940, explicitly pointed at the present fact or situation.

If the Quito Conference doesn't back it up, then the United States, acting under the pristine Monroe Doctrine, must do so. The act of faith known as the good neighbor polcy, and the freedom of the New World—but, most essentially, the security of the United States and the blessings of liberty invoked in our Constitution—are more at stake.

RESOLUTION THAT PROFESSOR BEMIS WANTS U.S. CONGRESS TO ADOPT BASED ON HISTORIC U.S. POLICIES

(Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, 1947)

Whereas the intervention of international communism directly or indirectly in an American Republic would constitute a fact or situation threatening the sovereignty and political independence of the states of the entire New World; and

(Monroe Doctrine, 1823)

Whereas the American Continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, have long since ceased to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power or powers; and

(Declaration of Washington, 1951, and Declaration of Caracas, 1954)

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, would be in effect such a colonization by a non-American power or powers, and would violate the sovereignty and political independence of an American state; and

(Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance and Monroe Doctrine, 1823)

Whereas such a fact or situation extended to any portions of this hemisphere would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States and the American Continents; and

Whereas in the rapidly developing contingencies of the atomic age there might not be time to assemble a meeting of the Inter-American Organ of Consultation to provide

for joint action to repel the danger, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States hereby

Resolve, That if such a fact or situation should present a sudden emergency, then any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance would be justified, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 of the charter of the United Nations, in taking steps to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World.

(Act of Havana, 1940, with Convention of Havana, 1940, and Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, 1863)

In case of such defensive measures having been taken by the defending state or states, it or they should report to the Inter-American Organ of Consultation, to the end that an emergency committee, after the manner provided by the Convention of Havana of 1940, be set up for the provisional administration of the state thus defended, pending its restoration to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Address by Senator Thomas J. Dodd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address by Senator THOMAS J. DODD which he made on September 7 to the members of the Peace Corps graduating class at Howard University here in Washington, D.C.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend Senator DODD for his thoughtful speech in which he so well sets forth the fine and constructive work which these dedicated American men and women are doing throughout the world.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD TO MEMBERS OF THE PEACE CORPS GRADUATING CLASS AT HOWARD UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1962

A year and a half ago a man came to see me in my office for the purpose of explaining a new project in which he was vitally interested. His name was Sargent Shriver and he wanted to describe a proposal which he called the Peace Corps. I had heard a little about it, and a good deal of what I had heard was criticism by those who felt that it was a visionary, fuzzy-minded scheme that could never work.

Mr. Shriver made an impression on me that day that I shall never forget. The Peace Corps was a visionary idea, and he made no bones about it. But he described its plans and purposes with such practicality, with such clarity, with such buoyant enthusiasm, that I was convinced then and there that the Peace Corps could make a remarkable contribution to our country and to the world and that it deserved a fair chance.

From the earliest days of its consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee and on the floor of the Senate, I have supported, first the establishment and then the enlargement of, the Peace Corps. I have watched its amazing success with growing satisfaction. It is a real honor for me to be invited here today to take part in the graduation exercises of this Peace Corps class and I am proud to be able to come here as a friend and a supporter of this great program to which you have dedicated the coming months and years of your lives.

The Peace Corps has succeeded because it is based upon a concept that has always been very close to the hearts of the American people. More than a century ago Abraham Lincoln, then a rather obscure candidate for the U.S. Senate against the renowned Stephen A. Douglas, said that the life of every great nation and of every great civilization had a central theme and that the controversies and conflicts, the laws, and even the wars were largely manifestations of the gradual unfolding of that central theme.

The central theme of American history, Lincoln said, was equality of opportunity, the right of all men and women to have a fair chance to improve their lot, to develop their talents, to realize their full potential.

It is this striving for an equal chance for all that has sparked the great political, social, and economic struggles and movements that have characterized our American history and it is the progressive realization of this ideal that has brought us to our present posture in world affairs.

Our great objective at home today is to complete the task of making equality of opportunity, in all of its broad aspects, a reality for every American.

Our great objective abroad is to make this same equality of opportunity available, in peace and in freedom, to every man and woman in the world.

In the pursuit of these goals we find ourselves engaged in a mortal struggle, a struggle for our very survival, a struggle forced upon us by an enemy who opposes our ideal with his own ideal, which is the equality of slavery and the destruction of the individual.

There are many aspects of this struggle for survival, and we must succeed in all of them. All of these facets, I suppose, could be broken down into two broad divisions.

The first division consists of those defensive programs which we must pursue to meet the ever-present threat of force and military aggression by the Communists.

The second division includes those more agreeable policies, the propagation of our ideas, the improvement of international trade, assistance to other nations such as the Marshall plan and the Alliance for Progress, and the other positive programs through which we attempt to foster the independent of other nations and the improvement of living standards for the peoples of the world.

But though we may for purposes of discussion break down our policy into two broad divisions, we should never lose sight of the fact that this policy is one seamless cloak, that it is all of one cloth and that all of its parts are interwoven.

It is not enough to support a great military buildup and to ignore those programs of foreign assistance, trade cooperation, and cultural exchange which are vital parts of our policy.

It is not enough to support the more peaceful and altruistic aspects of our policy while at the same time to shun those programs of military preparedness and nuclear development and stiff resistance to Communist aggression that are absolutely indispensable to our survival as a free nation.

In this great struggle which is being carried forward on so many fronts and at so many levels, each of us has a role to play.

For many, that role entails great personal sacrifice. The scientists who under incredible tensions strain their mental and physical faculties to the outer limits in order to gain for our country a year or a month in the arms race that has been forced upon us; the Foreign Service officers who labor under the American flag at great risk to themselves and their families in a thousand dangerous environments; the men in uniform who patrol the barren wastes and who occupy the lonely islands and stations which make up our vast Atlantic and Pacific missile ranges; the sentries of freedom who at bases and installations around the globe are today sacrificing some of the most important years of their lives in your defense and in mine; all of these deserve the gratitude of the American people and of all the people of the free world.

The members of this graduating class are today embarking upon a special kind of sacrifice, a special kind of service, the importance of which cannot be magnified or exaggerated.

By the end of this year, 5,000 of your fellow Peace Corpsmen will be serving in 38 countries.

They have brought something new into these countries.

They are not there to exploit the labor of others; they are there to labor for others.

They are not there to make a profit for themselves; they are there to return a profit to others.

They are not there to be served but to serve, to do a job, to train teachers, engineers, mechanics, carpenters, home economists, soil specialists, tractor and farm equipment operators, agricultural extension workers, and laboratory technicians.

Unlike their Communist contemporaries, they are not in these nations to subvert and enslave; they are there to liberate.

These young Americans are, as Sargent Shriver has described them, a blend of the statesman and the scholar. Every country that Peace Corps volunteers have gone to has asked that their number be doubled and tripled.

And as the Peace Corps has been of great service to other nations, so has it been to our own Nation.

As it has raised the esteem of our country around the world, so too has it helped to restore our own confidence in ourselves.

Never again let it be said that the young people of America are soft and selfish and incompetent. Never again let it be said that the students on our campuses have lost the traditional idealism of former days.

The brief history of the Peace Corps has already proved that whenever we give our young people an opportunity to serve, they will serve; whenever we clearly hold up an ideal, they will pursue that ideal; whenever we offer a challenge, they will respond to that challenge with a heroic effort.

The labor of everyone of the thousands of Peace Corps volunteers around the globe is living testimony to the truth that we in America are still working at the task of expanding human freedom and opportunity.

The Peace Corps is a reminder to all of us that if from time to time we have wandered from our mission, or temporarily forgotten about it, we are now back on the track.

Every Peace Corps volunteer that we send abroad is further proof that we in America still believe, after the passage of almost two centuries, that if a man is given a fair chance, he will elevate himself and transform the environment around him and that if man is given a real choice he will choose freedom and will stand with those who defend freedom in the world.

I understand that the members of this class, which include doctors, medical assistants and master fishermen, are going to Africa to work with the people in Togo and in Sierra Leone. We are endeavoring to keep the peoples of that great continent from sinking into the pit of despondency, despair, and hopelessness that will promp them to

turn to communism as a possible solution to their grave problems.

The best way to do this is to make them realize that through our material assistance and through the person-to-person help and instruction which the Peace Corps provides, we can help them to solve their problems, to make progress, to build the kind of society they want for themselves and for their children, and to do it in individual freedom and in national independence.

Those of you who are going forth from this class are playing a direct and vital and indispensable part in preserving and extending and enlarging the American tradition.

As you render a service to less fortunate peoples around the world, you render even greater service to your own country. And as your labor rewards those whom you seek to help, so will it prove to be the most personally rewarding experience of your lives. I envy you your journey ahead.

I am proud and honored to have been invited to come here to take part in this ceremony and I wish to express to each of you the gratitude and the admiration of the American people for the work you are doing in the cause of human freedom and human advancement, the cause to which our country is dedicated and which shall prevail.

Thank you and good luck to you all.

Speaking to You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think that the following column which analyzes the problem of structural or hard core unemployment that confronts us as a nation is both timely and thought provoking. While I do not necessarily concur in all of the things the author has suggested, I do think that his column should be spread upon the RECORD, and I do commend it to the thoughtful reading of the Members of the House.

The article follows:

SPEAKING TO YOU

(By John Burlend)

The Labor Day speeches this year centered around the sticky and persistent problem of unemployment. The solution proposed by the chief of the AFL-CIO, the 35-hour week, has kindled little public support nor is it likely to. It would add an insupportable burden to American industry as it faces a decade of grueling competition from the Common Market and other foreign rivals. The central problem however will not go away, nor is there an easy solution.

The strikes of today are less and less concerned with wage increases. The two headline strikes of this summer have been flight engineers of Eastern Airlines, and the telegraphers, so called, of the Chicago and North Western Railroad.

Both strikes are against improved technical efficiency; both are completely inexcusable. I know that some one will say, "Ah, yes, but if you were one about to lose your job, you would have a different viewpoint." There can be no defense of a strike called for purely selfish purposes that punishes not only management and investors but thousands of workers as well.

There is a grave warning here for society and for labor. Society is on notice that there are small groups in this country that are willing to destroy healthy companies and inflict injury on their fellow workers in order to protect an unnecessary job. If the same pattern should continue with every new laborsaving device, the cost would be as great as a depression. These strikes are a warning to society that a new approach may be necessary.

There is a warning to labor as well. Our Government deliberately fostered the growth of labor unions because the individual workman was unable to bargain effectively for himself. In the past few years we have seen examples of corrupt and gangster-controlled unions flaunting their power and defying public opinion.

We have been slow to take punitive measures because action that would correct the evils might well destroy unions as well. But if union power is exercised to destroy rather than to promote and protect, the reluctance of the public to take drastic measures may be swept away. Labor must be responsible or it will lose its protected position.

Even so, our problem is not solved. Automation has destroyed jobs; it will destroy many more. We face a situation that is unlike anything we have previously met. These ranks of unemployed are likely to be unemployable. These are the ones who drop out of school early because they lag behind, because they cannot maintain the pace. A large percentage are Negro, Puerto Rican, and migratory workers although each community has its own contingent.

These are people who cannot qualify for a job in this technical age. They cannot be retrained; they have never been trained for the kind of jobs that are now available.

Once upon a time there was an almost unlimited demand on farms for unskilled labor; today no farmer will trust expensive machines to untrained, low ability casual workers. Railroads employ less and less unskilled labor, even road construction requires men with skills and abilities.

We have hanging over us today an unemployed army of some 4 million; it is likely to get larger. They still need to eat even if they can't find jobs. If crime is the only occupation open to them, then they will be gradually recruited into the ranks of the enemies of society. Even if we have no feeling of charity for the unfortunate our own self-interest would prompt us to discourage crime.

There has been a great deal of talk about job retraining; there are areas where it may accomplish a good deal; there are other areas where it is little more than a cruel hoax. Some of the problem will be corrected as the Negro, the Puerto Rican, the migratory worker get better educational opportunities.

The problem of what to do with the youngster who has not the ability to find and hold a job in an age of technology remains. It seems to me that we will deliberately have to drain off these unemployables into a new type of job where their lack of skill and ability will be no great handicap and where they can perform services useful to society.

Perhaps this calls for the formation of a new CCC; perhaps, as was recently suggested, there should be an attempt to make domestic service more attractive. Before you raise your voice in anguish against any and every proposal to meet the problem, best that you answer two questions:

1. What would you do if you had neither the training or the ability to get a steady job?

2. Are there better ways of dealing with the problem of unemployment than battling an ever-increasing crime wave?

Bayh Says Free World Learning Lesson From Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today our young men and women of the Peace Corps are making history in that they are teaching all Americans and all nations in the free world a lesson in foreign affairs.

This fact has been clearly defined by the Honorable Birch Bayh, the Democratic candidate for U.S. Senator from Indiana, who in a recent speech delivered at Goshen, Ind., told his audience how this "bold program of the Kennedy administration is proving to be one of our most potent cold war weapons in combating communism."

Because Mr. Bayh's statement is worthy of consideration by all Members of this body, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from his Goshen speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE WORLD LEARNING LESSON FROM PEACE CORPS

Government officials in Washington and throughout the free world are learning a lesson in foreign affairs from young American men and women who have volunteered and are serving as good will ambassadors abroad in the Peace Corps.

This bold program of the Kennedy administration is proving to be one of our most potent cold war weapons in combating communism and providing underdeveloped nations with the skilled hands needed to aid in development and growth. These helping hands are making strides for the cause of freedom where American dollars have failed to win friends in the past. We are winning friends for freedom by helping the less fortunate friendly people of the world learn the skills necessary to help themselves.

The program has been so successful that at the present time some 50,000 requests for volunteers have been received from nations around the globe, more than 5 times the number of trained volunteers available for oversea service.

The program has been so widely accepted in Washington congressional circles that approval for additional funds to finance the effort has virtually no opposition.

Despite its success, the Peace Corps has been a vehicle which has been used to level personal attacks upon the President and other administrative officers. Regrettably, one such attack was launched by the senior Senator from Indiana, Mr. HOMER CAPEHART, my rival for election this fall to the U.S. Senate.

Last October Mr. CAPEHART, in criticizing the Peace Corps, was quoted as saying "Communist battle lines are no place for inexperienced, immature New Frontiersmen."

Apparently Mr. CAPEHART is not aware of the fact that Peace Corps volunteers are skilled in a trade or profession. Surveyors, engineers, agriculture technicians, nurses, teachers, and others with similar training receive vigorous apprenticeship before leaving on their respective missions.

It may be interesting to note that today we have 613 teachers serving their country in the Peace Corps; 151 agricultural and forestry workers; 78 volunteer workers in vocational training; 63 nurses, 23 surveyors, 25 engineers, and scores of others in various fields of endeavor. Twenty-four Hoosiers are presently fulfilling their tour of duty overseas ranging in scope from teacher's aids in the Philippines to electrical engineers in Pakistan. Bear in mind that these are not wildeyed liberals or migratory beatniks, as the Senator infers, but skilled and mature individuals who have realized achievement in their respective fields and are willing to devote 2 years of their lives to the cause of freedom. Still the Senator fails to recognize the need for vision and imaginative thinking in the area of foreign policy.

With this sort of judgment, I wonder how far this opinion can be trusted in other areas of vital concern to State and Nation.

The future belongs to the Nation that shows imagination and initiative in selling a sound philosophy. Our training program for the backward nations of the world is marked with these two qualities. With this program, we can achieve far better results with fewer dollars.

It is imperative that we have representation in the U.S. Senate that is capable of understanding the times in which we live and has the objective foresight necessary to deal with 20th century problems.

I personally feel that the Peace Corps program could be improved with the addition of more trained teachers to represent democracy accurately before the other nations of the world. Dollars, when given, are spent; food is consumed after donation; but education in the basic fundamentals and in the traditions of the American way of life will live forever in the minds of our less fortunate neighbors who are striving to improve their lot in life.

In the past, the Communist cause has gained considerable following by placing teachers in classrooms who expounded communistic indoctrination in addition to the subjects they were engaged to instruct.

In our way of life, we have a superior product to sell. American teachers can serve as our "secret weapon" in the cold war between ideologies.

We cannot solve space age problems with stone age reasoning. We must have capable representation with vigorous and direct action. A U.S. Senator from Indiana must have the vision and imagination so necessary to help America win the most important battle for the minds of men.

How Temporary Is a Temporary Tax?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mrs. St. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Maurice Stans appeared in the Washington Post of September 16.

It brings us back to the unfortunate truth that although you "cannot fool all of the people all of the time," you can certainly "fool most of the people most of the time."

The temporary taxes are a perfect example of this. People, including majorities in Congress, vote for these so-called temporary measures, and then like Ole Man River, they just keep rolling along.

The article follows:

HOW TEMPORARY IS A TEMPORARY TAX?

(By Maurice H. Stans)

If Webster were alive today, he would concede that the most inaccurate word in the Washington vocabulary is "temporary."

Members of Congress and of the Government bureaus know that one of the easiest ways to start a Government program is to give it a short life. Once it gets going, it is as certain as Pikes Peak to survive all attempts to cut it down.

The visible evidence of this phenomenon is the enduring existence of the many "temporary" buildings erected in Foggy Bottom and along Constitution Avenue during the war years. Some of them still survive almost 20 years later.

Taxes are very much the same. Most of the temporary taxes of the Korean war still are in effect. It will be a historic event when the tax on train, bus and boat transportation finally expires on November 15 this year and the tax on air travel is reduced to 5 percent.

An especially striking case history is the gasoline tax. The States originally had preempted this area of taxation, and the Federal Government moved into it gingerly and "temporarily" for the first time in 1932. Here's what happened after that:

1932—Temporary tax of 1 cent per gallon enacted.

1933—Temporary tax extended and increased to 1½ cents per gallon.

1934, 1935, 1937, 1939—Temporary tax continued at 1 cent.

1940—Temporary tax increased to 1½ cents, made permanent in 1941.

1951—Tax increased temporarily to 2 cents.

1956—Tax boosted to 3 cents (temporary).

1959—Tax raised to 4 cents (temporary) for 2 years.

1961—Tax at 4 cents extended temporarily to October 1972.

The fiction of a temporary tax goes on, and the present law specifies that in 1972 the rate shall drop to 1½ cents. Want to bet on it?

The National Defense Education Act was a temporary law, enacted in 1958 to stimulate scientific education as a result of the clamor following Russia's first entry into space with sputnik. Its proponents argued that 4 years of student loans, teaching fellowships, loans for scientific equipment and foreign-language instruction were all that would be needed to bring us back to rightful scientific leadership.

Now the administration has also asked for a further large program of student scholarships to supplement the loans, and the other parts of the act are sure to last a long while.

Another important temporary program was Federal public assistance grants to the States. They began in 1935, to provide assistance to those in need who did not qualify for social security benefits. It was confidently predicted that, as social security payments grew, this program would phase out.

Its costs in 1937 was $44 million. By now it has grown in scope, its benefits have been enlarged, its beneficiaries have increased and this year's budget is $2.7 billion.

The Small Business Administration, created temporarily in 1953, became permanent in 1958. The Rural Electrification Administration, created in 1936 to provide electric service to farms, has long since achieved its purpose. With 98 percent of American farmers having central-station electricity, President Eisenhower proposed that the Agency become privately financed for any future needs, but it still flourishes on appropriations of about $350 million a year.

A special milk program, established in 1958 as a temporary measure to help the dairy industry, continues to cost about $100 million a year. Temporary programs of grants for library services (1956) and for nurses' training (1946) were extended in 1962 for longer terms.

The granddaddy of all is a temporary program under the Morrill Act of 1862 granting $50,000 to each State to help land-grant colleges. It still carries on, supplemented by additional amounts under other laws in 1935 and 1961. Veterans' direct loans "to assist World War II veterans in their readjustment to civilian life" were extended again in 1961, 16 years after the war, despite President Eisenhower's plea that the need "has long since passed." The 1962 provision is $200 million.

And the most expensive of all is the temporary farm price support program enacted in 1938 to solve the farm problem. It now costs $3 to $4 billion a year, with no end in sight.

No matter how temporary their origin, Government tax programs, facilities, and personnel always continue and proliferate.

The happy delusion that fixing an ending date will bring such things to a close may help to satisfy the consciences of the lawmakers, but the taxpayers may as well be realistic and recognize that, once on the books, temporary programs never die, they just divide and multiply.

President of Salem College (W. Va.), K. Duane Hurley, Writes Inspiring and Purposeful Letter to Faculty Members as College Year Begins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, my alma mater, Salem College, located in Salem, W. Va., is a growing and progressive institution of higher learning which this year is marking its 75th anniversary. Under the able leadership of President K. Duane Hurley, Salem's dedicated faculty and staff are earning for it a place of respect among the colleges and universities of the East.

A recent letter from President Hurley to his faculty colleagues gives true insight into the high standards of personal and professional excellence exhibited by those educators. The letter came to my attention through the thoughtfulness of T. Edward Davis, chairman of the board of directors of Salem College, a body in which I am privileged to serve. Chairman Davis asserts that "this strong and challenging letter should be read by us all."

Mr. President, at this season when millions of our young citizens are returning to their schools and universities it is appropriate that we pause to remember those devoted and sincere men and women who administer and teach in the colleges of our Nation. Today, as never before, we realize that education is truly

a vital key to the future, and without its inspiration and light America cannot hope to maintain its position of preeminence.

I request that President K. Duane Hurley's letter to his colleagues be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 3, 1962.

DEAR COLLEAGUES: As another college year begins—probably Salem College's most significant year—I want to emphasize how pleased I am to be associated with you in this important educational enterprise.

Never before have the opportunities or challenges been greater. Full accreditation is in the offing for our institution; and, even more important, an increasing number of individuals are depending upon us for superior training and guidance in these critical days.

Therefore, with my pledge of cooperation and with the prayer that all petty and insignificant differences among us may be submerged for the greater good, I am proposing the following theme as our guide for the year: "achievement through teamwork."

In keeping with our constantly improving professionalism, the Benedum Foundation with a special grant has made possible a higher level of compensation for this year and the next. Now it is incumbent upon us to keep our performance superior in order to attract and merit such continuing support.

Some staff members were employed with the higher wage scale already in mind. Others will find attached to this letter a note from the business office indicating their revised salary for the coming academic year.

A number of factors were given careful, objective consideration in determining adjustments. First, conscientious effort was made to arrive at a generally equitable level of pay for all, commensurate with years of service and experience. This procedure required varying amounts of increase.

Other factors considered include degree standing, academic growth, graduate study, attitude, cooperation in campus activities, participation in community affairs, and teaching effectiveness. In addition, allowance was made for extra administrative and for other responsibilities, adjusted in keeping with the classroom load and other pertinent factors.

Of course, all of us have basic teaching and other assignments that are a part of the job: counseling, sponsorship of clubs, classes, and organizations; attendance at chapel, assemblies, and special convocations; participation in faculty meetings, and the like. We also have the obligation of setting the standard for the campus community in such matters as conduct, attitude and scholarship. How else are students expected to learn to be professional: handling grievances maturely; keeping matters of salary, et cetera, confidential; refraining from gossip and backbiting conversation about friends and associates; being willing to give one's best under all circumstances without thought of praise or compensation; and maintaining meaningful spiritual and religious influences in life?

Our college is a friendly, Christian, academic community in which each member has a basic concern for the welfare of the others. Our primary objective is to serve, rather than to be served. Ours is divine vocation.

In this spirit and as a fully cooperating happy team, I am confident that we can make this—our college's 75th anniversary—the greatest year of achievement. May God's guidance and blessing abide with us, assuring success.

Sincerely,

K. DUANE HURLEY,
President, Salem College.

Senator Robert Byrd Defends His Relief Roll Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, Senator ROBERT BYRD is one of the newer members on the Senate Appropriations Committee but one of our most effective and hardworking Members. I have followed with great admiration and respect his investigations into the scandalous relief situation in the District of Columbia. He has done a remarkable job of disclosing the inefficient and scandalous manner in which this program has been operated.

At all times during the investigations he has tried his best to help and protect the rights of needy people. Few people know better than Senator BYRD that if these programs are not honestly and efficiently operated, it is the needy who are hurt the worst. I have only the highest commendation for the fine work carried on by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, ROBERT BYRD.

Mr. President, his efforts in this field have won recognition and commendation all over the United States. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in North Dakota's largest newspaper, the Fargo Forum, of Fargo, N. Dak., under date of September 13, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR ROBERT BYRD DEFENDS HIS RELIEF ROLL STAND

Senator ROBERT BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, chairman of a subcommittee investigating welfare fraud in the District of Columbia, has been checking closely into the welfare situation. He has brought out some astounding evidence of fraud. But he has been charged with plucking bread from the mouths of women and children.

Because of these charges that he was not doing the right sort of job, that he was not being honest with those on relief, he made a statement in his defense which he prefaced with this statement:

"There is nobody here who can tell me about hard times—because I have seen them," he said. He explained that his mother had died when he was 10 months old and that he was raised by penniless foster parents, who "never took 5 cents" in welfare funds. He continued: "Some people may think we don't know what it is to wear tennis shoes in the snow. I went from one end of the community to the other with a little wagon gathering up scraps saved for me by housewives so I could feed the hogs. I was out of high school for 16 years before I could go to college. So never let it be said that I look at this problem from any ivory tower."

He made it plain that he was not trying to take bread out of the mouths of honest relief recipients. He was simply trying to get chislers off the rolls.

The District of Columbia's welfare payments shot up from $9,500,000 to $21,300,000 in the past 7 years. In his position as chairman of a subcommittee charged with investigating this situation, he wanted to find out the whys of this stepped-up welfare outlay.

He found some strange goings-on. Of the cases reviewed, investigators found that 78 percent of the persons on general relief were really ineligible for aid, as were 57 percent of the mothers receiving checks for dependent children.

These are large percentages. If that is the case in the Nation's Capital, what would a check show elsewhere? On the basis of the Byrd findings, Anthony Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is planning a review of the situation throughout the country. He takes the view that what happened in Washington might be happening elsewhere.

Making Our Words Stick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following strong statement from the Waukegan News Sun of September 6, 1962, expressing the necessity for firm thinking, firm intention and firm declaration to protect this hemisphere against Communist aggression.

MAKING OUR WORDS STICK

On today's editorial page, three of our columnists survey the tangled problem of Cuba.

Even a hasty reading reveals that there are no simple answers. Plainly, Cuba is no longer a country but a fortified Russian bastion 90 miles off our shores. But whether the threat is great enough to risk direct U.S. military intervention—and all the world-shaking consequences that might flow from such intervention—is still unclear.

President Kennedy draws a rather subtle distinction concerning the Cuban stockpiling of Russian arms. He says the evidence so far suggests the buildup is for defensive, not offensive, purposes; therefore, the President concludes, we do not have immediate cause for counteraction. However, he warns that if the Cuban Communists try to use these arms to export their odious "people's revolution," the United States will clamp down "by whatever means may be necessary."

We suppose that's all right as far as it goes. But surely the President must realize that the military buildup is only an opening move, that the rockets and jet planes which today will be used to further subjugate the Cuban masses can tomorrow be turned against the Dominican Republic or some other Caribbean nation. To be sure, we must not be stampeded into a rash move. At the same time, there is a need to fully convince the world that we mean what we say, that aggressive acts by the Kremlin's puppet regime in Cuba will not be tolerated in this hemisphere.

Actually, there is a certain irony in the present situation. Some 140 years ago, President Monroe proclaimed his famous Monroe Doctrine, boldly telling imperialistic European powers to keep their political noses out of this hemisphere. At the time, the United States was a comparatively weak country. But Mr. Monroe uttered his words firmly and we made it plain we were dedicated to making them stick. Today, the United States is the most powerful Nation in the world. Yet, many observers abroad feel our words lack a clear sense of resolution.

The task ahead is to make it starkly apparent that we mean what we say. Perhaps, as David Lawrence suggests today, a joint congressional resolution pointedly authorizing the President to act as he sees fit regarding Cuba is in order. Technically, it would be of little importance because the President already has broad powers as Commander in Chief. But the psychological impact could be considerable.

A Central Place of the Bible in Our Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Chaplain—Major General—Ivan L. Bennett, U.S. Army, retired, former Chief of Army Chaplains, presented an important manuscript to the Twelfth Washington Pilgrimage to the Religious Heritage of America at the National Gallery of Art on August 23.

Chaplain Bennett served in the Pacific during World War II and was staff chaplain at general headquarters, Tokyo, during most of the Japanese occupation. For his outstanding military service he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster.

I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CENTRAL PLACE OF THE BIBLE IN OUR HERITAGE

The coronation of Elizabeth II of England was an impressive event. I think that the whole world felt that it was fortunate that she came to the kingdom for such a time as this. Those who observed the coronation will long remember the Archbishop of Canterbury holding a Bible, and giving it to the young queen, saying, "This is the greatest thing in the world."

A COMMON CONFESSION

This is a common confession among men who have carried the burdens of great responsibility over extended periods of time, and have made the decisions involving the weal or woe of this Nation. The list includes George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Quincy Adams, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, and nearly everyone of the later Presidents.

Said President Grant: "To the influence of this Book we are indebted for the progress we have made, and to this Book we must look as our guide in the future."

Theodore Roosevelt expressed it in this way: "Almost every man who by his lifework added to the sum of human achievement of which the race is proud, of which our people are proud, almost every man has based his lifework largely upon the teachings of the Bible."

Woodrow Wilson wrote: "A man has deprived himself of the best there is in the world who has deprived himself of this (a knowledge of the Bible)."

Calvin Coolidge, surely not a man given to overstatement, goes on to say: "The foundations of our society and of our Government rest so much upon the teachings of the Bible, that it would be difficult to support them if faith in these teachings should cease to be practically universal in our country."

A STRANGE CIRCUMSTANCE

This place of centrality accorded the Bible is a circumstance for which you would expect officials of Western nations to have no predilection. It is not of the West. It has its affinities in the ancient East. America, England, France, Germany all received it in the form of a translation. It is an extraordinary circumstance in our culture that the Bible is the great Epic of our languages.

IMMENSITY OF DEMAND

Consider also how extraordinary is the continuing demand for this Book.

Margaret Hills, in collaboration with the New York Public Library, has been able to list 2,573 editions of the Bible published in America between the years 1777 and 1957.

A few years ago I arranged for the American Bible Society to present to President Eisenhower the Bible that marked the completion of the first half-billion copies of the Scriptures distributed by the society.

Almost simultaneously, the publishers of the Revised Standard Version announced the availability of the revised translation. Orders for 700,000 copies of this Bible were received before it came from the bindery. The first printing was for 900,000 copies. That exceeded any single printing of one book in the history of book publishing.

What is more noteworthy about the immensity of demand is the fact that it now assumes worldwide proportions. The American Bible Society is only 1 of 23 national Bible societies engaged in translating, producing, and distributing the Bible. Last year from 68 countries there were calls for more than 30 million volumes.

IN THE PAGEANTRY OF HISTORY

The first English translation of the entire Bible of which we have record was done by John Wycliffe in the 14th century. The first printed New Testament was the translation made by William Tyndale, printed in Germany in 1525. The first printed English Bible was the translation by Miles Coverdale, published in 1535. These dates are a reminder that it was a time of upheaval and transition. Old landmarks were being removed. The fall of Constantinople had caused ancient manuscripts to be brought to Europe, and these were awakening new interest in the Greek and Hebrew texts. The printing press, invented by Gutenberg, had proved itself a practical instrument for commercial use. Out of the resettlements imposed by the migrations of northern and eastern tribes, new nationalities and languages were taking form. The demand that had been voiced by St. Jerome in the fourth century and by St. Caesarius in the sixth century for the Word of God in the language of the people was now becoming general, and it was coupled with a suspicion that some sinister policy was depriving the common man of his birthright.

Victor Hugo once remarked that no army can withstand an idea whose time has come. A single idea now dominated the common people of Europe and England, the idea of the Bible in the native tongues of the people, and it was irresistible.

Alfred Lord Tennyson, in his "Dream of Fair Women," writes of "The Spacious Times of Great Elizabeth." In the reign of that remarkable queen there was a notable quickening of the national consciousness and the general intelligence. The "New Heavens" of Kepler, Copernicus and Galileo, and the "New Earth" of Columbus, Drake and Magellan, widened the intellectual horizon. In the prevailing passion for foreign travel the races of mankind were discovering one another. Nothing was wanting for a new epoch in English adventure and achievement but the signal. The signal came in the destruction of the Spanish Armada. Wealth increased, and with wealth came ampler leisure, which for the most part was turned to good account for a new era of adventure in art and literature. A new England sprang forward into a place of sustained leadership in a vast and growing empire of many peoples. The Queen authorized the English Bible for reading in the churches and in homes. And however materialistic the aims of the great companies exploiting colonial and commercial resources of the times, this could not be done without the labor of the common man, and the common man demanded that he be allowed to have his Book. If trade followed the flag, the Book went with the trade.

Of the period John Richard Green in his "Short History of the English People" had this to say:

"No greater moral change ever passed over a nation than passed over England during the years that parted the middle of the reign of Elizabeth from the meeting of the Long Parliament. England became the people of a Book, and that Book was the Bible. It was the one English book that was familiar to every Englishman; it was read at the churches and read at home, and everywhere its words, as they fell upon ears that custom had not deadened, kindled a startling enthusiasm. * * * and all the activities that had been called into life by the age that was passing away were seized, concentrated, and steadied to a definite aim by the spirit of religion."

William Wordsworth wrote (1770–1850):

"But to outweigh all harm, the sacred Book,
In dustry sequestration wrapt too long,
Assumes the accents of our native tongue;
And he who guides the plow or wields the crook,
With understanding spirit now may look
Upon her records, listen to her song.
Transcendent Boon. Noblest that earthly King
Ever bestowed to equalize and bless
Under the weight of mortal wretchedness."

How powerful the Bible's influence was is indicated by this statement of the historian, Trevelyan:

"By the end of Elizabeth's reign the Book of Books for Englishmen was already the Bible, although the authorized version that is still in use was only drawn up by James the First's bishops in the years immediately following her death. For every Englishman who had read Sidney or Spenser, or had seen Shakespeare acted at the Globe, there were hundreds who had read or heard the Bible with close attention, as the word of God. The effect of the continual domestic study of the book upon the national character, imagination and intelligence for nearly three centuries to come was greater than that of any literary movement in our annals or any religious movement since the coming of St. Augustine. New worlds of history and poetry were opened in its pages to people who had little else to read—indeed, it created the habit of reading and reflection in whole classes of the community and turned a tinker into one of the great masters of the English tongue."

When in later years other rulers who lacked the acumen of "great Elizabeth" and her "spacious times" tried to curb the religious liberties the Book had inspired, a steady stream of people with Bible in hand came to these shores. When the oppressor reached out across the wave there was a revolution, and "a new star appeared in the constellations of the nations."

AREAS OF INFLUENCE

Perhaps the most noteworthy areas where the influence of the Bible has been greatly registered are art, language, education, law, and literature. It is my understanding that you will be favored with a discussion of religious art by the curator of the National Museum. It may be worthy of note to say that the art galleries of the world list among their masterpieces more than 800 paintings by American and British painters who drew upon the Bible for their subject matter.

IMPACT UPON LANGUAGE

The translation of the Bible into English had a profound influence in stabilizing English speech. John Wycliffe drew upon upward of 200 dialects of England, Scotland and Ireland in making his English translation. Even so, it was often impossible to find among the dialects words with meaning equivalent to the words of the Vulgate from which Wycliffe worked. Thus it became necessary to anglicize words from the ancient tongues. Scores of words found their way into the English language by this process. It was thus that we got our word "beauty," among many others. These words were laid hold upon by men like Bacon, Shakespeare and Milton, and perpetuated. They were woven into our great hymns, oratorios, and liturgies by men like Cranmer, Isaac Watts, Philip Doddridge, George Frederick Handel, and Bishop Heber.

Someone has compiled a list of 53 poets and 35 prose writers whose works have survived with honor the publisher's ax, all of whose works are enriched with references and allusions to the Bible. No one can read them appreciatively without a knowledge of the Bible. More than 1,400 book titles have been taken from this book. We are indebted to the Bible for such expressive combinations of words as "peacemaker," "brokenhearted," "long-suffering," and "loving-kindness." It introduced scores of phrases theretofore unknown in English speech: "a coat of many colors," "the valley of decision," "the salt of the earth," "the widow's mite," "clear as crystal," "the fat of the land," "whited sepulchers," "the wings of the morning," "righteous overmuch," and many more.

While the English language received the Bible and was enriched and stabilized by it, the Bible in English gave to conscience a new vocabulary of expression; and it gave to men doing battle for freedom their trumpet and their sword. It gave a standard of conduct by which government would be brought into judgment; it gave to the weary and the heavy laden a song for their lips. It articulated hope beyond tragedy, with previous promises of redemption for the suffering and the destitute; and it had the needed words of solace and courage for the bereaved and the brokenhearted. For multiplied scores of thousands who had read no history, and had not traveled beyond their villages, it conveyed a sense of history so that the humblest peasant became aware of other peoples, other lands, and felt a kinship with Abraham of Chaldea, Joseph of Egypt, Moses of the Wilderness, and Ezekiel of Babylon. In spiritual compansionship the peasant went to jail with Peter and John and companioned with them when they "could but speak the things they had seen and heard." (Acts 4:20.) He traveled with Paul; was shipwrecked with him; shared his stripes; and preferred his martyr's crown to that on the head of the emperor, attesting the preference by naming his son Paul and his dog Nero. The common man was equipped with the language of freedom and personal dignity.

IMPACT UPON EDUCATION

One of the greatest, if inded not the greatest, incentives for mankind to free himself from the darkness of illiteracy, has been the desire to be able to read the Bible. Schools for children in England and America arose out of a desire to teach children to read. The textbook was the hornbook, which was not a book at all. It was a paddle, usually a thin oak paddle. It contained the digits, and it contained the alphabet in capital letters and in small letters. It also contained the "Lord's Prayer."

To protect the digits and the letters, the paddle was covered with thin sections of transparent horn. When you visit the London Museum again, ask to see the Hornbook. The Hornbook was used in the colonial schools of America for nearly a half century. It was replaced by primers printed on paper, but which drew more abundantly from the storehouse of the great passages of the Bible.

Whatever of all the sound and great fury concerning court decisions relating to the Bible and prayers in schools, serious-minded men and women will not overlook this difficult fact in the state of the Nation: that there are 50 million Americans who are ignorant of the Bible, who do not attend church or synagogue, and who make no provision at home or in the community for their children to gain a knowledge and an appreciation of the Bible.

Prior to the Revolutionary War there were 10 colleges in the colonies, which have survived to this day. Nine of these 10 colleges opened with faculties made up of men trained in theology. These colleges were set up for the express purpose of training men for the ministry. The 10th, without a denominational church background, was the University of Pennsylvania. It stemmed from a charity school founded by George Whitefield, best remembered as an evangelist of whom it was said that he could speak to an open-air audience of 20,000 people and make himself clearly understood.

It was the impact of the Bible that moved our colonial fathers to lay the foundations of common school and higher education in America.

IMPACT UPON LAW AND JURISPRUDENCE

In the 18th century Sir William Blackstone (1723–1760) made an epochmaking research in English law and jurisprudence, and this research led him to the conclusion that these laws, while mainly arrived at by court decisions, became articulate in decisions which rested back on two foundations which he called the laws of nature and the law of revelation. The laws of nature were the customs and rules of conduct that had prevailed in village and hamlet since ancient times. The law of revelation was articulate in Holy Scripture. In order to claim the benefit of a custom or unwritten law, a person going into court had to satisfy the judge that the rule had been the custom in the hamlet or shire "from the time when the memory of man ran not to the contrary." But the law of revelation, epitomized in the Ten Commandments, could outweigh established custom, since courts were bound to recognize that the law of God preceded all as the immutable principle of right and justice.

He found that King Alfred the Great had compiled his Domboc "from the Bible and from the laws of former Christian kings," and that he, after adding some laws of his own, appended a copy of the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer (887–890).

He found that the English Barons who forced King John to affix his seal to the Magna Carta (1215) had had the assistance of an archbishop in drawing upon the resources of the Bible in their delineation of human rights. Magna Carta not only became the basic constitutional Law of England in the centuries that followed, but it greatly influenced the language of the Bill of Rights contained in the first amendment to the American Constitution.

It was this impact of "the law of revelation" upon English jurisprudence that resulted in the later system of courts of chancery to relieve the rigidity of universal application of legal principles in courts of law. The chancellor was designed as the "King's conscience."

Such was the Biblical foundation of the laws of which Leonard Bacon wrote in his great hymn:

"Laws, freedom, truth and faith in God
Came with those exiles o'er the waves;
And where their pilgrim feet have trod,
The God they worshipped guards their graves."

After the commentaries had been in use by law students in America for more than a century, Judge Thomas M. Cooley, of Michigan State University, commended its continued use to his students, saying that "even by way of explaination or illustration, the original work of Blackstone is much the most useful as presenting us the law in something near the condition in which our ancestors brought it to America."

The need for understanding the commentaries was patent. This body of law had become the common law of all of the States of the American Union save Louisiana alone. Large as is the body of rules modified by statute and constitutional provision, or that have become obsolete through changes in the habits and modes of thought among the people, the fact remains that the serious student of the rudiments of our law still reads Sir William's Commentaries and the English Bible.

IMPACT UPON LITERATURE

If you would catch the simple and appealing literary charm of the Book's prose, read the story of Joseph and his brethren and ask yourself where else in the world's literature can one find this story matched in mingled simplicity with such mentally appealing involvement in the telling.

Or read the story of Ruth, following her husband's mother into an unknown land, leaving behind her homeland, kindred, friends, and saying in unreckoning abandon: "Where thou goest, I will go, and where thou lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God, my God. Where thou diest, I will die, and there will I be buried. The Lord do so to me, and more also, if aught but death part thee and me." (Ruth 1: 16, 17). See her under necessity, going to glean in the fields of Bethlehem, and finally being numbered among the who's who of the nation, holding an honored place in the genealogy of Him of whom it is said that "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."

Or read the story of Esther, the Hebrew maiden in captivity, following the circumstances through which she became queen to Ahasuerus. Observe her in spiritual crisis, boldly facing the capricious tyranny of her king, taking her life in her hand, thrusting herself into the royal presence in a manner forbidden by law, that she might plead the cause of her people, simply saying, "If I perish, I perish."

Or for the beauty of the Book's poetry, muse upon the pellucid imagery of the great Psalms: "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want." Or witness the lyric majesty of the prophet's cry, "Awake, awake, put on thy strength O Zion, put on thy beautiful garments O Jerusalem." Or "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace." Or consider this from the writings of a man who had been falsely accused by his own people, imprisoned, placed under the

lash, and subjected to conditions of life that would have embittered any ordinary man:

"Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. Love suffereth long, and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up."

HUMANITY'S BIRTHRIGHT

This priceless literary treasure belongs to the human race. It was produced over a period of 1,500 years. Its authorship included king and shepherd, lawgiver and prisoner, prophet and slave, tax collector and doctor, men in the seat of jugment, and men under sentence of death. It was culled from ancient Egypt, from Palestine and Syria, from the slopes of Lebanon, from Pontus and Ephesus, from isles of the sea, and from regions beyond the sea, Macedonia, Attica, Corinth, Rome. If it were an American or European product it would be difficult to share it. But just because it is a translation, we can share it with the nations of the world, not as a product of Western religion or Western culture, but as the birthright of all mankind: the Word of God in the languages of man.

Some portion of it has been translated into 1,181 languages. The day will come when the entire Book will be translated into all of these languages, and the nearly 1,000 more, now spoken but still unwritten. Just as Christian missionaries devised an alphabet for the translation of the Bible into the Slavic tongue in order to reduce it to writing, for translating the Bible in the Russian language, they have done as much for hundreds of others, and when the work is completed nothing in the literary history of the world can ever quite match it. For all mankind will have a written language; and every language will have the world's greatest masterpiece; and all nations will draw upon this greatest of all literary storehouses for moral insights, literary style and beauty, spiritual wisdom, and light upon the common pathway of life.

We Cannot Ignore It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 14, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville News of August 29, 1962:

WE CANNOT IGNORE IT

During the past few days it was reported in Washington by the Copley News service that between 16,000 and 20,000 combat-ready Soviet troops have landed in Cuba since July 29.

Cuban exiles say the Soviet troops could be used as a bargaining point for the Russians to pressure the United States to withdraw troops from Berlin and Vietnam.

It appears that now we not only have a Communist nation 90 miles offshore, but at least a division of Russians—Russian troops, armed and ready, according to the Copley report. The State Department first denied the landings, then said something about "technicians." The silence from the White House and State Department since the botched "invasion" more than a year ago has been deafening—indeed, the administration has almost acted as if Cuba has ceased to exist. The attitude seems to be "maybe if we ignore the danger it will go away."

The truth would more likely be that if Russian troops can be landed, missile-launching sites also can be built—and it appears the day is rapidly approaching when the President is going to have to face up to Cuba despite the obvious distaste for recalling the monumental foulup last year over the Bay of Pigs.

A division of Russians 90 miles from Miami cannot be ignored or swept under a rug.

The 175th Anniversary of the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Rare Odyssey of Our Constitution," written by Sid A. Levy and published in the Washington Star of September 16, 1962, in commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution of the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RARE ODYSSEY OF OUR CONSTITUTION
(By Sid A. Levy)

The Constitution of the United States will observe its 175th anniversary tomorrow at the National Archives, snug in a mechanized sanctuary made of glass, bronze, steel, concrete, and marble. The parchment's present security couldn't differ more than the almost casual way it was handled during most of its early life.

At one point, for example, the priceless document was unceremoniously dumped into a coarse linen bag and hauled out of town in a farm wagon—just a few jumps ahead of the invading British. That was in 1814. Before then, it had been handed about from one office to another in the fledgling National government, and for one brief period was even housed in a former tavern.

And it was another 137 years after that flight from Washington before the Constitution was finally encased in its own permanent protective covering. The 5-page original, which includes a 1-page resolution of transmittal to the Continental Congress, is in surprisingly good condition, considering its travels and travails—not to say its age. Despite treatment which would horrify a modern archivist, the document has suffered nothing worse than a moderate fading of its iron-based ink, which even so remains legible.

Unlike the more badly faded Declaration of Independence, which resides with it at the Archives Building, the Constitution wasn't put on any sort of display and was exposed to sunlight only infrequently between the March morning in 1790 when it passed into the custody of Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson, and the summer day in 1951 when technicians at the Bureau of Standards sealed it into its permanent enclosure.

QUIET SIGNING

The signing of the Constitution in Philadelphia on Monday, September 17, 1787, was completed in the late afternoon. It was a quiet ceremony, with little of the pomp and less of the exuberance that had set the city's church bells to clanging on July 4, 11 years earlier, when the Declaration was adopted.

The five sheets of parchment left Philadelphia the next day in the custody of Maj. William Jackson, secretary of the Constitutional Convention, who delivered them 2 days later to the Continental Congress in New York. For the next few years, the Constitution remained in New York, spending most of the time in various rooms at the city hall, where Congress met, though occasionally it was sent out for brief periods of safekeeping elsewhere while the hall was restored.

For a little while in 1788, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, John Jay—whose position was replaced the next year by that of Secretary of State—occupied rooms in a house at the southeast corner of Broad and Pearl Streets, which in earlier years was known as Fraunce's Tavern, a favored colonial social spot.

The following year, Congress established the Department of State and assigned it the job of keeping custody of the basic State papers. When President Washington signed the new law on September 15, 1789, the Constitution, along with the Declaration, was turned over to Secretary Jefferson. The documents traveled in his luggage to Philadelphia again, where he established his office, and remained there until 1800, when the Capital was moved to the District of Columbia.

Crated along with other state documents, the Constitution arrived by ship at Lear's Wharf near the foot of G Street West on May 27, 1800, and was carted off to the Treasury, then located at the south end of its present site. It was the only building suitable for storing them in the still uncompleted new Capital.

That August, the State papers were moved to one of the so-called "Seven Buildings" at 19th and Pennsylvania where most of the Government's offices were to be located. The next May, they moved again to the War Office, a large brick building on 17th Street, long since gone.

There the Constitution stayed for 13 years—until the British came. The War of 1812 had begun 2 years earlier, and now a British fleet was in Chesapeake Bay, preparing to land troops along the Patuxent. It was August, and Washington was full of rumors and alarms.

ORDERS FROM MONROE

From Secretary of State James Monroe, who had galloped out to see what was really going on, came urgent orders to rush vital papers off into safe hiding. Three State Department clerks dashed off to a downtown shop and bought a quantity of linen bagging material, had it run up hastily into sacks, and stuffed the Constitution, the Declaration and other documents into them.

The precious cargo was hauled away in wagons on the evening of August 23, 1814, to an unused grist mill belonging to one Edgar Patterson, 2 miles above Chain Bridge on the Virginia shore of the Potomac. But there was a cannon factory nearby and, fearing it would attract raiders, the clerks who were guarding the sacks borrowed farmers' wagons and set off again the next day for Leesburg, 35 miles away.

There the documents were stowed in an empty house and the keys were given to a local clergyman named Littlejohn. That night, Washington was in flames.

The Constitution returned home several weeks after the August raid, and for the next few years occupied temporary quarters, along with the Department of State, on G Street near 18th, then returned to the War Office, and finally moved to a building at 15th and Pennsylvania, where the Treasury now stands.

From 1820 to 1866 the Constitution remained stored away—there is no record of exactly how—until the Secretary of State leased a building on 14th near S, where he maintained his office until 1875. In July of that year the Secretary and his papers moved to the State, War and Navy Building—now called the Executive Office Building—next to the White House.

ON PUBLIC VIEW

Oddly enough, it was nearly 50 years before the thought occurred to officials that the American people might like to see the Constitution—or at least, before that thought resulted in action. In 1921, at the urging of Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes—who in turn got the idea from a committee headed by the Department's archivist, Dr. Gaillard Hunt—President Warren G. Harding ordered the transfer of the Constitution and the Declaration to the Library of Congress.

There, said he, the Government could "satisfy the laudable wish of patriotic Americans to have an opportunity to see the original fundamental documents upon which rest their independence and their Government."

The transfer took place in September. Two years later the Constitution and Declaration went on public view for the first time in a shrine on the second floor of the Library. The shrine provided safety "from touch and injurious light, while insuring their complete visibility without formality," according to an account prepared several years later by David C. Mearns and Verner W. Clapp of the Library staff.

STORED IN FORT KNOX

World War II brought a threat of enemy action against the continental United States, and so the documents were wrapped in special acid-free paper, sealed in bronze containers packed in rock wool inside a heavy metal-bound box, and were taken by Pullman car to a 3-year exile in the gold-bullion vaults at Fort Knox, Ky.

As early as the 1880's people who knew of their condition had begun to worry about the need for a more scientific approach to the safekeeping of the documents. In 1881, for example, the National Academy of Sciences recommended that the Declaration be taken down from the office wall where exposure to sunlight had faded it grievously, and be put under cover. Again, in 1903, a similar recommendation was made and in 1920 a committee, headed by Archivist Hunt, of the State Department, urged that both documents be sealed under glass.

The Bureau of Standards began research on how to do this, just before World War II. And this in turn stemmed from plans to put the two documents on view at the new Archives Building, for which President Hoover had laid the cornerstone in 1933. But it took nearly another 2 decades for Washington to get around to the job of installing them in the exhibit hall that had been designed especially for them at Archives.

SEALED IN CASES

It was 1951, in fact, when the Bureau of Standards finally sealed both the Constitution and the Declaration into the hermetically tight cases in which they now reside. These consist of several layers of tempered glass, paper, and light-filters, soldered and bound in bronze; the containers are filled with helium to prevent the deterioration which oxygen would cause.

The packages are roughly an inch thick and are the outgrowth of extensive research not only by the Bureau but also by the Libby-Owens Glass Co., which provided the special glass, and by Eastman Kodak, which developed a yellow filter cover for the exhibit case.

The case which visitors see on the second floor of the Archives Building contains the first and last pages of the Constitution, and is actually only the upper portion of an elaborate complex of machinery. Each evening at 10, a guard presses a hidden switch which activates a ponderous mechanism. This lowers the documents 20 feet into a steel and concrete vault which rests at ground level.

A heavy steel lid slides into place, and the Constitution and Declaration are then protected by 46 inches of steel and concrete in every direction, not counting the outer walls of the building itself. The second and third pages of the Constitution, plus the Letter of Transmittal, are permanently stored in the vault.

ATOMIC VAULT

When it went into use some 11 years ago, the vault was considered adequate protection against the atomic bomb, save for a direct hit. That notion has had to be discarded since then, however, for the hydrogen superweapons have changed a lot of ideas about bomb-blast protection. In fact, the Government has even abandoned earlier blueprints for whisking the documents out of town on an evacuation helicopter; there just wouldn't be warning-time enough.

Still, the vault is topnotch protection against virtually any other kind of disaster, and it can be pressed into action in a matter of seconds. It has its own emergency power unit, should the main electrical source fail.

Except for routine tests every 6 months to make sure the bronze-and-glass enclosure hasn't developed helium leaks, the Constitution remains untouched in its mechanical repository. And more and more Americans come to visit it each year.

This year already has set a record even though it has 3½ months to go. Between January 1 and the end of August, visitors numbered over 1.1 million. That's more than the total for all of 1961, when just over 771,000 showed up.

April is the peak month when the flood-crest of visiting school classes seems to hit. But June is a close second. The fall and winter months are relatively slack, yet even at the height of last winter's worst weather, February brought a total of 25,000 viewers.

Drug-Test Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in the current concern over the testing of new drugs we must be careful that we are not swept away in our enthusiasm to protect the public to the extent that we seriously damage or inhibit the development of new drugs which can be of great benefit to us all. I believe this is very well expressed in an article in the New York Times of Sunday, September 16, by Dr. Howard A. Rusk. Dr. Rusk is one of this Nation's most highly respected physicians. He is medical editor of the New York Times and chairman of the Department of Rehabilitation and Physical Medicine at New York University.

The article follows:

DRUG-TEST REGULATIONS—U.S. PROPOSALS INNOCUOUS ON SURFACE, BUT LOWERING OF STANDARDS IS FEARED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Forty years ago the late Mrs. Evelyn Walsh McLean was entertaining at her Washington home. One of the guests, whose husband was a prominent jurist, excused herself during the dinner.

When Mrs. McLean followed the guest out to ascertain the difficulty, the lady broke down and wept. "My teenage daughter is a juvenile diabetic," she said. "She is in a coma, may die and there is nothing that can be done."

Mrs. McLean immediately telephoned a physician friend on the faculty of the Johns Hopkins University in nearby Baltimore. When asked if there was anything new that might help this girl, he told Mrs. McLean he had heard that scientists in Toronto had developed a new compound that controlled diabetes.

The girl was rushed to Toronto by private railroad car. She received the new compound and is alive today.

The compound, of course, was insulin. It had just been discovered by Drs. Frederick G. Banting and Charles H. Best.

NEW REGULATIONS PROPOSED

New regulations on the clinical testing of new drugs have recently been proposed by Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Among other things, these regulations would require written approval of the Food and Drug Administration to give an experimental drug to a patient, who might die without it.

Under the new regulations, drug companies and individual clinical investigators would be required to file complete plans of their studies with the Federal Government.

This would include "Outline of the plan of investigation, including approximation of the number of patients to be treated with the drug and number to be employed as controls, if any; clinical uses to be investigated; characteristics of patients by age, sex, and condition; the kind of clinical observations and laboratory tests to be undertaken prior to, during, and after administration of drug; the estimated duration of the investigation; and a description or copies of report forms to be used to maintain a complete record of the observations and the test results obtained."

On the surface this requirement appears innocuous. But how does an investigator know 6 months in advance the exact age and condition of his caseload of patients for whom the drug might be indicated?

How can he know the exact clinical uses he may wish to investigate? A patient may show up with an unusual disease for which in his judgment the drug might be of value.

BARS PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT

To use the drug in such a case would require both the investigator and the sponsor to file a long brief with the Food and Drug Administration asking for permission. By the time it was received, the patient's condition might have changed considerably.

The opportunity to vary clinical investigation to take advantage of unanticipated findings would be lost.

Under these proposals scientific study would be limited to confirming or denying a hypothesis and this could be done only when the Federal Government approved of the hypothesis.

In essence, they would eliminate the use of professional judgment which is the basis for true investigations.

The new regulations would also require that investigators maintain all records and case histories for 2 years after the study and that "any officer or employee" of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could inspect and copy such records at any time.

In 1958 the ethical drug industry tested 114,600 substances, of which about 40 became marketable. In the United States new compounds are first given the most rigid series of tests in animals of any place in the world.

This testing reduces the number of compounds that show promise of efficacy and safety down to around 2,000 to 3,000 a year upon which clinical tests in humans are held.

About 25,000 clinical investigators are involved in these tests. It is difficult even to visualize the tons of reports from these 25,000 investigators that would come into Washington under these proposed regulations.

MIGHT LOWER STANDARDS

Unfortunately there is no reason to believe that the proposed new regulations would actually improve the already high standards imposed by the drug industry on clinical testing. In fact, they might accomplish the reverse.

Our objective in clinical testing should be to encourage more testing and larger scale trials. The nature of the proposed regulations, the impingement on confidentiality of patient records, and the legal risks to which investigators would be subject should tend to reduce the number of physicians interested in doing this type of research.

During the last month, this writer has talked with scores of leaders in the drug industry and the scientific community.

All agree that everything possible should be done to strengthen the clinical testing procedures of new drugs. All also agree that the proposed new regulations would not accomplish this objective.

There is also resentment of the precipitant in which the proposals were issued.

Usually in matters of this kind, the Federal agency involved meets informally over a period of months with the parties affected for an exchange of views.

This was not done. Even from the language of the proposals it is apparent they were hurriedly drawn.

They were then issued on August 9 and interested persons were given 60 days in which to express their opinions.

EXTENSION CALLED FOR

It is to be hoped that Secretary Celebrezze will extend this time period so that the Nation's scientific community will have an opportunity to evaluate these proposals carefully and make its views known.

There is no doubt that the new regulations have stemmed directly from the thalidomide incident. The thalidomide incident, however, illustrates rather well that our present regulations are effective.

There was sufficient toxicity data available from animal experiments to justify its clinical use with humans. The Food and Drug Administration did keep it off the market.

Had the new proposals been in effect, the thalidomide incident would have been the same except in one respect. The Food and Drug Administration as well as the producer of the drug would have had a record of the clinical investigators who had the drug in their possession.

Dr. Louis C. Lasanga of the Johns Hopkins University, has commented, "One final paradox: on the basis of the best available information, Marilyn Monroe would be alive today if she had been given thalidomide instead of barbiturates for sedation. This fact is one which illustrates difficulties in dealing glibly with the advantages and disadvantages of useful drugs."

Profitless Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the financial writers, and others, in the country are discussing corporate profits these days. They write of a "profitless prosperity." One businessman, head of one of our largest corporations, has come to believe that the general public feels that somehow profits are not a good thing. This gentleman, Mr. Charles Mortimer, chairman of the board of General Foods, recently spoke to his shareholders about this at the company's annual meeting. With the thought that his remarks may be of wider interest, I ask unanimous permission to have his remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What I want to talk to you about today transcends the interest we share as stockholders of General Foods in our own company's well-being. It is the stake we all have—186 million Americans—in bringing about a prompt turnabout in the widespread fallacious notion which persists that while our American profit system is good, the profits which make it possible are, somehow, bad if they exceed a bare minimum.

My remarks are dictated by my considered conviction that this misunderstanding and the consequent stigmatization of adequate profits constitute a grave and growing threat to the entire economic structure of our country and, therefore, to our very survival as a nation. This concern is by no means unshared. My point is that it needs to be shared much more widely and with more conviction by the American public.

I have purposefully chosen this forum because, quite frankly, it is my earnest hope that it may be possible to avoid the usual discounting as just self-pleading which all too often attends any businessman's undertaking to champion the cause of business profits. Perhaps there won't be the customary discount for bias when I speak of the role of profits in the American economy right after you have heard General Foods' report on our increase in net earnings for the 10th successive year. It should be clear that I am not indulging in a lament about our own company's profit situation.

Rather, I want to delineate the indispensable function of profits—and I use function in the most active sense of the word—in helping our national economy retain its outstanding and traditional characteristic of consistently being a rising economy. There can be no standing still—for nations any more than for individuals or businesses. Our national economy must move ahead or it will fall behind.

What is the status of our economic momentum? Are we going forward fast enough to meet our needs—future as well as present? Is our progress assuring that we will be able to fulfill the growing demands of our burgeoning population?

The answers to these questions are negative—so completely negative that among leaders in Government, business, and labor as well as outstanding economists and educators there is no difference of opinion as to whether we need to speed up our rate of economic growth.

This one area of agreement holds our brightest hope. It could become a rallying point for letting the world know that we are also agreed on raising our economic level in the only way possible—by strengthening our time-tested, private enterprise, free-choice system—called for short the profit system, because profit is at its core.

Instead, the picture we present to the world is a sorry one, marked by name calling, finger-pointing, and blame-fixing which serve only to entrench further some of the antagonisms and the bitterness we have inherited from bygone generations.

We need to dispel the most harmful of all the myths that have been handed down from the past—the myth which holds that conflict must exist between economic groups under capitalism. This belief is founded on another century's concept of capitalism. It utterly ignores the simple fact that what we have in the United States today is what has been aptly called a people's capitalism. Ours is a system in which the savings of millions of men and women in all walks of life provide the capital for investment in the various industries and businesses of America.

Like it or not, our profit system is on trial before the world today. To prove it is successful, we must shake our economy out of its current sluggishness. This will be a do-it-yourself job, and it begins with understanding.

We can do it if each of us will see clearly that he plays more than one role in our economy. I invite every American, regardless of his economic status, to look into what I visualize as a three-way mirror of good citizenship in which our overall well-being is reflected.

First of all, everyone sees himself as a consumer. That's obvious from a straight-ahead look in the citizenship mirror. Then, by looking simultaneously in one of the mirror's side panels, some 70 million of us who are employed can see ourselves not only as consumers but also as producers or earners. Of these, some 17½ million are members of labor unions.

In the mirror's other side panel, about 120 million of us are reflected. These are all the investors, thanks to the savings made possible by our American abundance which yields discretionary income—money above and beyond what we need just to live. More than a hundred million are indirect shareowners through a variety of financial institutions such as mutual savings banks, insurance companies, pension funds, and so on. Sixteen and a half million adults—very close to the number belonging to unions—are stockholders in American corporations.

Those of us who limit their visions to any one of the three panels of the citizenship mirror see only a pocktbook issue. And this accounts for the great apathy toward the infinitely more important overall issues—the national interest issues having to do with our very economic survival.

The consumer is primarily interested in prices. He lives by them. To the worker, wages are all important. He lives on them. The investor looks to profits. He lives because of them. Business must live with, on, and by all three—prices, wages, and profits.

Despite the fact that profits are generally regarded as merely something left over after consumption has been taken care of by production, that's not the way our economy works. Profits are vital to investment, and we must invest before we can produce and we must produce before we can consume.

Our economy moves forward only when both the investors' money and the workers' labor are combined efficiently to produce profitably what the consumer wants. This combination must provide: Prices that represent value to the consumer; the wherewithal for good wages for the worker; an adequate reward for the investor for risking his funds;

and, of great importance, the capital so necessary for business expansion.

I need not labor how dependent we are on sufficient profits for the continued health and vigor and economic growth of our Nation. Anyone who gives the matter even passing thought is bound to realize that a squeeze on profits necessarily results in a squeeze not only on investors but also on business investment in plant modernization and expansion which alone will provide more jobs in the future.

Commentators and columnists, educators and economists, are writing about the profit squeeze daily. Many have made the point that the present soft economy is not due to the lack of purchasing power but to the squeeze on profits, with the resultant erosion of confidence in businessmen's minds.

As one example, in a signed article in the Journal of Commerce, Henry C. Wallich, professor of economics at Yale University, made these observations: "The mounting conviction that more profits are needed derives from growing concern over the slow growth of the economy. Faster growth depends upon more investment in plant and equipment. Larger plant and equipment purchases require larger profits."

It is my premise today that every person in the United States old enough to be concerned about his own future and the future of the country must comprehend one simple concept. It is that to provide the greater number of jobs our country needs, profit margins must be substantial enough to encourage industry to increase investment. If this concept becomes understood and accepted, public opinion—which is the final arbiter of all great issues in this country—will soon see to it that the profit anemia, from which our body corporate is suffering is corrected.

During my lifetime I have seen some amazing and dramatic examples of what public opinion can accomplish, once it is correctly informed. During the war, as most of you will remember, there was a period when too many of our transports were being sunk by German submarines, accurately located as a result of loose talk in public places. A War Advertising Council-sponsored campaign asking that we "button our lip" soon eliminated much of this unnecessary tragic loss because it got through to the public that "loose talk costs lives."

In another instance—this one in peacetime—we are witnessing what the better schools campaign of the Advertising Council is doing to arouse interest and dispel apathy on the part of the public in getting a sufficient number of adequately trained teachers for our increasing student population.

The public can easily accept and act upon such understandable concepts as that loose talk can cost lives or that schools cannot be properly conducted—much less expanded—without a sufficient number of good teachers. Can the public understand that if profits are squeezed between lids on prices and constantly rising costs, our economic machine will slow down to the point where it will cease producing more and more jobs and actually, in time, even come close to stagnation?

The simple truth, as we all know, is that profits—and only profits—provide the incentive for investors to continue investing and that undistributed earnings must be available for ploughing back in the interests of keeping business modern and growing.

Unfortunately, John Q. Public is far more concerned about holding prices down and getting more wages for himself. He is not at all concerned about the level of corporate profits because he is looking into only one panel of the citizenship mirror. He does not understand that the favorable level of price he pays for a wanted item has frequently been made possible by the efficiency of the machines which made it. Nor does he grasp that it is only a sufficient profit which has made it possible to buy modern machines to replace obsolete ones.

He is as unconcerned about all this as his counterpart in World War II days was when he bragged to his next door neighbor, when he stopped for a glass of beer on the way home, that his son was sailing on a troopship leaving Hoboken the following midnight.

Loose thinking about America's economy—especially with respect to the profit picture as it has deteriorated in the last 10 years—is as dangerous to our Nation's well-being as loose talk was during World War II. Just a few figures demonstrate the need for balancing the profits factor more sensibly with the rest of our economy.

In the 1951–61 decade, our gross national product grew more than 58 percent. Employee compensation rose 68 percent. But the increase in corporate profits was only 8 percent. Retained earnings—that portion of corporate profits available for ploughing back into the business—actually were lower by nearly 18 percent in 1961 than it was in 1951.

It is obvious that profits are heading in the wrong direction if our economy is to be able to finance growth at a rate commensurate with the demands of our times.

All thinking Americans today are concerned about the future of the economy, with the accent on immediate future. I am one of those who fear that without prompt, sound actions which would avert it, there will be increasing erosion of confidence. This will take two forms:

Businessmen tend in times of uncertainty to become more cautious and conservative in their investment and spending policies. Loss of confidence on the part of the public takes the form of postponement of purchases. I have said before, and I strongly believe, recessions and depressions in this country start and end in the minds of men. Confidence is a delicate thing—an illusive, mercurial state of mind—and a severe flight of confidence usually ushers in a recession.

Many able people in government, in business, in labor and in our academic community are today pondering and discussing the lack of momentum now so apparent in our economy, trying to determine what should be done about it. In my opinion, what we do now, as always, should be the result of a sound, bifocal approach to the problem. There is a closeup immediacy, to be sure, but the long-range view is by far the most important.

For a short- and long-pull revival of the desired rate of economic growth, attended by growth in jobs and a better state of economic health, we need, of course, the currently promised fundamental revision of our tax laws. Such a revision will stimulate consumer confidence and spending on the one hand, and business confidence and investment for both the short and the long term. But this alone won't do the job. Combined with tax reforms, we must also have an administration-sponsored drive to reduce Government spending in a sincere effort to cut costs.

In addition, and I think of transcendent importance, it is essential to accomplish a turnabout through understanding in the American public's attitude toward the essential function of profits in a growing economy.

Only through such an understanding can we bring about a lasting change in political policies, thus enabling us to end the profit anemia which has sapped our corporate vigor. A changed public attitude on this score will provide a turning point from which we can resume the lusty economic growth of which this Nation is entirely capable—beginning right now.

I would like to close with an analogy from our own food industry. We all know that the food the human body requires must contain a balance of certain basic nutrients if good health is to be maintained. When we fail to get enough of any important one, the result is ill health.

The economic body cannot survive without a balance of nutrients any more than the human body can. Profits are the protein of our national economy. Profits revitalize our economic body and insure its future growth.

We must bring about public understanding that a healthy, growing economy requires a balanced diet of competitive prices, good wages, fair profits, and sound investment.

To get our economy rolling, all we have to do is free profits from the isolation ward of American economic thinking.

Drug Testing and Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks for the benefit of all colleagues in this day of adverse publicity to our drug industry and the possibility of prejudging in the other body's hearings without all facts available, I extend herewith a statement on "Drug Testing and Safety" prepared in a special issue of the Abbott News Digest, which clearly shows the other side of the coin.

The statement follows:

DRUG TESTING AND SAFETY

A new medical story, this time a tragic one, has raised questions in the public mind about the safety and testing of modern drugs.

Widely publicized have been cruel deformities in newborn infants, some of them claimed to be traceable to the drug thalidomide during its wide usage in Europe. With such spectacular coverage, the pharmaceutical industry finds itself in a position similar to that of a few years ago, when ill-founded charges in Senate subcommittee hearings blazed in headlines across the country.

At that time, the question of drug prices attracted the most attention. Today it is drug safety. For this reason, we believe all employees should have an accurate picture of the thalidomide incident and its possible implications.

DEVELOPED IN GERMANY

Thalidomide was first discovered and tested in West Germany. While animals did not respond to it, the molecular structure pointed to possible sedative properties. So it was tried in epileptics, where its sleep-producing activity became apparent. Marketed as Contergan, it became by 1960 the most popular sedative in West Germany, sold without prescription, and so seemingly safe that even would-be suicides could not take enough of it to be harmed. Thalidomide was combined with other products. It was also sold in a number of other countries, including England, Canada, and Australia.

The Wm. S. Merrell Co. in Cincinnati obtained a license from the German producer, Chemie Grunenthal G.m.b.H., and began clinical testing in January 1959. A new drug application (a request to the Federal Food and Drug Administration for permission to sell the drug in the United States) was submitted in September 1960, at a time

when years of usage abroad and testing in this country showed no indication whatsoever of harmful side effects.

In fact, Dr. Helen Taussig, Johns Hopkins University authority on birth deformities, wrote on "The Thalidomide Syndrome" in the August 1962 issue of Scientific American, in which she stated that when the Merrell Co. initiated its new drug application, the tragic developments in Germany "could not have been anticipated * * * it was an excellent sedative and appeared to be safe."

SIDE EFFECTS REPORTED

The first side effects reported were those of polyneuritis (mainly tingling of the fingers), usually after long-term use. For this reason, thalidomide was put on prescription in Germany in April 1961. However, widespread and successful usage continued.

Meanwhile, Dr. Frances Kelsey of the Food and Drug Administration, concerned about the failure of animals to respond to it and noting the polyneuritis, delayed allowing the new drug application to become effective and asked for more data.

In the summer of 1961 an increase in deformed births in West Germany began alarming physicians and led to investigations. By mid-November, thalidomide was implicated. The Merrell Co. first learned of this from Europe late on November 29. Within hours, the company had notified the Food and Drug Administration and began warning physician investigators not only to avoid giving the drug to pregnant women but also not to give it to women of childbearing age.

MANY FACTORS IN BIRTH DEFORMITIES

To a large degree, the evidence on the relationship of thalidomide to birth deformities is circumstantial. Because the treatment of nausea of pregnancy (usually a problem during early pregnancy) had not been a recommended use for thalidomide on clinical trial in this country, and because thalidomide apparently can cause deformities in the fetus only if the mother takes the drug between the third and sixth week of pregnancy, the danger of repeating even a small part of the European tragedy now seems extremely remote.

Still to be checked are other factors. One is the degree of inbreeding among affected families, always a consideration in some European communities. Another is measles, which can cause birth deformities, and possibly other virus infections. Significantly, the drug was not taken at all by approximately 50 percent of the mothers of the deformed European babies. The causes of malformed births go far deeper than one drug, or any series of drugs. Understandably, research is now being intensified in this area.

Much remains to be learned about thalidomide and its mode of action—which conceivably could still be excellent for some classes of people, especially the aged. Mice and rats have failed so far to produce congenital malformations, even at high dosage levels. Some American and European scientists have reported ill effects by giving massive doses to rabbits, but the significance of these findings is not yet understood.

MERRELL STOPS TESTING

As evidence continued to point to thalidomide, the Merrell Co. stopped clinical testing in March of this year. The company began to recall and destroy test quantities, using letters, telephone calls and its sales representatives, along with follow-up telegrams and registered letters. Drug stocks of deceased physicians were checked.

Merrell collaborated fully with the Food and Drug Administration and with local and State health officials. Mr. George Larrick, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, testified that the company had acted promptly and correctly. Clearly, it displayed responsibility at every point in keeping with the high standards of the prescription drug industry.

PRESENT CONTROLS ARE EFFECTIVE

In some quarters, hastily drawn conclusions from the thalidomide incident point to an aftermath that could be damaging not only to the pharmaceutical industry but to medical progress and the public at large.

For example, politically inspired remarks can delude the public into thinking present law is weak and inadequate. Rather than weakness, the thalidomide story disclosed the power of the Food and Drug Administration to keep a drug off the market indefinitely, even on scanty evidence. It showed how Government and industry team together at the first danger signal. Thus the stringency of existing law, not its weakness, made it possible to withhold thalidomide from public use.

SAFETY RECORD IS GOOD

The quality of the testing process for all drugs, in cooperation with the Food and Drug Administration, has brought about an industry safety record that must rank as very good, especially when viewed against the potency of modern medicinals. In the last 4 years, only 15 of 784 products have been withdrawn from the market because questions of safety arose. In most of these cases, action was taken by the involved company after independently finding side effects and reporting them to the Food and Drug Administration. One of the products that was withdrawn had been marketed only after clinical trials in 6,000 cases and was found to produce a serious side effect in approximately one of 35,000 patients.

It has been estimated that a thorough safety study in animals for just one drug may cost as much as $100,000. An average new product takes 5 years of preparation. And pharmaceutical companies average about one new product for every $5 million they invest in research. Obviously, no company can afford to risk its reputation—and its integrity—with unsafe products in the medical marketplace.

Within the limitations imposed by the present boundaries of scientific knowledge, drugs are as safe as human skill and dedication can make them. The record of the United States in medical progress and the effectiveness and safety of drugs is unsurpassed.

INDUSTRY ESTABLISHES SAFETY COMMISSION

But science has no boundaries. Referring to thalidomide, Dr. Austin Smith, President of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, said, "The phenomenon of a drug which may cause widespread malformation of infants has not previously been reported in the history of medicine." We are limited by knowledge, not law.

Thus the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association moved swiftly in the wake of the thalidomide disclosures to set up a new Commission on Drug Safety. Its goal—to broaden knowledge for research and testing of potent drugs likely to emerge in the future. Chairman is Dr. Lowell T. Coggeshall, distinguished scientist and administrator. Abbott is especially proud of the appointment, since Dr. Coggeshall serves on our board of directors. Other top scientists from industry, medicine and the Government will serve on the new body.

Dr. Coggeshall has pointed out that the objective will be to provide "maximum assurance to the public of the safety of new drugs, without imposing unnecessary delay in bringing the dramatic fruits of this research to the public."

SAFETY RESEARCH NOT NEW

Of course, intensive research into the side effects and safety of drugs is not new to science, industry, or the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. Within our industry's trade association, a specially selected group of top scientists in toxicology (including Abbott's Dr. Robert J. Stein) has long studied the problem. This year, for example, 33 members of the drug evaluation committee are working in teams to prepare papers on 11 topics—all assigned prior to the publicity explosion on thalidomide.

As another example, our own pathology department routinely checks for changes in animal tissue after drugs are given, not only at the cellular but at the subcellular level.

Other independent groups, on which industry scientists serve, have long worked in this vital field.

VITAL TO UNDERSTAND RISKS

It is the responsibility of the industry, then, to help the public understand the thalidomide tragedy so that "panic buttons" will not be pushed for extreme legislation.

It must be realized that just as new and improved aircraft could not come into use without test pilots, so new and improved drugs could not appear without trials in human beings. No matter how extensive prior animal testing—and these techniques are quite effective—the proof of value rests in results with human patients, often over a period of years. Complete absence of toxicity in animals cannot guarantee complete safety in human tests. These involve risks, even though every effort is made to reduce them to a minimum. They may always involve risk. It is the acceptance of risk that makes progress possible.

REGULATION COULD IMPEDE PROGRESS

We do not believe the public would be willing to go along with legislation that could unduly slow down or curtail clinical testing of drugs. Such a step, if it would entangle clinical research in a web of regulation, could keep useful drugs from the market for years. In effect, regulatory excess could shift to Government agencies those responsibilities that belong to physicians devoting their lives to the advancement of medicine. As we stated in a recent advertisement, "Evaluation of drugs by the medical profession is difficult enough without being rendered more complex by Government agencies bound to enforce unrealistic regulations."

Thus we hope that our Federal officials will await the findings of the Commission on Drug Safety and other responsible bodies like the American Medical Association before recommending changes in American drug research and testing programs.

Unneeded and stifling regulation, then, is the danger raised by the thalidomide incident, which must be used as a guide to new knowledge, not as a barrier to continued medical progress.

Kenosha: Booming Port on America's Fourth Seacoast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, progress in America reflects the dedication of men—imbued with good ideas and willingness to work hard to achieve ever-brighter goals for the future.

To illustrate: Kenosha, Wis., in the recent past, was only a haven for small pleasure vessels and fishing boats. Now, it has become a full-fledged national harbor.

How was this accomplished? By far-sighted leadership and a great spirit of

enterprise, reflected by citizens of the community. As a result, Kenosha is now a significant and growing port on the Great Lakes.

Fortunately, the St. Lawrence Seaway, for which I was privileged to sponsor legislation, also came along to open new opportunities and speed progress.

Currently, legislation is pending before Congress for further improvement of Kenosha and other harbors. This, I believe, should receive speedy approval.

In times of economic problems, which persist plaguingly, we need adequate priority for forward-moving programs that create jobs, business, and industrial activity, and general economic progress.

Recently the Kenosha News, one of our outstanding Wisconsin newspapers, published a series of articles on the fast growth and development of Kenosha Harbor.

Reflecting the way in which the spirit of enterprise and hard work have helped to promote progress in this splendid community, I ask unanimous consent to have two of these articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kenosha (Wis.) News, Sept. 10, 1962]

KENOSHA'S HARBOR BIG BUSINESS NOW

(By Mary-Anne Smoler Thompson)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The City of Kenosha's Harbor can boast an amazing progress, but it is a story few Kenoshans understand fully. It is the tale of how a natural harbor, once only the haven for some pleasure vessels and a handful of fishing boats, became a full-fledged port, handling cargo on its way to and from world ports. This is the first of three articles about the city's million-dollar harbor.)

There was a day when a large ship in the Kenosha Harbor was an oddity.

But that day is past. Now a large ship docked at the port of Kenosha no longer means a treat for Kenoshans. It means business, and big business at that, for the city.

Every year more and more ships find their way into the harbor's 220-foot-wide entrance channel and to load or unload an ever-increasing amount of cargo. Last year alone, 76 foreign ships visited the port of Kenosha, importing and exporting a total of just under 50,000 tons of cargo.

By the end of August this year, 68 ships had used the harbor, as compared with 38 by the end of the same month in 1961, a recordbreaking year. Tonnage, too, will be far above its 1961 total by the time the harbor ends its shipping season provided the North Western Railway strike is settled.

To handle this amount of traffic, the Port of Kenosha is business on a grand scale. It is, in fact, so large that few Kenoshans realize its tremendous impact.

When a ship docks, there must be longshoremen on hand. In addition, there must be rail cars close to transport cargo to and from the docks. The men aboard ship, too, have needs which can be supplied only by ports.

What this adds up to is hundreds of thousands of dollars which find their way into the city.

In 1961, Kenosha's total income resulting from harbor operations was just under $350,000. Dock payrolls, taxes, and estimated retail sales to ship crews all went into this figure. If and when the railway strike is settled, indications point to an even larger total this year.

In addition to the cash dividend the harbor has been paying, it has made the city a livelier railroad center. In 1961 a total of 1,189 railroad cars were used for the harbor as compared with 520 cars the previous year.

Today's harbor, which has brought this business to this relatively small city, is an example of what can be made of a natural advantage by farsighted city leaders. It is something Kenoshans can point to with pride.

Nature did its part by providing a fine natural harbor with a turning basin 600 feet in diameter. Along this harbor the city has helped to develop three loading and storage docks, the north dock, on which the Kenosha Yacht Club is located, the Haas dock on the west side of the harbor channel from the turning basin north toward the 50th Street Bridge, and the south dock.

All three docks are run by the Endee Co., stevedore contractor and warehouse operator. Endee leases the Haas and north docks from the city on 10- and 25-year leases, handing over yearly rent payments to the city as well as a percentage of whatever the firm earns in cargo handling activities.

Endee and city officials made trips to Washington and abroad telling shippers about the advantages of the port and urging them to make use of it.

The advertising has been successful and there remain few shippers in Europe who have not heard of this small city.

W. Casey Schmitz, chairman of the Board of Harbor Commissioners, has stated that one port was needed between Chicago and Milwaukee and that Kenosha is it.

But he never neglects to point out that we are no tiny port taking the few loads of cargo the larger harbors can't handle. Kenosha competes, very often successfully, with these larger ports so that many shippers specify they wish their cargo handled through Kenosha.

Vehicles, flour, corn meal, lard tallow, grease, steel, liquors, electronic devices, military equipment and countless other items are loaded on the Kenosha docks when they might have been loaded at Milwaukee or Chicago.

The reason for local success is simple economics—often the operation can be handled most rapidly and cheaply in Kenosha. A foreign-flag vessel, Schmitz explained, cost $1,500 a day to operate. If it docks at Lake Calumet in Chicago, it must waste time—4 to 12 hours traveling the 7 miles down the Calumet River from Lake Michigan and must pay a tug charge of $2,400.

There is no tug charge in Kenosha's harbor since tugs are seldom needed. In addition, ships have been able to tie up and start unloading within 11 minutes after passing the breakwater at the mouth of the harbor.

Experience has shown shippers that the more than 100 local longshoremen can handle the loading operation more rapidly than Chicago workers, matching times recorded by far more experienced longshoreman in ocean ports.

Economically, Kenosha's popularity with shippers seems secure for the present. Still, the board of harbor commissioners is working on plans for the future so that the harbor can not only maintain but enhance its position.

Moving of the Kenosha Yacht Club from the north dock, further dredging of the harbor, now 21 feet deep, and arranging for more railroad yard space near the harbor and rail service to the north dock are all considerations now being studied.

Once gained, the city is doing all it can to see that this great economic advantage will never be lost.

[From the Kenosha (Wis.) News, Sept. 11, 1962]

ONCE SCOFFED AT DREAMS OF PORT

(By Mary-Anne Smoler Thompson)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The port of Kenosha, now a booming business dumping profits into the city yearly, was not always a harbor used, or even noticed by major shippers. At one time, it was considered little more than an unsightly spot too near the downtown area. This is the second in a series of three stories explaining the development and growth of the harbor, one of Kenosha's greatest assets.)

Harbor? What harbor?

Why spend good taxpayers' money to improve harbor facilities and to buy up shoreline property when no ships even use the harbor?

These were questions asked by Kenosha citizens as late as 1957, when the city was considering a purchase of the Haas Coal Co., dock property on the west side of the channel from the turning basin, north toward the 50th Street Bridge.

And the citizens had a point. Looking backward, they could see a long history of declining use of the harbor until it was virtually worthless to the city.

At the end of the 19th century, back in the days of the Allen Tannery, Kenosha's natural harbor was busy. Small ships buzzed in and out, carrying coal and other supplies for the city.

Of course there was no St. Lawrence Seaway open then, so all of the shipping was lake traffic, carrying cargo from one Great Lakes port to another. And with the advent of railroad and motor shipping, this limited lake traffic gave way to the newer, cheaper ways of transporting goods. Soon only a few items, including coal, could profitably be shipped on the lakes, and even this shipping was declining.

In 1954, lake traffic in Kenosha reached an all-time low. Tonnage amounted to the negligible total of 19,157 tons, so low that the Federal Government removed the port from its formal listing of tonnages for Great Lakes Ports and placed it in another special listing of "project harbors having tonnage totals of less than 25,000 tons."

Understandably, a future port of Kenosha handling cargo from all over the world and dumping hundreds of thousands of dollars into the city through payrolls, taxes, and sales looked like the impossible vision of a dreamer. Even the fact that Kenosha could ever again be considered a commercial harbor seemed farfetched.

And the concept of doing business in our harbor was almost—but not quite—lost in these years of shipping lull, with recreational boaters enjoing the harbor and beginning to consider it exclusively theirs, hoping and expecting no longer to be bothered by cargo ships getting in their way.

Luckily, however, the city was not without foresight. There were those who could see how greatly our natural advantage—an almose perfectly shaped natural harbor—could pay off for the city of Kenosha.

These citizens, some of them officials in the city government, some Kenosha's representatives to the State government, some on the harbor commission, some associated with local industry, others just interested citizens, knew what the harbor record showed. But they insisted that the city look forward, not backward.

They realized Kenosha had to take a chance. The problem of making Kenosha's shoreline a commercial harbor looked as hard to solve as the problem of which came first, the chicken or the egg. And the two problems were similar.

To get shippers to use the harbor depended upon deepening and improving the harbor. This work depended upon the availability of a great deal of money—usually

Federal money. But the availability of Federal money depended on proof that the local harbor had enough shipping to justify the expenditure. Of course it did not—that was the problem.

It appeared in 1954–55 that the only way to improve the harbor was to take steps on a local level and to spend city money on the projects.

The objections of taxpayers who asked "What harbor?" were well founded at this point, considering the low level of shipping here and the lack of any concrete indications of what was to become a booming Great Lakes trade with the opening of the improved St. Lawrence Seaway.

Still, those who believed in the possibilities of the harbor managed to have their way, and the city invested more than $250,000 in harbor development between 1955 and 1959—taking the chance that the port would still never be used.

Good Faith of U.N. Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., on Friday, September 14 published the following column by William S. White.

This, of course, was just after the House of Representatives, with a whoop and a holler, had passed the $100 million bond issue. I have never heard that Mr. White was, or is, an isolationist, that he is anti-Kennedy, or that he does not love the underdeveloped portions of our universe. If he did any of these things or believed any of them, he would, of course, be unworthy of notice.

It is therefore interesting and perhaps instructive to read what he has to say about the United Nations and to find that, according to the caption, he may even believe that its good faith can be challenged.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 14, 1962]

GOOD FAITH OF U.N. CHALLENGED—LATEST KATANGA INCIDENT PROMPTS IDEA THAT SOMEONE DOESN'T WANT PEACE

(By William S. White)

It rather looks that somebody up there in the United Nations doesn't like the prospect of any real settlement of the difficulties in the Congo.

On September 3, President Moise Tshombe of separatist, anti-Communist, Katanga agreed in principle, under heavy pressure, to a U.N. scheme for placing the province under the general authority of the Central Congo Government.

He agreed, even though the U.N. put the thing to him with rare arrogance, throwing down an ultimatum with the public warning that it was to be neither debatable nor negotiable. Putting aside all questions of ordinary manners and tact, this was an extraordinary way to appeal for unity in the Congo. After all, the very right of the U.N. to intervene at all in the internal affairs of this or any other country is open to honest dispute.

But to repeat, Mr. Tshombe went along, largely through the good offices of the Belgians. Though long since driven from the Congo themselves as evil "colonialists," they have patiently tried to help pick up the pieces there. The United States also was of great assistance in the proposed compromise, our people having meantime dropped some of their excessively harsh early attitude toward anything connected with Mr. Tshombe.

But once Katanga had promised to go along, new provocations followed. The U.N. Secretary-General, U Thant of Burma, needlessly slapped Mr. Tshombe again by allowing some of the troops of his opposition in the controversy, the Central Congo Government, to become part of the U.N. force in Katanga.

The Central Congo Government, meanwhile, had done its bit by provoking some of the Western Allied governments. With loud huzzahs, it donated a base on Congo soil to train Angolan rebels who intend to take the colony of Angola from Portugal by arms. This, of course, was a great contribution—in reverse—by those who say and say again they want to end bitterness and disunion in Africa.

Some would think, quite simply, that it was a preparation for aggression. But the U.N., these days, can rarely find anybody guilty of aggression unless he is a Westerner. When the good "excolonial peoples" mount an aggression it is only self-defense, or simple justice, or something. Anyhow, since the Central Congo Government is a creature of the U.N., it is perfectly obvious that the U.N. could have stopped this pointless provocation of Portugal, had it wanted to do so.

And now, to cap it all, there has been another armed clash in Katanga between U.N. troops—troops supplied by Premier Nehru's India, which has gone unrebuked for its little aggression in Goa—and the Katangans. Mr. Tshombe says the U.N. first opened fire. The U.N. says Mr. Tshombe's troops did. It is possible that in this area of tough power politics and maneuvering the U.N. may be right as to the details this time—through its past record for candor is not impressive.

But the U.N., which claims itself to be terribly responsible and Mr. Tshombe to be terribly irresponsible, had the plain duty to avoid this incident in the first place, particularly in the present circumstances. Surely, avoiding it could not have been too desperately difficult if, as the U.N. itself claims, there were no casualties whatever. If the Katangans really did open fire first, how did they manage to hit nobody at all? And what of the bodies of Katangans which Mr. Tshombe displays in a mortuary?

In any case, who fired first is not the real point. The real point is that Mr. Tshombe now can and does challenge the good faith of the U.N.

Again, does somebody up there in the U.N. really like the idea of a peaceful settlement? Or is somebody up there in the U.N. more interested in making more bitter incidents rather than in settlements?

Baron Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, 230 years ago Baron Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben was born in Germany. It is fitting that we today honor his birth because of the great contribution he made to our cause during the Revolutionary War.

General von Steuben arrived in the United States at Portsmouth, N.H., on December 1, 1777, with letters from Benjamin Franklin, Silas Deane, and Beaumarchais. He offered his services to the Continental Congress, waiving all claim to rank or pay and asked only that his expenses should be paid while acting as a vounteer with the Army. The "Dictionary of American Biography," volume 17, states as follows:

He proposed that if his services should contribute to the eventual success of the American cause, he would then expect compensation for his sacrifices in leaving Europe and such reward as Congress might be pleased to grant him, but that if the cause should fail, or if his services should not prove beneficial, he would make no claim whatever. This proposal to stake his fortunes upon the success of the cause made a deep impression upon the Congress. His services were accepted and he was directed to report to Washington at Valley Forge where he arrived on February 23.

The dictionary continues:

Washington was so favorably impressed by his practical knowledge and experience that he prevailed upon him to serve as acting inspector general and to undertake the training of the Army * * *. He formed a model company of 100 selected men and undertook its drill in person. The rapid progress of this company under his skilled instruction made an immediate appeal to the imagination of the whole Army. Drill became the fashion and within a few weeks the new gospel, imparted day by day to the model company, had spread throughout the Army. This is perhaps the most remarkable achievement in rapid military training in the history of the world. The baron's success was so speedy that on April 30 Washington recommended his appointment as inspector general with the rank of major general. On May 5 the appointment was confirmed by the Continental Congress.

The contribution that General von Steuben made to the cause of our independence is well documented. He was a valued adviser and friend of Gen. George Washington.

Today is General von Steuben's birthday—on Saturday, September 29, 1962, he will be honored at the fifth annual Steuben Day parade in New York City. It is my pleasure to invite my colleagues and all citizens to join with us in New York in paying tribute to this great American of German descent, because he did become a citizen of our country by act of the Pennsylvania Legislature in March 1783 and by act of the New York Legislature in July 1786.

McNamara's Defense Savings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News on Friday, August 17, gave a well directed boost to the efforts of Secretary Robert McNamara in an editorial entitled, "Let the

Man Alone." The editorial chronicles the savings and efficiencies which Mr. McNamara has produced in the huge Defense Establishment and points to places where further progress will be made in the effort McNamara is making. I join with the Washington Daily News in its commendation of Secretary of Defense McNamara and wish him well in carrying further the goals of efficiency and economy in our military plant. The editorial follows:

LEAVE THE MAN ALONE

The House Armed Services Committee is off base in charging that Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's drive for real unification at the Pentagon "endangers our national security."

"No one," an Armed Services Subcommittee said in a report filed this week, "questions the need to eliminate unnecessary duplication." Everyone, it says "applauds intelligent savings." To which we add "Amen." But then the committee calls for new legislation—a congressional veto over any further unification—which would make it much more difficult to root out duplication and achieve further savings.

We don't think many will fall for this sort of doubletalk. Just what has Mr. McNamara done to raise these fears? For one thing, he's created a Defense Supply Agency—the committee's principal target—which already has saved several hundred million dollars and soon will count its savings in the billions. He's set up a Defense Intelligence Agency to bring order out of chaos there. He's done the same thing for the sprawling electronics empires, and a few others. It is pure claptrap to say these intelligent, long-overdue moves, endanger our security. They enhance it.

For each these steps Mr. McNamara has ample legislative authority. More—if we are to believe Senate Armed Services Chairman RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat of Georgia—than he has yet used. He also has the support of the majority of Congress and the American people. They applaud intelligent savings and approve the elimination of waste—with no strings attached.

Mr. McNamara has done a remarkable job. He has earned the right to expect our support. We have this message for those who would tie his hands:

Leave the man alone.

The Answer Is "No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we move closer to the climax of the so-called tax reform bill, it would be well for us to keep in mind the interpretation that the public is giving the measure. We must also keep in mind the elemental fact that Government spending is the single basic factor in determining increases or decreases in the Federal tax structure.

This element is very effectively discussed in an editorial which appeared in the Thursday, September 6, issue of the Blue Island Sun-Standard, Blue Island, Ill., which I insert under unanimous consent into the RECORD at this point. The editorial is entitled "The Answer Is 'No' ":

THE ANSWER IS "NO"

The President's report to the Nation on tax policy contained no surprises. His main points had been anticipated. The salient ones: That the economic situation does not justify a tax cut at this time; that, if conditions worsen he will ask for one at any time in the future, even if this requires a special session of Congress; and that, in any event, a comprehensive bill including both tax reductions and tax overhaul will be presented in January.

The difficulties that confront this program are easily foreseen. There are, for instance, almost as many different views on what tax reform should encompass, and just who and what should be most favored with tax reductions, as there are Members of Congress.

That aside, a more important question instantly arises. If taxes are to be reduced without resulting in deficits of literally disastrous size, the reductions must be of a nature that will spur capital investment—not just consumer purchasing power—and thus create new sources of taxation for the future. Realistic depreciation allowances for industry and a lower corporation tax are examples of this need.

To compound the problem the administration has made it clear that it will continue to press for major, new and expanded spending programs and for increased concentration of power and responsibility in the Federal Government.

There's the main rub. Can we have tax reduction on anything even resembling the necessary scale and have, along with it, an insatiable welfare state without running the risk of ruinous inflation? The answer—unless all precedent is meaningless—is "No."

Some Questions, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 20, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie, Ind., Star, of September 6, 1962:

SOME QUESTIONS, MR. PRESIDENT

President Kennedy has failed to tell the American people the truth about Cuba.

The President has told no active falsehood. He has simply refused to set forth facts to which every citizen of the United States is entitled. It is possible to tell considerably less than the truth by maintaining silence. This is what the President has done and is doing about Cuba.

The facts now seem to be that several thousand Red "technicians" have landed from at least five or more passenger ships at various ports in Cuba. These "technicians" are not Latin Americans. They are either Russians or East Europeans who are moving into Cuba under the sponsorship of the Castro regime. The alliance between Castro and Communist Russia is a recorded fact of international life, and the Cuban press has admitted both the military nature of aid it receives from Russia, and the diplomatic support offered by Moscow.

There is every reason to believe that the President has had and now has accurate knowledge about the military buildup in Cuba. Could ship movements of this nature have escaped the eye of the world's largest Navy only 90 miles away from the shores of the United States? If ships bearing the Red "technicians" unloaded at night in Cuba ports, they had to steam in broad daylight to arrive off the island just south of this country.

The first reports of these landings in late July and early August were brushed off by the administration as the exaggerated claims of excitable Cuban refugees. If anything, the orignal reports seem to be conservative in nature. If the administration was unwilling to admit the nature of these military movements, the Cuban official press is only too happy to boast about the Red intrusion into the Western Hemisphere. A reliable press report also tells of a landing at Mariel, a port mentioned earlier in these columns as a place where "technicians" came ashore.

In an effort to excuse the lack of American policy regarding Cuba, some intellectuals have tried to draw a parallel to Quemoy and Matsu. Americans are supposed to be "mature enough" to tolerate a Red strongpoint only a few miles from Florida. The groups of Chinese face each other across the Formosa Strait. The Communists who moved into Cuba have no claim on any part of the two Americas, other than the old Red drive for empire.

Some questions are in order. We direct them to the President.

Has the Monroe Doctrine been discarded?

Are there Russian troops, technical or otherwise, in Cuba?

Will a buildup of Red power be permitted to continue in Cuba?

Why has the administration failed to inform the American people fully and fairly about the situation in Cuba?

If no one says anything about the Reds in Cuba, will they go away?

The Kennedy record regarding Cuba is sorry enough to date. It should not be compounded further by a failure to inform the people of this country about the situation as it truthfully exists, not as we might wish it to be.

Where is candor, where is vigor, where is courage we were promised?

Memorable Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star, Friday, September 14, 1962:

MEMORABLE ANNIVERSARY

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, founder of the Czechoslovak Republic, died 25 years ago today, believing he had laid the foundation of the only durable democracy in Eastern Europe. It did, indeed, survive the inroads of fascism, only to fall prey to the long tentacles of communism.

A patriot as well grounded in democracy's principles as our own Jefferson, Masaryk is still the inspiration of those trapped behind the Iron Curtain as well as champions of freedom everywhere. Educator, philosopher, statesman, Masaryk in the words of one admirer "taught the nation to accept democracy as the only modern and satisfactory way of public and private life."

He was a humanitarian who spent a lifetime seeking, and living, the truth; fighting for his country's liberation while gently teaching the creed of "Love thy neighbor as thyself." We join with the Council of Free Czechoslovakia in honoring the memory of a noble and eloquent man, who said: "If people could understand each other, we should have had democracy at one stroke; without mutual understanding, without tolerance, there is no freedom. Only when we are completely truthful and open with one another can we learn to know one another; but without love there is no truth; without truth and love we cannot know our fellows."

Would Federal Help Kill or Cure U.S. Arts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the New Frontier has adopted another ADA program, this one calling for subsidization of the arts by the Federal Government. President Kennedy has recommended such a course of action and has already set up a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, with promised handouts of subsidies and other gratuities to artists.

Russell Kirk, a distinguished writer and expert on this subject, pointed out the dangers to art and artists inherent in this course of action in an article which appeared September 9 in the Los Angeles Times. Under unanimous consent I include it as a portion of my remarks in the RECORD:

WOULD FEDERAL HELP KILL OR CURE U.S. ARTS?

(By Russell Kirk)

Last year and this, certain manipulators of public opinion and enterprising politicians have been demanding the creation of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts—with subsidies and plums.

And a very able gentleman, August Heckscher, has been appointed special Presidential adviser on culture.

No doubt American arts and letters could stand improvement. But will Federal grants accomplish this?

"The problems of the performing arts in America today are not the problems of decline," Arthur Goldberg, former Secretary of Labor, declared recently. "They are the problems of growth; a growth so rapid, so tumultuous, so eventful as to be almost universally described as an explosion."

If this is so, why do the performing arts need subsidies?

But perhaps the "explosion" in the American theater is of the sort described a generation ago by a critic of Dos Pasos' novel "Manhattan Transfer"—"an explosion in a cesspool."

Some months ago, a big Brazilian audience walked out in disgust from a Tennessee Williams' play presented at the American Government's expense: They thought it an explosion in a cesspool—and they weren't Communists, either.

Early this year, pressure was brought to persuade our State Department to finance Julian and Judith Beck's Living Theater for a trip to the Theatre des Nations, in Paris.

But in March, when the zealots for Federal subsidies to the drama were thumping tubs, Julian Beck himself was recuperating in Bellevue Hospital from injuries he received during a clash in Times Square between the police and demonstrators protesting President Kennedy's decision to resume nuclear testing.

When at length money was found for this expedition, the Living Theater went abroad to display American culture to Parisians: They presented four plays, concerned principally with addiction to narcotics, homosexuality and the horrors of American capitalism.

Now American players and performers abroad ought not to become propagandists for the American way of life.

But neither should they be paid to be propagandists against our civilization.

The height of absurdity was reached, perhaps, when State Department-subsidized actors presented, as representative of American theater, a grim Marxist drama by Bertolt Brecht, who happens to be a Communist playwright of East Germany.

To judge by what our bureaucratic guardians of culture have accomplished so far, I suspect that large Federal patronage would smother, rather than nurture, the theater and arts and letters generally.

And if all we possess nowadays is the art of nihilism or of ideology, we may do well to let laissez faire take its course until such silliness is swept off the boards.

The Price of Timidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial which appeared in the Rochelle Leader on September 14, 1962. I think that this editorial presents very concisely and tersely the whole tragic chronology of the series of mistakes that have been made with respect to Cuba. I am particularly impressed by the fact that the writer points out that if we had only moved firmly in the early stages that we would not today be confronted with what seems almost an unsoluble problem. I would further express the hope that this administration, and yes, the American people, have learned a lesson; namely that dictators from the left, no matter how much they may be romanticized, are just as dangerous and destructive of freedom as the fascistic dictators of the right.

The editorial follows:

THE PRICE OF TIMIDITY

It is humiliating and frustrating to stand idly by while Russia converts the island of Cuba into a heavily armed Communist stronghold 90 miles off our shores but this is the price we are forced to pay for our indecisions of the past.

This country's handling of the Cuban situation has been one long series of bungles and while the chief blame must rest on the shoulders of our policymakers there are few Americans who are completely free of guilt.

In the early days of Castro's uprising he was romanticized by the press and other mediums of the United States as a heroic fighter for the freedom of his people.

Our State Department adopted policies that helped make it possible for Castro and his followers to dispose the corrupt and dictatorial Batista regime and take over the rule of the island.

Our State Department, writers and others who welcomed the Castro takeover were willing to shut their eyes to the fact that Fidel Castro had for years been associated with Communist movements.

They continued in their blindness when they apologized for his bloody purges, supression of civil liberties and his seizure of American property and high-handed treatment of American citizens.

We were told repeatedly that all would be well if only we were patient with the bearded leader and tried to understand his viewpoint.

The apologists went so far as to say that the United States was in some mysterious way to blame when Castro began to villify this country and hysterically accuse it of being the enemy of the Cuban people.

If we had moved firmly in the early stage of the Castro takeover and demanded that the stolen American property be either returned or paid for in full, if we had demanded an immediate end to the mistreatment of American citizens and taken steps to sponsor a free election in Cuba we would not be faced with a Cuban problem that seems insolvable.

But we humbly accepted the insult and made no move to protect our interest or to save the people of Cuba from the chains that were forged by Castro and his Communist cohorts.

We belatedly declared an economic boycott in hope that it would weaken the Castro regime and lead to its overthrow but we took no decisive action when Russia and Red China moved in to strengthen the Communist domination of the island.

During the closing months of the Eisenhower administration the United States quietly supplied money, arms, and training for a Cuban invasion force and gave encouragement to the Cuban underground preparatory to an assault on the Castro regime.

But when the appointed day came there was a new administration at the helm in Washington, the promise of air cover for the invasion army was withdrawn and the landing force was sacrificed in the Bay of Pigs because of our timidity.

The fiasco was a severe blow to American prestige, it practically wiped out the Cuban underground and resulted in the even more humiliating "tractors for prisoners" episode.

Our actions to date have been an open invitation to the Kremlin to do whatever it wishes on the island 90 miles off our shores and strategically located to permit spying on our Cape Canaveral operations.

The Russians have accepted the invitation, are forging an even stronger hold on the island and are converting it into a Communist fortress.

Like the Berlin wall the fortress of Cuba is now an accomplished fact. We failed to act when action would have been effective. The only course open to us now is to watch and wait in the hope that events will give us a chance to make up for our blunders.

Very Well Spoken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star, Friday, September 14, 1962:

VERY WELL SPOKEN

The President, in this single sentence, has said all that needs to be said now about Cuba:

"If at any time the Communist buildup in Cuba were to endanger or interfere with our security in any way, including our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities at Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country, or if Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies."

The President does not think any of these conditions has as yet arisen in Cuba, and neither do we. The warning, however, is both timely and unmistakably clear. We believe it will be correctly understood by Fidel Castro and his blustering friend in Moscow.

Restoring Historical Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, September 16, was Barry Day in Philadelphia. In memory of the founder of the American Navy, a luncheon was held in my district at the Commodore Barry Club. A parade downtown followed, and it was concluded by the laying of a wreath at the statue of Commodore Barry in the center of Independence Square. The audience in the square was addressed by the Honorable John Morgan Davis, Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable James H. J. Tate, mayor of Philadelphia, and Rear Adm. John B. Hefferman, former historian for the Navy.

After the ceremonies, Mrs. Tate, my wife, and I accompanied Mayor Tate on an unscheduled short tour of Washington Square East—Society Hill—to see the latest developments. The changes in the physical appearance of this center-city area under the redevelopment program are astonishing. The outside structure of the 536-unit Hopkinson House is impressive and attractive. The voluntary rehabilitation of historic residences and structures was most interesting. The area also includes newly constructed contemporary homes, one of which we visited in the 200 block on the east side of South Third Street. These were erected across the street from the 18th century Powell House.

At this point and others, we ran into hundreds of people participating in the Society Hill house tour, sponsored by Christ Church, to raise funds for the restoration of the Pancoast-Lewis-Wharton House at 336 Spruce Street, which will eventually become a rectory.

The 12 family row homes of contemporary design with spiral staircase and parking compound were very striking. Dramatic changes have taken place in the Spruce Street area where private initiative was transforming deteriorated buildings of the 18th and 19th centuries into charming modern town houses. Many are also restoring quite a number of historical features.

One of the most interesting homes we visited was restored by Mr. and Mrs. Jared Ingersoll, who personally and proudly participated in the showing of their home on Spruce Street and the historical features which they rebuilt or restored. They graciously showed the attractive and interesting changes to hundreds of people who came into the house as part of the special Christ Church tour.

Federal agencies such as the FHA and the Urban Renewal Administration are helping to develop much of this area which borders on the south side of the Independence Mall National Park. In addition, the private initiative, spurred by public investment and the leadership of the Philadelphia city government, is greatly aiding in the development of a city area which will become one of the showplaces of the Nation.

The Will Behind the Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times, September 9, 1962:

THE WILL BEHIND THE WORDS

The defiant warning issued by President Monroe against the designs of imperialist Russia was composed of strong words—and a strong will to enforce them. Our capacity to resist was slight but it was magnified many times by our great determination.

Ten days ago the reverse seemed true. President Kennedy said at his press conference August 29 that the Monroe Doctrine still "means what it meant" in 1823. But many Americans wondered if it did; many nations were acting as though they were sure it did not.

The will that had first given meaning to the words of the doctrine seemed strangely lacking in the months that followed the disastrous Bay of Pigs expedition.

Caution and inaction were interpreted as weaknesses by the Soviet Union as it boldly stepped up the transformation of Cuba into an armed Communist base. Our close NATO allies—Britain, West Germany, Norway and Greece—were so unimpressed with our passive attitude that they stood by as their merchant ships carried arms, equipment and technicians to the island outpost.

Not until Moscow publicly admitted its coarse intervention did the will of the Government again manifest itself.

Mr. Kennedy issued another reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine last week. This time, however, he began to take the first steps in demonstrating our determination. There could be not doubt as to the impatient mood of the Congress and the Nation; they possessed the will; they lacked only the leadership.

When the President asked Congress Friday for permission to call up 150,000 Reservists, the bipartisan support was immediate and strong. Its leaders did not need to be told that the Reserves were necessary "to permit prompt and effective responses * * * to challenges which may be presented anywhere in the world."

Mr. Kennedy should now act upon the proposal of Republican leaders that he request permission to use armed forces "as he sees necessary," just as President Eisenhower did to meet the Communist threat in the Formosa Straits. Congress will not say "no."

There should be no hesitation on the part of the President in making other necessary responses.

He should demand, not merely ask, that our NATO allies ceasé allowing merchant vessels carrying their flags to aid our common enemy. It is an outrage that those nations whom we have helped to defend and to rebuild should repay us in this way.

He should in fact insist that NATO countries and the members of the Organization of American States immediately join us in collective action against the Cuban threat, including an effective embargo. It is late, yet not too late.

If our friends are irresolute, we must act alone, reserving to ourselves the right to take any action necessary against those who would endanger hemispheric peace and safety.

We will surely be accused of rattling our saber. We are not, but we have drawn it from the scabbard and it will stay unsheathed.

United Nations Loan

SPEECH
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefore.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, along with many other California organizations and individuals strongly supporting the purchase of U.N. bonds by the United States, the California Farm Research and Legislative Committee sent me the following telegram which I wish to read into the RECORD:

SANTA CLARA, CALIF.,
September 14, 1962.

Hon. B. F. SISK,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As per our telephone call to you this date, please place in the RECORD tomorrow, September 14, when the House takes up the matter of U.S. purchase of United Nations bonds, that the California Farm Research and Legislative Committee strongly favors such purchase.

GRACE MCDONALD,
Executive Secretary.

A Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, throughout the time I have been entrusted with public office responsibilities, it has been my custom to periodically publish a summary account of my activities, and I have continued this practice during my service in the Congress during these past 16 years.

It is manifestly impossible to present here a detailed account of my every legislative word and action over these past years because of the limited time allowed, and the newly restrictive rules of the Joint Committee on Printing; and, more particularly, this year, because the ending date of this Congress is still uncertain with the legislative fate of many measures yet remaining undetermined.

However, because of our desire to present a timely recital of stewardship, in accord with the Biblical mandate, and for the public benefit, I shall try to comment upon some of the more widely publicized issues of this Congress and further reveal my fundamental philosophy of government, and life, by including various extracts of speeches on other basic legislative subjects of national significance. This summary is being submitted, of course, with the realization that the great majority of our people are currently aware that most of our important legislative actions these days are for the continuation and amendment of laws already in effect and which are expanded or modified, by our determinations here, through the succeeding years.

THREE FUNDAMENTAL REQUIREMENTS: MILITARY SECURITY, COMMUNIST CONTAINMENT, FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Speaker, the manifest destiny of this Nation, in opposition to atheistic communism, is to safeguard our own freedoms and thereby preserve the light of liberty in a threatened and frightened world.

It is equally obvious that to accomplish this task we must ever strive to be war deterrently equal, or even superior, to the Kremlin dictatorship in military might and space exploration; anything less than that could well provide a desperate temptation to reckless and ruthless individuals.

At the same time, it would be the height of folly and imprudence and an invitation to economic disaster for ourselves if we lessened our vigilance, or relaxed our supervision, in preventing waste and extravagance in our required military procurement and space research programs.

The largest item, by far, in our national budget, now reaching into the 40 billions of dollars, is the military defense appropriation; nobody will argue against an adequate defense appropriation. However, the duty of the Defense Department to maintain our defense system does not carry with it any right of profligate spending. Frugality can be a mark of military efficiency as well as it is of an enterprising business or individual.

Our problem, then, is to provide for our full security against the Communist projection but to do it within a financial system and atmosphere of the most careful planning and the most frugal spending. This is the conviction with which I considered our military appropriations in this Congress, as well as in the past, and such conviction is revealed in the following extract from my speech in the House on this subject:

Mr. Speaker, indeed, there is no question about the imperative necessity, in the light of the belligerent attitude of the Kremlin, of our military forces being fully prepared to protect the security of the United States against any surprise move by the Soviets.

When the House returns to the consideration of this grave subject, in the near future, I most earnestly hope we will not be of a spirit to disregard the necessity for including every reasonable safeguard against and restriction upon wasteful and extravagant military spending that we can. Thirty-nine and a third billion dollars is an awful lot of money and its very enormity provides an avenue for careless and negligent expenditures.

On this score the Comptroller General, in his recent report, pointed out the existence of waste and inefficiency, by the Defense Department, in its management of electronic supplies of the military services.

In past reports multitudinous examples of extravagance and waste by the Defense Department have been disclosed through the use of negotiated contracts instead of competitive bidding and confused and antiquated bookkeeping methods.

Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of the Congress, and of the administration itself, to insure that the purse strings operated by the various departments of the Defense Department are kept sensibly and economically tight. Closer supervision of negotiated contracts to prevent exorbitant profits and a wider use of competitive bidding practices would do much to save the taxpayers' money.

A more strict adherence to the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, and a better organized central procurement unit would go far toward preventing duplication and waste.

Adequate national defense is indeed vital but the people of this country are seriously disturbed by the continuing revelations of wasteful and extravagant spending by the military without regard to the fact that each and every penny spent comes out of the hard earned, and highly taxed, pay of the average American workingman and business. The duty of the Defense Department to guarantee our security does not carry with it any license to indulge in loose and careless financial practices.

With past experience in mind I hope that this House will continue to impress upon the Defense Department that economic frugality and wise spending can be a mark of efficiency in the military field as well as it is of an enterprising business.

WE MUST PERSEVERE IN THE PURSUIT OF PEACE

Mr. Speaker, while we indeed have every right to provide for our fullest defense against any aggressor, I most earnestly believe, a I have repeatedly stated here, we have an accompanying duty, to ourselves and to others, to perseveringly pursue every honorable means that might bring blessed peace to this troubled earth.

It appeared to many of us that the most practical and effective way to promote peace would be to seek mutually satisfactory agreements, with guarantees, on disarmament with other nations. A great many of us very deeply felt that this Government should have a special unit or branch which would concentrate its activity on the objective of disarmament.

That is why I personally introduced H.R. 7950, in this Congress, which was designed to establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency. A similar bill was finally approved and it is a matter of gratification to me that we now have in the executive department of this Government a new U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency whose fundamental purpose is to promote peace through disarmament. I am pleased to include extracts from my remarks in the House when this important legislation was under discussion:

Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor, in this Congress, of a similar bill (H.R. 7950) I most earnestly urge my colleagues here to conscientiously consider the basic objective of the legislative proposal contained in this measure (H.R. 9118) to establish a U.S. arms control agency.

To my mind the fundamental objective of this, and companion bills, is to provide a concrete demonstration of our willingness to explore every honorable means and avenue of reducing and eliminating the terrible potentialities of a nuclear catastrophe being visited upon this Nation and the world.

I realize there are some very sincere individuals who question the timing of this legislation toward arms control agreement when the two strongest nations in the world are engaged in an arms race. However, in my considered opinion, it is indeed just the time when there is the greatest urgency to deal with this problem. The heightening tensions, and the increasing arms race, is just the period when we ought to devote our best efforts to find the means to avoid war and cut down the arms development competition because of the frightening dangers, that are contained in such competition, of a worldwide holocaust.

Associated with this primary purpose of conscientiously attempting to prevent total destruction of humanity, there is the vitally important propaganda benefit that surely would accrue to us, in the eyes of the world, from the creation of an official agency of this Government to seek peace through honorable agreement for arms control.

Thus far, and unfortunately, we are forced to admit that the deceptions and falsifications of Communist propaganda announcements have been extremely difficult to overcome and have tended to influence unwitting and unknowing peoples elsewhere toward the conviction that it is the Kremlin leaders rather than ourselves who are honestly seeking peaceful negotiations.

The United States has certainly been most earnest, most serious, and most honest in its aims for world peace; we are not an aggressive nation. We are not, however, a spineless people who shun war when the alternative is base servitude; as our glorious history demonstrates, we can fight, when forced to, and we can win, but as a God-fearing people and Nation we prefer honorable peace.

What this new Agency, proposed to be established in our Government by this legislation, would do for us would be to find realistic ways to bring about a reduction in armaments, to find formulas which would protect the national interest, and at the same time promote the cause of peace.

Very likely some well-intentioned persons, will be inclined to say that the creation of an Arms Control Agency implies that we

may be bowing to the opposition and moving toward a modified pacifism as a national policy. An examination of our history, our traditions and our intentions clearly demonstrates that nothing could be further from the fact.

What we are demonstrating to the world, however, is that the United States, first among all the nations, has established in its official Government pattern a conscientious effort for a policy of peace. An effective Arms Control Agency certainly does not mean, or imply, that we are willing to settle for peace at any price; but it will most surely prove to any enemy, and the world, that we are not afraid to pay the price of peace.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly urge the Members here to exercise their patriotic judgment of the merit and value this legislation would contribute to the strengthening of our position of world leadership today and approve this measure without extended delay.

SELF INTEREST—MUTUAL SECURITY

Mr. Speaker, in the face of the continuing and harassing Communist design of conquest of all, and suffocation of freedom everywhere, I remain most deeply impressed with the foundation principle involved in our mutual security and foreign assistance programs. That principle is the prevention of the necessity for American fathers and sons to fight, and perhaps die, again, all over the world.

At the same time, I have been steadfastly concerned that the assistance was absolutely needed, that the security projected was, in reality, mutual, and that every possible safeguard was implanted into the program for the most frugal spending, the fullest return, and the absolute removal of waste and extravagance.

Since we originated this program back in 1948, the facts increasingly have shown that many of the countries we have assisted have gradually reached the point of economic productivity beyond any previous capacity, and in many instances, it is clear no expanded aid is warranted in earnest mindfulness of our own inexhaustible resources.

It did appear to me that the measure we acted upon in 1961 should include, as a practical and effective projection, Executive authority to plan development assistance to friendly countries on an assured basis of 5-year duration. The burden is upon the Executive to determine when such assistance is important to the advancement of the U.S. interests.

However, while it is indeed practically wise to carefully contribute to the rehabilitation and development needs of our friendly allies, it would be the height of foolish generosity to bankrupt ourselves in doing so.

Mr. Speaker, these are the basic principles which have governed my actions on our foreign assistance programs and they are indicated in the extract of my remarks which follow:

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as I see it, this debate on the reasonable continuation of our mutual security aid program should begin with a concrete demonstration of our deepest concern for our overburdened American taxpayers.

That legislative concern should be even more concentrated and emphasized because of the factual evidence in the record "of waste and extravagance—a pattern of loose, lax administration through the entire complex of foreign aid."

I earnestly hope that in the phases of the program where this extravagance and waste has been displayed the recommended reductions will be approved.

The divisions of this program which appear to have been operated and projected in the best interests of ourselves and the advancement of our foreign allies are the technical assistance and Development Loan Fund extensions. I hope that these features will be adequately supported as their worth has been substantially proven.

Let us strive today to conscientiously enact a measure that will provide reasonable assistance to our allies, in the fields where such help is most needed, while we insure elimination of those parts of the program which have been proved wasteful and worthless.

A HIGH NATIONAL MORALE IS IMPERATIVE

Mr. Speaker, it is true that in modern times, especially since the end of World War II, our legislative activities here have increasingly extended and expanded, in their import and impact, upon areas all over the world.

These legislative projections which we have had, of necessity, to deal with are, at times, so technical and complex, it is extremely difficult, for even the most expert, to understand them thoroughly.

However, in their development and execution, it is quite simple to see that they have thrust ever increasing burdens upon the American taxpayers and American industry.

Although our American people have accepted these burdens with loyal understanding, I have questioned, over these past several years, the possibility of a too rigid concentration upon world alinements and too little regard for the essential interest and welfare of our own taxpayers.

During this period, I have attempted to point out that the most important need for the furtherance of any Government objective is a continuation and encouragement of a high morale among our own citizens. If they lose confidence in this Government and its officials, and if they feel their welfare is being disregarded then we are, indeed, inviting deep domestic difficulty.

The preceding Chief Executive of this Nation told the people, upon assuming his office, that his yardstick of measurement of Government activities he would recommend would be—"Is this good for all Americans?" At that time, I urged that the Congress adopt it as our rule of legislative action also, and I have conscientiously attempted to follow that rule myself.

The fundamental strength of the United States is the combined will and determination of each individual to support his elected officials in their conduct of the Government.

My convictions and actions, in support of this rule and principle, are, I believe, revealed and demonstrated in the remarks I made at the time the legislative issues that follow came before the Congress.

LEGISLATION FOR THE GOOD OF ALL AMERICANS—APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE OF AMERICAN CITIZENS

Mr. Chairman, it was the unanimous judgment of our Original Thirteen States, as expressed in their Independence Declaration, that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

In my opinion there is no measure coming before this body more fully designed to promote the enjoyment of these rights to American citizens than the appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies. The basic units and activities of these executive departments are more closely connected with the lives of our citizens than any other agency of our Government "for the people."

Mr. Chairman, to attempt to either regulate or improve the health and happiness of human beings in terms of dollars and cents is a most difficult, if not impossible, task. We are all, I am certain, agreed on the necessity for practicing economy in Government expenditures and to preserve our financial stability and world position. However, I think we are further agreed that gestures of doubtful economy at the expense of lowering national standards of working conditions, health protection, and educational advancement is most unwise and impractical, more especially in these days of communistic competition.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriations we grant under this measure are designed to continuously improve the Christian, civilized working conditions of our people and to protect and advance the health of all our citizens, particularly children, women, and the aged. It is obvious, therefore, that this appropriations bill is of the greatest importance to the progress of our national welfare and that is why each of us have the highest obligation to devote the most conscientious attention to it.

At a time when we are generously granting billions of dollars to aid our foreign allies, let us not be neglectful of our own citizens. At a time when we are telling the world of our better way of life, as opposed to Communist barbarism, let us not dangerously reduce any of these public services whose contributions to national progress have been universally acknowledged. At a time when we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the curse of communism, let us take no unwise chances of disrupting the high morale of our own good people. In conscience, let us vote in support of the continuing and full functioning of these units and agencies whose services are, indeed, in the national interest and emphatically good for all Americans.

AMERICA'S ANSWER TO COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA—SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. Speaker, in my firm opinion adequate social security legislation is one of the soundest barriers we can erect against the advancing scourge of communistic propaganda and philosophy challenging us this very hour and forcing us to fight for the survival of our democratic system. If the sunset of the American worker's life, without individual fault, brings only the despairing darkness of fear of want, then there is grave doubt our democratic way of living can hope to match the appeal of Communist state paternalistic promises. When this subject was discussed in the last Congress I reminded this body of how much stronger, how much more resistant to Communist entreatment and intrigue the Nation would be when its citizens are assured that our great business system and our Government working harmoniously together establish a dignified, humane financial operation making them eligible to receive what every worthy working American deserves,

namely, security in time of adversity and dire need.

Here on the floor in 1950 I emphasized our action then was on the first comprehensive change in social-security laws proposed since 1935. I remarked that the entire scheme was antiquated and obsolete and would require continuing revision for adjustment to the complex changes of economic life in an atomic age.

Again this year, I spoke on the amending bill, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I very earnestly hope that this House will promptly approve the modest improvements recommended in this bill, H.R. 6027, the Social Security Amendments Act of 1961.

Although the improvements included in this proposal are not as liberal or expansive as a great many of us have recommended, the changes suggested will benefit almost 4½ million American people within the first year of operation.

As has been more technically explained here, the bill in summary provides a small increase in the minimum benefit with a 10 percent increase in the benefits for widows, widowers, and parents, makes benefits available for men beginning at age 62, liberalizes the insured status requirements, and establishes a further period of disability.

These increases and changes are all in accord with the policies established by the Congress in the past and add to our present law improvements that are sound and desirable.

The increases and improvements are fully financed by the very slight addition to the contribution rates and insure that the social security system continues in actuarial soundness.

There is no question but what the overwhelming majority of the American people approve and desire the continuation and reasonable expansion of our social security system in accord with the economic trends. This measure offers us the opportunity to meet the desires of our people and more toward reasonable adjustment of the program in line with the economic standards under which we live. It offers us, also, the further opportunity to demonstrate to the American taxpayers that, while we have true concern for the rehabilitation and progress of peoples in foreign lands, our primary concern is, and ought to be, for our own people who are making tremendous sacrifices for the promotion of peace and progress throughout the world.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS, 1961

Mr. Chairman, the declared policy written into the original Fair Labor Standards Act is "to correct, and as rapidly as practicable, to elimininate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers."

I doubt very much that there are any here who seriously dispute that policy; there are indeed many here who sincerely differ about the ways and means by which this accepted policy can be best extended at this time. Our challenge and duty today is, then, to exercise the fullest measure of study, patience, and tolerance in working together for legislative agreement on a bill to further project our basic policy of advancing the general welfare of workers in the present economy while conscientiously enadeavoring to insure its impact upon all industries and individuals is as equitable as we can humanly make it. I hope our discussion here will proceed with mutual understanding and deference so that we can fulfill our duty.

In determining our action on this measure it seems to me primary consideration should be granted to such fundamental factors involved as the advanced living costs affecting the average American family in our modern economy, the essential need of placing more purchasing power in the hands of those who will surely spend it, thus accelerating recession recovery, and implementing the basic objective of moving our economy ahead to meet the Russian challenge, as the President recommends.

The authoritative statistics presented to us show that last year there were some seven and a half million families in this country who had incomes less than $2,000 annually, this in the most prosperous country in the world. It has been expertly estimated that the average family needs a minimum of between $4,000 and $5,000 a year to live at the barest level of respectability.

Let us further realize it has been 6 years since the last minimum wage was approved by the Congress, and the Department of Labor has revealed that, with the advanced livings costs in the intervening period, even raising the minimum wage immediately to $1.25 would only provide a third of what is presently required to maintain a modest but adequate standard of living for the average worker.

These and other statistics recited here are, in my opinion, impressively convincing and should influence our decision in favor of improving the structure of our general wage system and the national economy.

It is our proud boast that the standards of ordinary family living under the American system are the best and highest in the world. We are engaged in a desperate struggle with Communist Russia for survival and the elements of that challenge more and more seriously involve the economic factor.

Under the dedicated and inspiring leadership of our great President, John F. Kennedy, let us prove that our proud boastings are a reality and let us move the economy of this country forward in keeping with our destiny of freedom, progres, and leader of the civilized world.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly hope this House, without extended delay, will approve this housing bill of 1961, H.R. 6028, designed to assist in the provision of housing for moderate- and low-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend existing laws relating to housing, urban renewal, community facilities and other purposes.

As one who has, in patriotic concern and consistency, supported an adequate housing program for the American people over the past 14 years here, I sincerely believe the measure now before us contains the most comprehensive and most commonsense program in my experience. Its embracement of a 4-year period is a sensible and practical attempt to rescue us from the emergency housing legislation phases that have confronted us in the past.

The various sections and provisions of this bill have been clearly and specifically spelled out in detail by proponents and opponents and there is no need for repetition now. With but one or two innovations all the basic provisions of this measure have been passed, in one form or another, by this House before. It is strongly supported by the industries involved, civic officials, most housing authorities, the majority of economic experts and the President himself.

The testimony and the statistics revealed here demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that there is a vital and imperative need for more housing in this country; the evidence further shows, and clearly, that the impetus that will be provided to the construction and related industries will encouragingly accelerate our advancing economic recovery and further reduce the unfortunately great number of American workers still unemployed.

Despite the hesitation of some sincere and conscientious questions here there can be no doubt, on the record, of the essential national benefit already derived from our previous programs of urban renewal and slum clearance, college housing, housing for the elderly, community facilities, farm housing, FHA mortgage insuring authority extensions, and related activities. I submit it is unhappily too seldom that we have such a realistic record of actual performance and experience upon which to base our continuing legislative judgment in promotion of the general welfare.

TAX REFORM AND REDUCTION

Mr. Speaker, the power to tax is the power to destroy. The conflict and competition between the various States, municipalities, and Federal Government in the collection of taxes is robbing the American wage earner of his birthright and will bankrupt the country unless we institute corrective steps in the immediate future.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE REVISION

Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues here well know, I have, for the past 7 years, repeatedly urged the vital necessity of complete revision and recodification of our entire Internal Revenue Code. In three successive Congresses, I have introduced bills whose purpose was to accomplish that objective. We all fully realize that our present internal revenue laws are jumbled, complicated, often contradictory, little understood by the average person, and filled with obsolete regulations, imposing multitudinous inequities, irritations, and too often great hardships upon the American taxpayer.

The time is long overdue for a complete and thorough revision of our tax system in the public interest.

One of the most compelling and forceful reasons for supporting this measure arises out of the alarming current unemployment trend throughout the country. We, all, I know, earnestly and sincerely hope this trend is short lived and will be eliminated when the administration readjustment policies and programs are completed. Nevertheless, and without any partisanship, we would indeed be lax in our duty if we pretended that dangerous unemployment did not now exist. It is, therefore, imperative and timely that some effort must be made to increase consumer purchasing power, thereby stimulating production and helping to reverse the rising unemployment rate. It is fundamental in the American system that our tax policy should, to the fullest possible extent, encourage a constant expanding economy.

Let us plan now, barring any national or world emergency, to expand this program of tax reduction and elimination so that the entire American purchasing public and all affected industries will be treated alike with fairness and justice.

We have abundantly fulfilled all our pledges to our foreign allies and friends; let us keep faith with our own people who have suffered too long from too much taxation.

OUR OBLIGATION TO THE VETERAN AND DEPENDENTS

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the people of this country wish to turn their backs in forgetfulness of the substantial sacrifices made by our war veterans and their dependents in protecting this Nation from armed enemies. On the contrary, I believe the great majority of the American people realize there is only one safeguard for this Nation in time of emergency, and that is the willingness of American men and women to fight and die to preserve our national security. I am sure they further understand that the efficiency of our fighting men is governed by the morale of their families and dependents. In these tense days of international turmoil, it is not only just but patriotically wise to inspire the

veteran of the future with the example of our real concern for the veteran of the past.

SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE

Mr. Speaker, it has been always an unquestioned American tradition that this Government shall aid, counsel, assist, and protect the interests of small business in order to preserve our democratic system of free competitive enterprise.

That is why I advocated and voted for the passage of the original legislation establishing a permanent, independent Small Business Administration agency. Recognizing the importance of our small businesses in defense production efforts and the national economy I have consistently urged every reasonable Federal assistance and guidance to them throughout my congressional service.

WAGE JUSTICE FOR WORKING WOMEN

Madam Chairman, as our immediate inspiration to unanimously approve this measure, H.R. 11677, the Equal Pay Act of 1962, we need only to look around us and observe the most competent, industrious, distinguished, and gracious ladies whom we are privileged to call our colleagues. I know we unanimously agree that these distinguished lady legislators work as hard and as diligently as any male Member of the Congress and indeed, by their gracious presence, contribute more to this body than any male Member. There is no thought here of a differentiation in legislative salary because of sex.

For our background inspiration to promptly and favorably act on this bill, we need only to reflect that it is designed simply and solely to provide wage justice for working women.

We all realize that the origin of the wage rate differential for men and women performing comparable jobs in the false concept that a woman, because of her very nature, somehow or other should not be given as much money as a man for similar work.

This antiquated concept has been long and completely demonstrated to be false and it is indefensible from every standpoint. This being so, we may wonder why this legislation is necessary.

The answer is furnished to us in the authoritative information provided by witnesses before the House Committee on Education and Labor and the impressive array of statistics unhappily proving that discrimination in wage payments, on the basis of sex, continues to exist even in this modern space age.

Recognizing that the concept of wage payment discrimination against women is false; having before us the surprising but overwhelming evidence that such discrimination still continues to exist; and realizing that this measure represents the correction of basic injustice being visited upon women in many fields of endeavor, let us, I urge you, firmly reject any crippling amendments and proceed immediately and unanimously to the enactment of this measure extending simple wage justice to the increasing corps of America's working women.

CHALLENGES THAT MUST STILL BE MET—CORRUPTION IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. Speaker, a return to the patriotic soul and spirit of a morally operating democracy is essential to our national security and the peace of the world. Our constant struggle must be to keep our governing machinery at all levels free from the blight of special privilege and grants to the few at the expense of the general welfare. Freed from the vices of corruption and favoritism our governmental institutions will work as our forefathers intended them to work—for the common good of all.

NATIONAL BANKRUPTCY IS OUR GREATEST POTENTIAL DANGER

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues well know that many times during past years I have repeatedly stated my belief that the not too subtle strategy of the Communist leaders is to encourage us to spend ourselves into national bankruptcy and thus take over our country and the world, without the necessity of engaging in any real war. I, and I think a good many of my fellow Representatives here, am determined not to become an unwitting Russian ally in that cunning Communist purpose.

THE HOOVER COMMISSION ECONOMY OBJECTIVES MUST BE PERSISTENTLY PURSUED

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege, in past years, to be a member of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. As is so well known, the Expenditures Committee acted upon the Presidential reorganization plans based on the Hoover Commission recommendations. More than half of the Hoover Commission recommendations have been adopted, with tremendous savings resulting and I am proud to say I voted for them all.

MORAL LEADERSHIP IS OUR MOST URGENT NATIONAL NECESSITY

Mr. Speaker, if the citizens of the United States do not retain confidence in their duly elected Government Representatives then even the most astronomical appropriations of money will not save us from national disentegration and Communist tyranny. It is not the amount of dollars appropriated that will save this country in the long run; it is only a morally confident people united in common respect for proper Government authority that has ever preserved a nation in time of emergency.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. Speaker, limited as this summary necessarily is, it would be even more inadequate if a partial list of some of the measures I introduced in this, and past, Congresses were not included; they follow:

House Joint Resolution 335, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

H.R. 2473, a bill to provide for the issuance of a series of special postage stamps to be known as the "Signers for Freedom Stamps," honoring the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

H.R. 3194, a bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions.

H.R. 5263, a bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas.

H.R. 5957, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an accelerated amortization deduction for industrial or commercial plants and facilities constructed or established in economically depressed areas.

H.R. 7950, a bill to establish a U.S. Disarmament Agency for world peace and security.

H.R. 9421, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from the gross income for one-half of the expenses incurred by him in the construction of a civil defense shelter of approved type and design.

H.R. 10357, a bill to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes.

H.R. 10375, a bill to amend sections 1821 and 1825 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem, mileage, and subsistence allowances of witnesses, and for other purposes.

H.R. 12773, a bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code to permit a written declaration to be accepted in lieu of an oath, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 109, a resolution calling upon Congress to take effective action against the spread of inflation and the high cost of living.

H.R. 2395, a bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy.

H.R. 2471, a bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2473, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education.

H.R. 2475, a bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States.

H.R. 2529, a bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes.

H.R. 12106, a bill to eliminate discriminatory employment practices on account of age by contractors and subcontractors in the performance of contracts with the United States and the District of Columbia.

CONCLUSION—TIMELY COUNSEL FROM A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. Speaker, the words of wise authority remain forever as comforting beacons of guidance in troubled, distressing hours. A counseling message to all Americans is contained in the following extract from a speech given at Harvard University graduation exercises on June 30, 1910, by the late great Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes:

"The most important agencies of democracy are, after all, not the organs of government, but the influences that shape public opinion. * * * Democracy must prize its public life. It has stripped it almost altogether of ceremonial and of meaningless and absurd forms. It has placed the public officer in a position of power, to be used for service. * * * Having surrounded him with none of the pomp which makes appeal to the thoughtless and ignorant, it must invest him with the higher honor which should be the reward of fidelity. Those who cultivate the true democratic spirit will be as earnest in their support of faithful officers as they are unsparing in their condemnation of the faithless."

H.R. 10080

SPEECH
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on February 5 of this year, I introduced the pending bill, H.R. 10080, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide charitable contributions deductions to be taken for gifts made to nonprofit organizations which are created and operated exclusively to consider proposals for the reorganization of the judicial branch of government, to make recommendations and provide information with respect thereto, and to seek public support or opposition to such proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced this bill at the request of the Chicago and the Illinois State Bar Associations in order to deal with an immediate problem that

exists in my home State of Illinois. At the present time, the backlog of undecided cases in the courts of my State has become such a problem that the leadership of both political parties has joined in support of the adoption of a new judicial article to our State constitution. This issue will be decided by a public referendum in the coming November election, at which time a two-third's majority of those voting on the issue will be required for the adoption of this article. Past experience has indicated, however, that adequate funds cannot be obtained to finance the kind of vigorous statewide campaign that is necessary to inform the public on this matter and to insure voter participation at the polls unless contributions for this purpose are made tax deductible. This is what my bill is designed to provide.

As reported to the House, the bill H.R. 10080 includes appropriate safeguards to insure that no private individual may benefit from these tax deductible contributions and that the donee organizations cannot involve themselves in any political campaign for or against any candidate for public office. However, this reported bill will achieve the objective of granting tax deduction for gifts made in 1962 to nonprofit organizations considering judicial reform proposals with respect to which a referendum will occur during this year, thereby being of aid to the situation presented in my State of Illinois.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the Congress to give favorable consideration to this bill.

Textiles Kicked Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision of the U.S. Tariff Commission in the proceeding filed by the Department of Agriculture under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act was the cause of great disappointment and concern to the people of my congressional district. Many of us feel that the decision was in utter conflict with the evidence presented to the Commission and totally inconsistent with the best interest of our domestic economy.

No one can accurately contend that the decision was to the advantage of those who earn their livelihoods in the textile plants of the United States. This causes all of the citizens of my area grave concern regardless of their personal employment since the textile industry constitutes our principal industry.

On Sunday, September 9, 1962, the Gastonia Gazette, published in Gastonia, N.C., presented a very splendid and well written editorial entitled "Textiles Kicked Again" dealing with this subject. Since the editorial should be of interest to all who are interested in preserving our domestic economy I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Sept. 9, 1962]

TEXTILES KICKED AGAIN

Gaston County may not be 100 percent dependent upon the textile industry, but it is certainly not far from it. Every merchant, every salesman, every businessman, and every laborer relies to some extent on the textile industry.

The bulk of the taxes in Gaston County are paid by the textile industry or people employed by it or related industries. Our civic and charitable organizations are largely dependant upon contributions from this industry.

The next time you pass a school, or the library, or the YMCA, or look at any public building, say to yourself "This was largely built by textiles," and you will be right.

This is not designed as a glowing tribute to our industrial leaders. The Gazette is keenly aware that there have been times when our manufacturers were wrong. They are human, they make errors. There have been some instances, although few in number, where the industry has exploited our county and our people.

Still, over the years, this county and most of what is in it has been built by textiles. If the industry falls on hard times, so does Gaston County.

While most of our citizens are vaguely aware of the foregoing facts, they are not aware of the crisis facing the industry. The textile industry, and Gaston County with it, is being castigated in Washington. It is being sacrificed on the altar of "good international relations."

Make no mistake about it. It is not the wealthy industrialist who is being sold down the river—in most instances, he has other investments, other sources of revenue, or cash stashed away—it is not, then, the rich man who will suffer, though he will feel the effects—it is you—it is John Q. Public.

It is you, Mr. Businessman—it is you, Mr. Worker—it is you, Mr. Salesman—it is you, Miss Secretary. All of us are in the same boat. If textiles goes, so go we all.

Is textiles going? "Of course not," our leaders will tell us, "we don't want so many people out of work, and above all we want the economy good."

Then what's all the yelling about? Why all the sound and fury? Is it coming from a bunch of chronic complainers?

The answer is no. It's coming from people who are normally calm and reasonable. Why then the yelling? The headlines on last Thursday's Gazette gave a part of the reason—"Cotton Import Equalization Fee Nixed." In a story exclusive to this paper, Managing Editor Bob Hallman reported that the Tariff Commission had turned down the industry's plea for an 8½ cents surtax on foreign textile products.

Why should our industries have wanted this in the first place? Don't they believe in free enterprise? Can't they compete? Of course they can compete, but an army wouldn't be expected to fight if it had its weapons taken away by its own commander who delivered them into the hands of the enemy.

Our industries want to charge 8½ cents on foreign goods because our Government forces them to pay 8½ cents a pound more for the cotton it takes to produce these goods. The mills of Gaston County cannot buy American cotton at the same price foreign competitors buy it. Even if foreign labor were not cheap, even if Japan, Portugal, and other nations did not have modern mills built with equipment and money furnished by the American taxpayer, even if all these hurdles were not in the way of competition, our own textile industry would start off with a costlier raw material, though of no better quality. A Japanese merchant can buy the same American cotton, off the same American farm, much cheaper than an American can buy it.

Why? Why this seemingly senseless system? The answer is—naturally—we subsidize our farmers. The Government of the United States guarantees our farmers a certain price for their cotton. It also guarantees them a market for a certain amount of cotton. Thus, if the American cotton broker won't pay the farmer a price as high as that guaranteed by the Government, then the Government will simply buy the cotton at that price and none will be available to the broker.

What about foreign countries? Why can they buy it cheaper? Well, it seems that our Government is buying up a great deal more cotton than our own industries will use, so it has to do something with the excess cotton. It elects to sell this on the world cotton market. Naturally, since other countries aren't subsidizing their farmers, the Government can only get the going market price on the world market. For quite some time now the going price has been below what American industries have to pay. Therefore, foreign countries are buying the same American cotton much cheaper.

Last year, in North and South Carolina alone, the little 8½ cents extra charge cost our industries some $247 million. That's quite a bit of money for any industry to pay and still try to compete.

What has this expenditure accomplished? Supposedly the cotton subsidy would help the poor cotton farmer who could not otherwise make it. What has actually happened, however, is quite different. In approximate figures, some 70 percent of our cotton is grown by some 30 percent of the cotton farmers. In other words, most of the subsidy money is going into the pockets of the big cotton farmer, who has the machinery and efficient work force to make it even without a subsidy. Remember Billie Sol Estes?

What of the little farmer—the fellow who owns 3 or 4 acres instead of 10,000? He's still just barely scraping by. Subsidy or no subsidy, his lot is a hard one. The fact of the matter is we are squeezing the life out of our textile industry, the Nation's third largest employer, just to line the pockets of some businessmen who own big farms.

To put it another way—our Government has made it very clear that, while it does not believe in the free enterprise system for the farmer, it feels that our industries should compete on a free world market. It is willing to maintain a false market for the raw product, but feels that the finished product must stand on its own. Tariffs would not, says our State Department, be good for "international relations." And like willing sheep that have been told by their master, the Tariff Commission follows suit.

Where to from here? The State Department has suggested the voluntary quota agreement route. Get all the nations who are willing to agree to restrict their shipments to a certain number of pounds and then there will be no trouble. This agreement is supposed to be entered October 1 for a period of 5 years.

There is only one trouble with this system. The same nations that are being asked to sign this agreement, signed a similar agreement last year for 1 year's time and almost without exception, not a single one abided by it. These same nations have enough cotton products stored in bonded warehouses to flood our market and put our industries out of business. Can we believe that they will now honor an agreement that they have failed to in the past?

But, says the State Department, if they don't honor it we will simply confiscate their excess goods or at least refuse to let them in the country. What if the State Department decided that this was not in the interest of good international relations?

Some quarters have suggested there is another alternative, and this is the one that the Government will probably take if one can judge by precedent. It has been said that the Government may simply subsidize the industry—with whose money, pray tell? Will the subsidy come from the cotton farmers who are in turn being subsidized by industry? Will we all simply subsidize each other while paying the salaries of the hundreds of thousands of Government workers required to administer these schemes and dream up new ones? Will we just swap money with each other while the rest of the free world moves ahead?

Thank the good Lord we have a sensible and courageous Congressman who has fought, often against pressure from his own party, to preserve our jobs. Thank the Lord we have two Senators who have done the same. They have heard the voice of our people crying out to them.

But that voice has not been heard by others in the halls of Government. It must become a roar that cannot be ignored. It must be sounded and sounded time and again until it penetrates into the administrative branch of our Government. If it fails to do so, we might also fail.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of September 15, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT: CUBA

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

President Kennedy's recent statement on the Cuban situation at his news conference is almost unbelievable. He said it, he must have meant it—yet, his statements and the facts are in obvious direct conflict. The President has full authority to act, by his own admission, and when asked then why he is asking for Congress' approval replied, "I think it would be useful, if they desired to do so, for them to express their view." Well, I shall express mine as my normal procedure requires in representing the people of Texas' Fifth District. Well do we Texans remember the earlier mistake of calling up our Texas reservists.

He, the President, downgraded Castro's position, his strength and popularity in Cuba and Latin America. Facts are that he, Castro, is consolidating his power and control over Cubans, reducing their ability to revolt, and becoming a pipeline for infiltration of Latin America, Castro is winning, as communism has won everywhere, by force, not popularity or the free election or choice by the people. The President reported the Government's long knowledge of the increased shipment of technical and military personnel and weapons to Cuba from Russia, and lately the acceleration, and then stated, "These new shipments do not constitute a serious threat to any part of this hemisphere." Facts: Such shipments violate the Monroe Doctrine and are a terribly serious threat to the United States and this hemisphere, including the ultimate danger of increased loss of life when these weapons are used, as weapons always are used. The President said, "unilateral military intervention on the part of the United States cannot currently be either required or justified." Fact: The invasion of Cuba was justified, even planned by both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, in the abortive April 1961 invasion. Seventeen months later the danger of Cuba to us is far more acute. And we do nothing but keep the situation under "careful surveillance." No blockade, not even a protest on arms buildup and Russian intervention. President Kennedy claims that our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities at Cape Canaveral, or the lives of Americans are not endangered. Fact: They are when we permit the construction of missile sites within range of our shores and in the hands of an enemy who has warned that his goal is our destruction. He then said, "We intend to do everything within our power to prevent such a threat from coming into existence." He even recognized how our NATO allies are trading with the enemy and using their ships to transport weapons of destruction into this hemisphere. Facts: We continue to do nothing except watching and "surveilling, not even a protest."

President Kennedy said, to meet this or any other crisis he has asked for authority to callup 150,000 Reserves. Fact: He already has such authority and 2.8 million men under arms for such action as is necessary in Cuba, requiring no further act of Congress. Calling up 150,000 is almost insignificant and without an adequate explanation as to why it is necessary is creating a wrong impression and may invite miscalculated action by Khrushchev who is already convinced that we will not fight to protect ourselves and our principles. President Kennedy pledged to "continue to work with Cuban refugee leaders." Fact: We backed down before on our promise to help—will they believe us now? "Continue to keep the American people and the Congress fully informed." Fact: He has not, at any time, given adequate information to Congress or the people. We have been told repeatedly that "it is not in the best interest of the country for the people and Congress to know all that is happening." Quote from the President: "Rash talk is cheap * * * American people should keep cool their nerve and their head." Fact: Official indecision, inaction, and lack of policy is our greatest danger—the American people will support strong, decisive, knowledgeable leadership but will not agree to supine acceptance of Monroe Doctrine violation, Communist aggression in this hemisphere, and invite the war by miscalculation of our strength or determination by our Communist enemies who may judge our inept State Department leadership as indicative of our military capability. It's happened before.

Let's get hard-headed and start making our own policy instead of timidly waiting for others and their actions and demands to shape our next move. Let's remember the American blueprint. In 1823 the blueprint was known as the Monroe Doctrine, an American statement of policy which courageous Americans have always supported. Today, the Communist dictator, Khrushchev says: "The Monroe Doctrine has outlived its usefulness. It has died a natural death. The only thing left to do is to bury it, just as you bury anything dead so it will not poison the air." So President Kennedy has and is letting Khrushchev with the aid of his puppet, Castro, dictate our conduct, the great United States. Khrushchev backs up his threat by rocket rattling and the threat of nuclear destruction if we do not agree to his demands and junk the Monroe Doctrine. Perhaps some think that "Better Red than dead," should replace the "Give me liberty or give me death" of Patrick Henry and our Monroe Doctrine forefathers. Both Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy are assuring the American people that weapons and troops in Cuba are defensive and therefore no threat. Weapons, any weapons, are both offensive and defensive. What difference does it make what they call the Russian troops and weapons now in Cuba? So they are defensive. Whoever frees Cuba from communism will be just as dead by the action of the weapons and troops which will be used to keep Cuba Communist. Who else but Americans will implement the Monroe Doctrine? Should we wait until they're completely fortified to make it more of a fair fight and so that more American boys will die?

Now we are told the answer to all this cold war jockeying and invasion of our hemisphere, the Berlin wall and a divided Germany, Vietnam, Laos, Africa, and our overall foreign situation is to call up 150,000 Reservists, upset the homes and businesses of 150,000 families. Is this the bold New Frontier firmness to replace the firm action the Monroe Doctrine states is our policy? What nonsense.

The Cuban invasion which we caused to fail, a failure for which President Kennedy assumed full responsibility, demonstrated that the military policy of victory requiring force was replaced by a State Department political decision of "no force" since that might offend our Latin neighbors and others. We know now the decision was wrong and this pertinent statement from one civilian official who was close to the whole invasion operation now makes this judgment in the September 17, 1962, issue of U.S. News & World Report: "In retrospect the political decision was wrong." A military man, also close to the operation said this: "If you go back to that time and look at the whole problem you find that this country faced one fundamental question: Can we permit a Communist country in this Western Hemisphere? Now, if the answer is yes, then you do one thing. If the answer is no, you do another. But if you weasel on that answer, start compromising, then you wind up in confusion—with no real answer. One thing we should have learned from this Cuban fiasco is this: You can't run a military operation that way."

To understand our present indecision and inability to act it is necessary to remember that we have no policy. The abortive Cuban invasion timetable of events shows this. We must learn from experience, so here is the Cuban fiasco timetable from the same issue of U.S. News & World Report:

"Predawn hours of Monday the invasion began and President Kenneday called off the promised air support. Two administrations planned it. Monday noon he reversed his decision and ordered the planes used but bad weather prevented such use and he said use them Wednesday. Tuesday, the invaders were losing because of lack of support."

"Tuesday night the President was attending a White House party for Congressmen and received another appeal for help. He approved the use of one carrier for 1 hour Wednesday morning as a cover to land supplies. Specified no land attacks. Wednesday there was a communications mixup, the Cuban fliers mistimed their strike. The U.S. planes never got into action and, anyway, it was developed, it was too late, the invasion was a failure. U.S. military officials, in close touch with the invasion, said it came within a hairbreadth of success. The invaders inflicted 2,000 casualties on

Castro's troops and suffered only a 100 prior to the collapse because of lack of support. Out of that fateful decision by President Kennedy Soviet Russia is entrenched in Cuba and communism is a real threat to the whole hemisphere."

To those who say we must show unanimity of teamwork behind our President by burying our heads in the sand and by not criticizing the indecision and lack of policy is to say our type of free society has already ceased to exist. With this I do not agree. The people are entitled to know, to judge, and to order a change in course when our Nation is following a road to national suicide. This is freedom of speech and action. We need more than the empty gesture of calling up 150,000 Reserves. We need a determined policy clearly stated by the President which would use effectively the 2.8 million men now under arms, an immediate blockade of Cuba to prevent further Russian troops and arms from being landed, and whatever action it takes to rid the Cuban people of the Communist masters who now enslave them and threaten us and the rest of the free countries of this hemisphere, action which is obviously called for by the Monroe Doctrine.

The Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the days of the 1960 presidential campaign and subsequently, during the months of the Kennedy administration, reference to the President as a skilled politician has been frequent. Great things were predicted for legislative output when in the White House there was one with political acumen gained from experience in both Houses of Congress, one having, what many commentators considered, perfect political mastery.

This aura of political invincibility seems to have been dispelled. Or we might say the Kennedy political sloop has run aground shortly after its skipper indicated it was in full sail.

The Christian Science Monitor, in an editorial on July 25, notes the efforts of Kennedy the politician and how he has sought to shift the blame for his political failures. I believe the Monitor has made an excellent evaluation of this and its editorial follows:

KENNEDY THE POLITICIAN

Mr. Kennedy is now talking frankly partisan language about his stalled domestic legislative program. He blames the Republicans for his lack of success. There was a long series of statements to this effect in his latest press conference.

Mr. Kennedy respects both logic and objectivity but in this case he seems to be taking leave of both. Why should he blame members of the opposition party for predictably voting against bills with which they traditionally disagree? He could more logically blame the voters. The voters gave him an insufficient number of Democrats who agree.

And how can he shrug his shoulders so fatalistically about the conservative Democrats while pointing such an accusing finger at the Republicans? Where is consistency?

Mr. Kennedy also argues that because Republicans oppose his program they are for inaction. He is for action. But in many cases enough Republicans agree with the broad aims of Kennedy domestic bills to pass them, if they had been drafted with more attention to the national need and less to Democratic politics and power.

But his frankly partisan approach to most of the major domestic bills provoked a frankly partisan answer. He knew that the conservative Democrats would vote with the opposition. Logic would suggest that his strategy was at fault, and not either the conservative Democrats or the Republicans. He misjudged the election returns.

This is all the more curious because at the start of his second year in the White House the President told reporters he was going to follow an entirely different strategy. He recognized the need for emphasizing national needs and deemphasizing party politics.

A few weeks thereafter he proposed a Department of Urban Affairs in a highly political manner. For whatever reason, perhaps a rising political self-confidence, his approach to Congress radically changed. With this more recent approach Mr. Kennedy created his own frustration.

He has now explicitly described his plan for the coming congressional campaign. To the degree that it can be separated from recrimination over the past, it is a partial return to logic again. The President is tackling the real cause of his difficulty in the narrow decision of the voters. "The areas I'll be campaigning in are seats * * * where there will be a very clear choice between Republicans who oppose these programs and Democrats who support them. That's where I am going to go."

The voters will be there waiting. It remains to be seen whether they will consciously choose to base their vote on what kind of Congress they want to give Mr. Kennedy. (Many of them probably didn't, last time.) But they have this opportunity now and they should use it.

Meanwhile it is curious that Mr. Kennedy should be gauche about allocating blame for his plight, when he is supposed to excel at the political arts. It could be that he misjudges the future voting as well as the past. He may find that the same actions on his part which drove the moderate votes in Congress into opposition will cause the voters in November to prefer more conservative candidates.

The Future of America's Growth Depends Upon a Vigorous, Efficient Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the major problems this Congress has faced deals with agriculture—we have an abundance of agricultural production and, consequently, have billions of dollars of surplus in storage.

All of us must agree that the real problem is distribution for even today half the world is starving. Our acres lie idle while other nations struggle to produce food from land drained of its fertility by centuries of cultivation.

It might be well, at this time, to examine our position and some of the circumstances which have led us to where we now are.

An interesting and factual presentation has been given by Mrs. John F. Kirk, executive vice president of the Velsicol Chemical Corp.—a producer of insecticides and other basic chemicals.

His speech, entitled "Price Support Costs Now 5 Billion—Have We Created a Frankenstein?" goes to the basic problem and gives an excellent analysis of the overall problem. Some of his more impressive arguments are in charts, and it is indeed unfortunate that they cannot be reproduced in the RECORD for I am certain that these charts would be able to demonstrate more readily the real circumstances under which agriculture operates today and what we can expect in the future.

His speech is doubly interesting because of the many articles which are appearing regarding the use of insecticides and herbicides to protect our growing crops. Questions have been raised about use of these chemicals.

I have been assured, Mr. Speaker, that these questions are without foundation. I have checked with the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as well as the National Academy of Sciences and have been given unequivocal assurances that our food supply is safe.

How can they be so sure? I have been advised that these chemicals are subjected to more scrutiny, more pretesting than anything which might find its way into our food supply.

I have had letters from constituents asking what if anything the Congress is doing regarding these chemicals used in agriculture. The Congress has done all we can do in that we have vested in the proper agencies of Government the authority they needed to require specific data from manufacturers in order that they might intelligently pass on the toxicity of the various products. They check these products themselves and then arrive at safe levels.

Mr. Kirk points out in his speech that in the not too distant future, our real problem will be more serious than the one we are facing today—a problem of an insufficient food supply. We need these chemicals—today, as well as tomorrow. The Department of Agriculture estimate that only about 8 of the 72 major crops produced in the United States could be commercially grown without the use of agricultural chemicals. Can you imagine what our diet would be like with only eight different crops from which to choose? I shudder at the thought.

In order that my colleagues might have an opportunity to read Mr. Kirk's speech, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. Kirk's speech was given at the Western Agricultural Chemicals Asso-

ciation meeting this year in Yosemite, Calif.

The speech follows:

PRICE SUPPORT COSTS NOW 5 BILLION—HAVE WE CREATED A FRANKENSTEIN?

I am certain that all of us in the agricultural chemical industry have experienced occasional conscience pangs—occasional moments of doubt about the economic desirability from an overall patriotic point of view, of the contribution of our industry and of our personal contribution to the ever-growing efficiency of agricultural production.

We, as U.S. taxpayers, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, now have more that $7 billion invested in surplus commodities. During 1961, we as taxpayers, spent more than $5 billion in price support activities to buy up, store, give away, or barter agricultural products. Out of every $100 that we paid in either income or Federal excise tax, $6 was used for this price support activity.

Meanwhile, our industry's scientists are at work developing new and more effective insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, nematocides, growth regulants, and feed additives. The fertilizer industry is developing better plant foods. The equipment manufacturers are developing larger and more efficient agricultural production machines. The plant breeders are developing improved varieties—higher yielding, more resistant to insects and disease, better adapted to machine harvesting. The poultry and animal breeders are developing faster growing, higher producing strains. The nutritionists are developing better feeds. The experiment stations are working "hand in glove" with us in all of these developments. The county agents, farm advisers, farm press, and our own commercial men are educating the farmer about new developments and improved practices—showing him how to profit by using these developments and improvements in his own farming operation.

These efforts of the scientists, the manufacturers, the educators, and the farmers, have been coordinated under our free enterprise system. We have been spurred on by the profit motive and driven by the lash of competition to ever increasing efficiency.

Man-hours of labor required to produce the crops and animals needed to feed and clothe one person per year, as well as provide surpluses for exports and CCC storage, have declined from 155 in 1940 to 100 in 1950 and only 60 in 1960.

Farm population has dropped from 31 million in 1940 to 25 million in 1950 to 21 million in 1960. As a percent of the total population, the drop was from 35 percent in 1910 to 23 percent in 1940 to 17 perecnt in 1950 and 11 percent in 1960.

Truly a remarkable picture and one much envied by the Russians who have the scientific knowledge to duplicate our performance, but lack the catalyst of our free enterprise system.

But where are we going? With more and more crops being produced with less and less land and labor and with less and less pounds of feed required to produce a pound of meat, eggs, or milk, will we finally be drowned in our abundance and we taxpayers bankrupted by the burden of our surpluses?

Is there any moral justification for our continued collective efforts to further improve agricultural efficiency? Are our efforts merely compounding the surplus problem for the future and adding to the taxpayers' burden?

The obvious answer is that increasing population and land diversion for housing, recreation, and highway use ultimately will restore the balance and our surpluses will disappear. But how long will this process require? Estimates and projections can be based on past trends.

The U.S. Department of Commerce publishes extensive information in its annual edition "Statistical Abstracts of the United States." Using these Government figures, we can start with population. In 1890, we had 63 million people in the United States. This nearly doubled by 1930 to 123 million and nearly tripled by 1961 to 180 million. The Commerce Department makes projections through 1980 on four different fertility assumptions. The most conservative forecasts 231 million by 1980. The most optimistic projection forecasts 275 million people by 1980.

Next we can look at housing units. The Government figures show the total number of units by years. Dividing the number of units for a given year into the population for that year, we find that the number of people per housing unit have declined each year from 4.85 in 1890, to 4.42 in 1920, to 3.78 in 1940, and 3.38 in 1960.

Although we are having more children per family, our higher incomes have reduced the doubling up of generations and permitted more second houses for summer or vacation use. Assuming that this trend will continue, we have estimated figures for each 5-year period and project that by 1980, we will average 3.15 people per housing unit. Applying each of these figures to the population estimate for that year, we have estimated that housing units will increase from the 30 million of 1930, the 43 million of 1950, the 53 million of 1960, to 73 to 86 million in 1980. With the accessory streets, schools, and shopping centers, we assume that we will average one acre of land for each two housing units. We calculate that we will divert for this use 2.5 to 3.5 million acres between now and 1965, another 2.5 to 3.5 million acres by 1970, another 2.0 to 4.5 million by 1975, and a further 3.0 to 3.5 million acres by 1980.

Next, look at automobiles. Motor vehicle registrations have increased from 27 million in 1930, to 49 million in 1950, and 74 million in 1960. This is equivalent to one car for each 4.5 persons in 1930, one car for each 3.1 persons in 1950, one car for each 2.4 persons in 1960. We estimate that there will be one car for every 2.2 people by 1980. Based on the population projection, we expect that by 1980 motor vehicle registrations will reach 105 to 124 million.

Obviously, our present highway system will not be able to accommodate the resulting increased traffic. Our State highway system totalled 324,000 miles in 1930, 608,000 miles in 1950, and 702,000 miles in 1959. In 1959 there were approximately 100 cars for each mile of State highways. Assuming that we continue to expand our highway system to maintain this ratio, we will need approximately 800,000 miles in 1965, 900,000 miles in 1970, 1 million miles in 1975, and 1,100,000 miles in 1980. Assuming 200-foot right-of-ways to accommodate divided lane highways, 24 acres of land will be required for each mile of new highway. This will result in a diversion, for highway use, of 2.4 million acres during each of the next four 5-year periods.

As urban population increases, it is expected that park and recreational needs will grow. The State park system totaled 4.6 million acres in 1945, 5.1 million acres in 1955, and 5.7 million acres in 1959. We have estimated that the growth rate will accelerate and will total 6.5 million acres in 1965, 7.5 million acres in 1970, 9 million acres in 1975, and 11 million acres in 1980.

Totaling the expected amount of acreage diverted for highways, parks, and housing, we have estimated that the cumulative diversion by 1980 will total from 25 to 31 million acres. Unfortunately, highways, housing, and parks usually take the best agricultural land and can be expected to subtract directly from the area available for crop use.

The area used for growing crops in the United States increased from 220 million acres in 1889 to a peak of 362 million acres in 1929. Since 1929, the increase in virgin lands converted to crop use and areas reclaimed by irrigation and other methods have been more than offset by the diversion of cropland for housing, industry, roads, and parks. As a result, land used for crop purposes had dropped by 1960 to 328 million acres.

Of this total, the Government estimated that 59 million acres were devoted to the production of crops that were exported, leaving 269 million acres to produce the food and fiber consumed by our population of 178 million people. Thus, in 1960, we required 1.51 acres of cropland for each person in the country.

Through the years, the acreage required per capita has dropped as our agricultural efficiency has increased. In 1889 the figure was 3.5 acres per capita, by 1939 it was 2.39 acres, by 1949 it was 2 acres, and by 1960, 1.51 acres. If progress stops and there is no further drop below the current 1.5 acres per capita, the population increase alone will require by 1980 the use of 347 to 410 million acres for domestic consumption.

By 1980 we are expected to have diverted 25 to 31 million acres of cropland from the present total of 328 million. Thus, we will have no land left for the production of export crops and, in addition, we will have an indicated deficit of 44 to 113 million acres of the minimum needed to produce food and fiber required for our domestic population.

This deficit can be met by one, or a combination, of the following: (1) Reclaiming land now not suitable for crop use; (2) changing our dietary habits to consume a higher proportion of vegetables and grain products and a lower proportion of animal protein, thus following the example of overpopulated areas of the world such as India and China; and (3) further increasing farm efficiency to the point that we will need only 1.09 to 1.31 acres per capita to merely maintain our existing dietary standards.

If we fail to further expand our agricultural efficiency and do not reclaim additional land, the land available for production of export crops will drop from the 59 million acres used in 1960 to 22 to 33 million acres by 1965. By 1970, the acreage available for export will range from a maximum of 13 million acres to a deficit below our domestic needs. The deficit will increase by 1980 to 44 to 113 million acres. To maintain our present dietary standards and continue our present level of exports, farm efficiency will have to be increased by 1980 so that only 0.95 to 1.12 acres per capita are required.

If our assumptions and projections are correct, we can expect only a few years of agricultural surpluses. If we are going to continue to enjoy our steaks and not accept a rice and beans future for our population, our industry's efforts to help improve the efficiency of agricultural production must be continued.

Meanwhile, what of the 5 billion price support cost? Figured per person, it is less than $28 per year, less than 8 cents per day * * * actually, a small insurance premium to the consumer for assurance of an adequate food supply. Although our surpluses may seem large today, these projections of our future needs show that we will have to speed up our efforts to improve agricultural efficiency if we are going to prevent today's surpluses from turning into tomorrow's shortages.

Thus, our industry's and our personal contribution to the growing efficiency of agriculture actually is socially desirable and in the country's best interest.

Our position is vindicated.

Relief for Senior Homeowners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was especially pleased to note that the Senate included in its consideration of the tax bill an amendment introduced by Senator DIRKSEN, providing that citizens over 65 would not be subject to a capital gains tax on the paper profit realized from the sale of their personal residences.

This type of tax relief as a most practical manner of directly aiding our senior citizens. I was particularly interested in this amendment since earlier, in conjunction with Senator DIRKSEN, I had introduced legislation which called for this same tax relief for persons over 60 years of age. I am certainly hopeful that the conferees will retain this amendment in the final version of the tax bill.

This tax relief has drawn widespread favorable comment across the country, and I insert into the RECORD an example of its support in an editorial from the September 9, 1962, issue of the Chicago Heights Star, Chicago Heights, Ill., entitled "Relief for Senior Homeowners":

RELIEF FOR SENIOR HOMEOWNERS

The U.S. Senate has adopted an amendment introduced by Illinois Senator DIRKSEN providing a measure of tax relief for persons over 65 years of age.

Under terms of the amendment, people in this age group will no longer have to pay a capital gains tax on profits realized from the sale of their homes. At present, all property owners who sell their dwellings must pay 25 percent of the so-called profit in taxes, unless they purchase another home within a year.

In one sense, the present law is unfair to persons under 65 as well as older citizens. This is due to the fact that the increase in the property's value over the original purchase price is not profit at all, but merely evidence that inflation has boosted the valuation by reducing the worth of a dollar.

It is appropriate to provide relief for at least those over 65, however, because they are the least likely to buy other residential property. Many of them, their families having achieved maturity and departed, find apartment living preferable to maintaining unnecessarily large homes.

An attractive feature of the amendment, too, is the fact that it gives the oldsters tax relief to which they are entitled, rather than imposing new or higher taxes to subsidize them. Few things are so rare as a day on which lawmakers vote to benefit one group of constituents without penalizing another.

Meanwhile, action is needed at the State level to provide tax relief for older persons who retain their residential property.

This can be attained through overhauling the revenue article in the State constitution. The tax burden imposed on real property cannot be eased markedly until other sources of revenue are provided to finance schools and other essential services.

The real estate levy falls hardest on taxpayers relying on a fixed income, particularly when the actual buying power of the income is reduced periodically by increases in the cost of living.

The President's Textile Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the various agencies of the Government to implement the President's textile program is a matter of serious and grave concern to the Nation and increasing alarm to those of us who live in the textile areas of the South. We are afraid that the State Department which has a horrible record of failure insofar as the promotion of the best interest of this country is concerned, may add to its record of failure, a record of an indifference to the needs of the people in the textile areas of this country. We feel they are in opposition to our best interest and we are most unhappy.

Recently the U.S. Tariff Commission, in a devastating decision, destroyed much hope for relief. The President of the United States has indicated his unhappiness with that decision and so have people from all walks of life in the district I have the privilege to represent.

The Chamber of Commerce of Rock Hill, S.C., has evidenced its concern, and I enclose here, as part of my remarks, a resolution passed by the chamber and forwarded to me by their very efficient manager, Mr. Vernon Grant of Rock Hill, S.C.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE ROCK HILL (S.C.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas we, the members of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Rock Hill, S.C., are concerned about the serious threat to the American textile industry created by the increasing flood of textiles from low wage foreign nations; and

Whereas in general, we agree with the overall conduct of our foreign policy and commend this administration for its efforts to strengthen the national defense and bolster democracies around the world. We are willing to assume our share of the sacrifices necessary to promote world trade and good international relations, however, we feel that it is asking too much to require the domestic cotton manufacturers and the American textile workers to compete at home and in the world market with low-wage foreign-made textiles and at the same time pay 8½ cents per pound more than foreign competition is paying for American cotton. Especially does this seem unfair when this difference in the price of cotton is artificially created by our own governmental policy. This inequity is even more unjust when you consider the fact that, following the destruction of World War II, the recovery of much of the foreign textile industry was promoted at the expense of American taxpayers, including the very industries that are being threatened by this favored foreign competition; and

Whereas the action of the U.S. Tariff Commission in turning down the proposed "import equalization fee" places the textile industry in an even more precarious position thus defeating what we believe to be the intent of Congress and the President of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the board of directors, That the Chamber of Commerce of Rock Hill, S.C., respectfully urge President Kennedy and the Congress of the United States to immediately take all steps and pass all legislation necessary to eliminate or offset the adverse difference in the domestic and foreign cost of cotton and to adjust the tariff rate and the import quotas sufficient to give reasonable protection to our domestic textile industry and secure the jobs of millions of American workers.

J. ED MARSHALL, Jr.,
President.
VERNON GRANT,
Manager.

Adopted September 11, 1962.

Our Fine Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police, Mr. Wayne Ethell, sent me two resolutions recently adopted by that association, which I feel are noteworthy.

One resolution calls attention to the 13th anniversary of the establishment of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Laboratory by its able Director, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover on November 24, 1932. The Laboratory long ago proved to be most effective in combating crime, and the resolution adopted by the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police is demonstrative of the esteem all the law enforcement agencies have for this Laboratory.

The second resolution commends the book "A Study of Communism," written by the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, for incorporation into the high school and college curriculums throughout the United States. This great book, which I have read, is indicative of Director Hoover's constant fight to protect the internal security of the United States.

I have the highest regard for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and I feel that there is no other public servant who has given so much to the betterment of our country than its fine director, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I take great pleasure in bringing these two resolutions to the attention of all of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the FBI Laboratory was established by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover on November 24, 1932, for the purpose of serving all law enforcement agencies throughout the United States in the scientific examination of evidence in criminal cases, and has rendered scintillating, effective, harmonious, and gratis services in this direction; and

Whereas the law enforcement agencies of Ohio have used the facilities of the FBI Laboratory to a degree rarely exceeded by that of any other State; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under Director J. Edgar Hoover, constantly strives in all scientific matters and in many other service aspects to improve the professionalization of police work and effective service to citizens; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police in conference assembled at Cincinnati, Ohio, on September 11, 1962, does hereby commend Director J. Edgar Hoover, FBI, for his multifold services, and congratulate him on the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the FBI Laboratory which will occur on November 24, 1962; and be it further

Resolved, That the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police expresses deep gratitude for the many aspects of FBI cooperation and for its efficient, effective, economical service to the people of the United States and to the people and the law enforcement agencies of the great State of Ohio.

WAYNE ETHELL,
President,
Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police.

RESOLUTION RE "A STUDY OF COMMUNISM," BY DIRECTOR J. EDGAR HOOVER

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover is eminently qualified as an authority on communism and since his assumption of FBI directorship in 1924 has held responsibility for protecting the internal security of the United States, and conducting investigation into all aspects of subversive activity, espionage, sabotage, and related functions with emphasis on communism; and

Whereas the book "Masters of Deceit," written by Director Hoover was an outstanding compilation of Communist ideology, tavtics, and strategy, and served a vital need in the United States; and

Whereas the recent intensification of Communist activity directed toward the capture of the minds of young people and the overt actions of the international Communist conspiracy are directed at the destruction of the United States, and thus emphasizing the importance of all citizens being aware of Communist challenges against law and order; and

Whereas it is fundamental that the Communists seek to destroy confidence in established agencies of government, including the dedicated public servants in the police profession, and it becomes important for each citizen to be aware that the Communist world membership of 40 million, its false appeals, its propaganda, front groups, infiltration of non-Communist organizations and other subtle tactics, including the all-out systematic campaign to recruit members from the college campuses, can be combated only through enlightened citizens; and

Whereas Director Hoover has now performed another characteristic service to the American people through the issuance of his new book, "A Study of Communism," designed to help high school and college students, as well as adults, more effectively serve in the protection of the United States and in contributions to government under law; and

Whereas Director J. Edgar Hoover has, without remuneration to himself, offered in "A Study of Communism" the most modern, complete, factual compendium of the entire Communist picture in textbook form, especially designed for use in the schools, as well as in adult education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police does hereby express its hearty commendation to Director J. Edgar Hoover for his latest book, "A Study of Communism," and for his selfless services in providing this penetrating analysis of the Communist threat to freedom as well as for his many years of protecting the internal security of the United States; and be it also

Resolved, That the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police endorses "A Study of Communism" and urges its incorporation into the high school and college curricula throughout the land, as well as the widest possible dissemination to citizens everywhere as a means of enhancing democratic government under law.

Adopted by the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police in conference assembled at Cincinnati, Ohio, September 11, 1962.

WAYNE ETHELL,
President, Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police.

The Birthday Anniversary of General Von Steuben Is an Appropriate Time To Remember His Contribution to This Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, September 17 is the anniversary of the birth of Maj. Gen. Frederick Wilhelm von Steuben, one of the most important military figures in the American Revolution. He had been successful militarily in his native Prussia where he had been personally appointed to a high military post by Frederick the Great. He was selected for the general staff duty at the royal headquarters and in this position gained experience which enabled him to perform a unique and extremely valued service later when he came to the United States to aid the struggle for American independence.

After initial contacts with Benjamin Franklin in Paris, he came to the United States and joined General Washington's army in 1777. It is typical of this man who served us so well, that he offered his services free of charge to the Continental Congress. When they sent a commitee to ask him what his desires were, he told that he did not care about rank or pay, and that he was willing to volunteer to serve the American cause, confident that he would receive just reward if America was victorious and so confident of her success that he made no mention of the possibility of failure.

Steuben was a soldier's soldier. George Washington was so impressed by his practical knowledge and experience that he was appointed acting inspector general and given the difficult and key job of training the Army. The Americans at this point in their history were high on enthusiasm and good intentions but low on professional training. This one serious shortcoming which threatened their success was overcome by General von Steuben who drilled the troops to perfection and wrote the basic training manuals for those he could not personally direct.

His "Regulations for the Order and Discipline of the Troops of the United States," contained the essentials of military instruction and procedure skillfully adapted by this brilliant man to the needs of the American soldier. It has not received the place in history that has been awarded to the writings of Jefferson, Hamilton, and Madison; but it clearly contributed as much or more to the early history of this Nation.

Washington obviously had high faith in this man for he appointed him to a number of key and important posts in which his talents and skills contributed immeasurably to the American cause. One of the most important tasks he had was to serve as Washington's representative in the discussions which were held with the Continental Congress in the efforts to reorganize the Army.

After the surrender of the British to which he so importantly contributed, General von Steuben continued to work for his adopted Nation. He assisted Washington in the preparation of a plan for the future defense of the United States and the mobilization of her Armed Forces. Washington's last official act before relinquishing command of the Army in 1783 was to write a letter of commendation to von Steuben for his invaluable services to the United States throughout the war.

After the peace, Von Steuben permanently stayed in the United States and eventually became a citizen of the Nation he had served so well.

I hope that the time is not far off when our Nation will remember this man in a fitting fashion. Early in the first session of this Congress, I introduced legislation—H.J. Res. 344—which would authorize the President of the United States to proclaim this date—September 17—each year General von Steuben Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben. I hope that action can be taken in the near future to approve this legislation—the text of which follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO PROCLAIM SEPTEMBER 17 OF EACH YEAR GENERAL VON STEUBEN MEMORIAL DAY FOR THE OBSERVANCE AND COMMEMORATION OF THE BIRTH OF GEN. FRIEDRICH WILHELM VON STEUBEN

Whereas it is sought to pay homage and respect to the memory and achievements of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben, who came to our shores on December 1, 1777, to offer his heart and his hand to assist in our struggle for independence, and his heroic deeds are emblazoned in the history of our country; and

Whereas the hero, born in Magdeburg, Prussia, on September 17, 1730, did join with Washington at Valley Forge and devote himself with great resolve and effect to the bolstering up and reorganization of our then tried soldiers, and distinguished himself at Monmouth and Yorktown; and

Whereas, by historical coincidence, Constitution Day and the birthday of Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben both occur on September 17; and

Whereas the said Major General von Steuben was instrumental in promulgating the drill regulations and regulations for order and discipline of the troops of the United States which were adopted by Congress on March 29, 1779, and in addition he is historically credited with the fundamental idea of the establishment of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States of America is author-

ized to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on September 17 of each year, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the birth of General von Steuben.

It is interesting to note that the Constitution, which General von Steuben helped to make possible, was signed on the anniversary of his birth—September 17, 1787. It is fitting that these two anniversaries be celebrated jointly. Governors of many of the States have already proclaimed September 17 as Steuben Day. The States which now observe the anniversary are California, Connecticut, Illinois, Michigan, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Washington, and my native State of Wisconsin.

Whatever Happened to the Monroe Doctrine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people, in ever-growing numbers, demand action against Russian intervention in this hemisphere.

Florida news media have been particularly alert to this threat at our southern door—only 90 miles from our own Florida beaches. Our broadcasters and our editors report from the vantage point of close proximity to the danger, and with the advantage of contacts with Cuban exiles now living in Florida.

Miami television station WTVJ has been one of the leaders in this reporting, calling attention to the problem to all. In an editorial broadcast September 4, News Vice President Ralph Renick asks, "Whatever Happened to the Monroe Doctrine?" As a further indication of the feelings of our citizens regarding the Russian move into Cuba, I ask that this fine editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE MONROE DOCTRINE?

Tonight marks the beginning of our sixth year of daily editorializing. This is the longest continuing series of editorials carried on any American television station. We don't expect unanimous agreement on these opinions and you can be assured our daily mail count upholds that expectation. Please know that your comments are most welcome and we thank you for your continued interest as we broadcast tonight editorial No. 1072.

President Kennedy's admission late today that Russia is supplying Cuba with defensive missiles with ranges up to 25 miles, serves to emphasize the growing danger near our borders.

The President said Russian equipment and technicians are being used primarily for "defensive" purposes. He indicated that when any "aggressive" capability is reached by the Cubans with U.S.S.R. help, the situation would be "turned back by whatever means may be necessary."

Several other items point up the gravity of Cuban developments.

One is Pan American World Airways announcement that it is having financial difficulties in operating its "lifeline" airlift flights from Havana to Miami. To shut off this transportation link would in effect be erecting another "Berlin-type wall" to keep refugees trapped in a Communist state. Some 20,000 Cubans who have been cleared for transportation to the United States are still awaiting an airlift from Cuba. We must not allow this refugee flow to be cut off even if it means help from our Government to keep the planes flying.

A second item is the status of the two 35-foot boats which defecting Cubans brought to Key West. The craft are owned by the Cuban Government. The U.S. State Department has asked the Federal Court to remove the boats from the jurisdiction of a Miami lienholder in order that they may be sent back to Castro.

This is tantamount to giving a killer a weapon. Testimony in Federal court today indicates the vessels can be used as gunboats. We recall the shooting fracas 15 miles north of the Cuban coastline with a U.S. Navy plane as the target. Let's keep the boats impounded here.

Finally, the landing of a Cuban training plane at Key West today makes us wonder if Sunday's Operation Skyshield did any good. The North American Air Defense Command won't say whether the Cuban craft was detected prior to its landing today. This makes us suspect our air defense spotting system between Florida and Cuba still has some hole in it.

And, oh, yes, there was one more thought which we expressed here a week ago Friday. Whatever happened to the Monroe Doctrine?

Dag Hammarksjold's Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a year ago today, the rich career of one of the most extraordinary men of our generation came to a tragic end. While pursuing his persistent and courageous search for peace in the Congo, Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations, along with 15 of his aids crashed to death in a plane. The peace that he sought has not yet been altogether achieved. When it is, it will be a living monument to this dedicated man who gave his life to its cause.

Much has already been written about Dag Hammarskjold, the man and the leader. More remains to be written—the full story of his deeds in a life of service to his nation and humanity. But perhaps nothing will ever be written which captures the spirit of the man better than Dag Hammarskjold's own words, spoken as he accepted his election to Secretary General.

These words were recalled by Pauline Frederick, the distinguished news reporter and analyst, in her broadcast on the National Broadcasting System's program "Emphasis," on Friday, September 22, last year. On this said anniversary, I would like to read Miss Frederick's script into the RECORD so that all who read this may have an insight into this gifted and truly great human being:

FREDERICK. This is Pauline Frederick, "Emphasis," United Nations.

The first words Dag Hammarskjold spoke in the General Assembly, on April 10, 1953, on accepting his election to Secretary General were his creed. Here it is:

"With humility I accept an election, expressing a confidence in me which I have still to justify—with a humility inspired as much by my knowledge of personal limitations as by my awareness of the extraordinary responsibility which you impose on me by your election.

"My background is, as you know, the civil service of my country—a civil service strengthened by a long tradition and firmly founded on law. It is the bodies by which the nations of Europe are trying to shape the future of that part of the world that I have gathered the experience I have of international cooperation. There I have learned the vital importance of loyalty, devotion, and integrity of those engaged in the work.

"I bring to this task a firm will to devote myself without any reserve to the work carried out by the United Nations Organization in pursuit of its high aims. I am here to serve you all. In so doing, I shall count on your understanding, on your advice and on your will to give to what I have to say the attention that it may deserve. I am animated by a desire to meet all problems with an open mind. It is for you to judge how I succeed. It is for you to correct me if I fail."

Dag Hammarskjold went on, "Ours is a work of reconciliation and realistic construction. This work must be based on respect for the laws by which human civilization has been built. It likewise requires a strict observance of the rules and principles laid down in the charter of this organization. My work shall be guided by this knowledge.

"This great Organization grew out of the pain and turmoil of the last war. It welded together in what should be a continued cooperation for world peace all those who had fought against oppression. By all who have sacrificed themselves, by all sacrificing themselves in the fight for freedom and peace this Organization has—in the words of one of the greatest leaders of democracy—been 'consecrated far above our poor power to add or detract.' May I quote also these other words from the Gettysburg address. 'The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did * * *. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished task which they have, thus far, so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us.'

"In concluding, may I remind you of the great memory just celebrated by the Christian world, may I do so because of what that memory tells us of the redeeming power of true dedication to peace and good will toward men. We are of different creeds and convictions. Events and ideas which to some of us remain the very basis of our faith are elements of spiritual heritage of man which are foreign to others. But common to us all, and above all other convictions stands the truth, once expressed by a Swedish poet when he said that the greatest prayer of man does not ask for victory but for peace."—Dag Hammarskjold's creed.

This is Pauline Frederick, NBC News, at the United Nations.

U Thant, U.N. Helmsman, Takes Wrong Turn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the menace of communism to the United States and to the free world is well known to all of us. Yet, periodically, we find disturbing signs that the danger and basic evil of the Communist philosophy is underestimated and overlooked.

The September 7 issue of the New World, the official publication of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago, contains two interesting commentaries by its editor, Rev. J. M. Kelly, one on the subject of the attitude of Acting Secretary General of the U.N., U Thant, toward the philosophy of communism, and the other a most pertinent commentary on public concern over the Soviet buildup in Cuba. I ask leave to insert the articles into the RECORD at this point.

The articles follow:

U THANT, U.N. HELMSMAN, TAKES WRONG TURN

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, the 19th century German philosopher, is reported to have said of himself: "One man has understood me, and even he has not." This could well be true. Hegelianism is one of the most difficult of all philosophies. In it God comes off rather poorly. It would be impossible to discuss his philosophy in this brief space. Nor is it necessary. It is better to consider the quote. It applies very well to Burmese U Thant, acting Secretary General of the U.N., who recently quoted Hegel to back up his own concept of the U.N. Presently he is on a tour of the Communist-bloc nations. "I firmly believe," Thant said, "that the world is heading for a synthesis," predicting that the conflicting ideologies of East and West will eventually merge, producing another kind of political system in the march of history. He quoted Hegel's contention that each philosophy "contains the seeds of its own destruction." We may fervently hope that this is true of U Thant's own philosophy.

Thant, speaking to (Red) Polish officials and diplomats, said further that history proves that "various strong religious and political convictions are not a permanent feature of society—just a passing phenomenon"—and that the United Nations is "the only hope for the future of mankind."

These remarks have secured for Mr. Thant the blessing of Nikita Khrushchev, who is now willing to accept him as acting Secretary General, and shelve his demands for a U.N. troika directorate—at least temporarily. For the rest of us, they leave much to be desired, unless we are willing to shelve our own ideals—religious, moral and social. It is not a happy thing to find this type of philosophy being expounded by the man who is expected to steer the U.N.—the "only hope for the salvation of mankind." If he steers it long enough in this direction, it could well become a guarantee of the destruction of a good part of mankind.

In spite of Mr. Thant's rationalistic and materialistic approach (which is not far removed from atheistic communism) God remains the only hope for the salvation of mankind, and the U.N. and all of us had better keep it in mind. Religion is in no sense a passing phenomenon. It was designed by the God Who made us. If we ever lose track of this idea, we will succeed in making the world safe for tyranny, Communist or otherwise.

SOVIET BUILDUP IN CUBA IS CAUSE FOR CONCERN

The Cuban fiasco grows uglier all the time. The ingress of Russian troops, advisers, technicians, etc., can have only one meaning—a Russian airbase, missile base, all-out military position within 90 miles of the United States of America. It may be doubted that the Soviets need this; they probably had us pretty well covered some time ago. This may be only another propaganda move. But the move is only a few miles away—as close to our continent as Milwaukee is to Chicago.

There is a disturbing contradiction between the estimates of Soviet strength in Cuba made by our administration and other observers. Our administration says there is no significant buildup of Cuban offensive capabilities through recent Soviet military aid. Other sources tell us of as many as 5,000 Russian military personnel being landed in Cuba—plus a wealth of military supplies and equipment. In addition, there is the promise of further military and industrial aid from Moscow.

It is not always easy to sift fact from propaganda. We can be quite sure that the Soviet is trying to capture Cuba. Mr. Kennedy has said that "it continues to be the policy of the United States that the Castro regime will not be allowed to export its aggressive purposes by force or by threat of force. It will be prevented by whatever means may be necessary from taking action against any part of the Western Hemisphere."

A small group of American troops backed the Russians away from Checkpoint Charlie in West Berlin. The U.S. Navy kept Quemoy and Matsu in the free world. What could be accomplished by a cruise around our little neighbor to the south, I wonder?

United Nations Loan

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, the President is requesting authorization from the Congress to purchase up to $100 million of United Nations bonds. This request follows action by the General Assembly of the United Nations, making it possible for the Acting Secretary General to issue $200 million worth of bonds to finance the United Nations peace and security operations in the Middle East and the Congo. This decision gives rise to two questions: Has the United Nations authority to carry out peace keeping operations in accordance with its charter? And why is it necessary for the United Nations to have to issue bonds?

For nearly 17 years the United Nations has served the national interest of the United States as well as the interests of most of its members through its many regular functions and its peacekeeping operations. The United Nations capacity to act has certain limitations, limits set by the willingness of its members to support extension of the United Nations' executive role.

These limits are gradually widening. Besides and beyond its much-publicized military operations, the United Nations provides various kinds of advice and self-starting aid for all of its less developed members. It also provides a wide range of peaceful settlement procedures, ranging from single representatives of the Secretary General to peace observation teams, mediators, conciliation commissions, and the general supervision of progress toward self-government. The peacekeeping role of the United Nations is seeking to avert small wars that could germinate into large-scale global conflicts. While some of the crises taken to the United Nations continue to be dangerous, in many instances the trend has been reversed.

THE UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY FORCE (UNEF)

The United Nations Emergency Force—UNEF—which was established on November 5, 1956, by a resolution of the General Assembly during the Suez crisis, has maintained relative peace and order in the Gaza strip and along a border of about 140 miles separating Israel from its neighbors, the Arab Republics. An estimated 5,160 troops in the UNEF maintain law and order. The United States does not contribute any troops for UNEF.

The Secretary General's estimate for the expenses of the Force during the first half of 1962 totaled $19,836,800. A short time later it was agreed that the expenses be kept within a target level of $19,500,000.

UNITED NATIONS OPERATIONS IN THE CONGO (ONUC)

One week after the Congo gained its independence from Belgium on June 30, 1960, army mutiny, followed by widespread civil disorder and pillaging, broke out. Belgium immediately rushed troops back into its former colony to protect Belgian nationals and commercial interests.

In the face of this disintegration the Central Government of the Congo appealed first to the United States and then to the United Nations to restore the internal situation and to protect the national erritory from Belgian aggression.

An emergency session of the United Nations Security Council on July 13–14, 1960, authorized the Secretary-General to provide military and technical assistance to the Congolese Government—12 African, 1 Irish, and 1 Swedish batallions were flown into the Congo within 8 days.

At successive Security Council meetings, the then Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold, was unable to obtain specific instructions. The Soviets were bent on continuing chaotic conditions in the Congo and were for the with-

drawal of U.N. forces. Internally, Mr. Hammarskjold tried to maintain civil order—U.N. troops were ordered to shoot only in self-defense—stave off economic and social chaos and remain aloof from quarrels among rival Congolese leaders. Externally, Mr. Hammarskjold tried to get the Belgians out of the Congo and to prevent other powers—African as well as Communist and Western—from intervening in the Congo.

Meanwhile the internal situation in the Congo deteriorated rapidly, and the U.N. found itself caught in the crossfire not only between the Central Government and several secessionist provinces, but also between National President Joseph Kasavubu and Premier Patrice Lumumba. Subsequently, Lumumba turned to the Soviet Union for military aid.

In defiance of Security Council resolutions calling on all states to refrain from intervention in the Congo, Russia sent plane loads of "advisers," "technicians," and arms to Lumumba. It began to appear that, in spite of all efforts to keep the cold war out of the Congo, Soviet diplomats and Communist advisers had all but captured the machinery of the Central Government.

On September 20, 1960, after Russia had vetoed a compromise resolution in the Security Council, the General Assembly took up the Congo question and, by a 70 to 0 vote, urged the Secretary General to "continue to take vigorous action."

Western experts agree that the heart of the problem, insofar as it affects the office of the Secretary General, is article 100 of the charter, which specifies that he and his staff "shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or any other authority external to the Organization." Secretariat staff are "international officials responsible only to the U.N." And, finally, all member nations are pledged "to respect the exclusive character of the responsibilities of the Secretary General and the staff and not to seek to influence them."

One of the significant accomplishments of the 1st part of the 16th General Assembly was its provision for financing the U.N. operation in the Congo—ONUC—for the period November 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962.

ONUC was established and its mission defined by decision of the Security Council on July 14, 1960, and further defined on July 22 as "the complete restoration of law and order in the Republic of the Congo."

LEGALITY OF U.N. TROOPS IN THE CONGO

There has arisen on several occasions the legality of the United Nations troops in the Congo. Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter is entitled "Action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression." Articles 39 to 51 under this chapter describe the authority and responsibility of the Security Council and such action as is deemed necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security. The action that the Security Council took through the instrumentality of the United Nations Forces in the Congo was action pursuant to article 40 which states:

> In order to prevent an aggravation of the situation the Security Council may, before making the recommendations or deciding upon the measures provided in article 39, call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable. Such provisional measures shall be without prejudice to the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. The Security Council shall duly take account of failure to comply with such provisional measures.

Accordingly, if the United Nations had not intervened in the Congo there would have been confrontation between the East and the West. The situation in the Congo was no simply an internal affair, but rather it was a situation of great danger to international peace, and a situation calling for the very wisest measures that the United Nations could possibly take.

A further and substantiating reason is the fact that the Congolese Government asked for the action of the United Nations to help preserve peace in the country, and the Congolese has at all times since given its consent and agreement to the operations of the United Nations there.

AUTHORITY TO ISSUE U.N. BONDS

The question has been raised whether the United Nations has the authority to issue bonds. That the United Nations has a legal personality has been established by the International Court of Justice in the case of Reparations for Injuries Suffered in the Service of the United Nations—I.C.J. Reports, 1949, pages 174, 179:

> The Court has come to the conclusion that the Organization is an international person. That is not the same thing as saying that it is a state, which it certainly is not, or that its legal personality and rights and duties are the same as those of a state. Still less is it the same thing as saying that it is a "superstate," whatever that expression may mean. It does not even imply that all its rights and duties must be upon an international plane, any more than all the rights and duties of a state must be upon that plane. What it does mean is that it is a subject of international law and capable of processing international rights and duties, and that it has capacity to maintain its rights by bringing international claims.

The capacity of the Organization to exercise its legal personality in the territory of member states is reflected in article 104 of the charter:

> The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its members such legal capacity as may be necessary for the exercise of its functions and the fulfillment of its purposes.

The Reparations case, when read together with article 104, further demonstrates that the Organization has the authority to carry out, by necessary and proper means, the functions entrusted to it:

> It must be acknowledged that its (the Organization's) members, by entrusting certain functions to it, with the attendant duties and responsibilities, have clothed it with the competence required to enable those functions to be effectively discharged (loc. cit.).

The United Nations is endowed with the authority to levy mandatory assessments to meet the expenses of performing its functions. Article 17 of the charter provides in part that:

> 1. The General Assembly shall consider and approve the budget of the Organization.
> 2. The expenses of the Organization shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly.

Political entities that enjoy legal personality and possess fiscal power characteristically have the right to issue bonds.

The authority of the United Nations to borrow was exercised in 1948, when the organization borrowed $65 million from the U.S. Government to finance construction of its headquarters. No question about its capacity so to borrow was raised. The members have been regularly assed to repay the loan, as part of the organization's annual budget, and no question about such assessments has been raised.

It is accordingly concluded that the United Nations is authorized to issue bonds in view of (a) the provisions of articles 17 and 104 of the charter, (b) the holdings of the International Court of Justice, which confirm that the organization may implement its express powers by appropriate means, and (c) the organization's undisputed practice in exercise of those powers.

DECISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

The International Court of Justice recently held that, by 9 votes to 5, assessments levied to finance UNEF and ONUC were "expenses of the organization" within the meaning of article 17(2) of the United Nations Charter. Because of the effect it will have on the financial situation of the U.N., and on peacekeeping activities, the opinion is widely regarded as one of the most significant in the Court's history. Opinions rendered by the International Court of Justice in response to requests from the General Assembly are advisory. While they authoritatively state the law, they are not legally binding until accepted or endorsed by the General Assembly. There have been nine previous advisory opinions; all were accepted and acted upon by the General Assembly. There is every reason to believe that the General Assembly will similarly accept this opinion of the Court.

The impact of the Court's opinion, once it has been accepted, will be twofold. First, many States have justified their refusal to pay UNEF and ONUC expenses on legal grounds; this they will no longer be able to do. Now that the legal issues have been resolved, it will be more difficult for States to refuse to pay UNEF and ONUC expenses. Second, the decision of the Court will affect the operation of article 19 of the United Nations Charter.

Article 19 deprives any member of its vote in the General Assembly when its arrearages equal or exceed the amount due from the member for the preceding 2 full years. Prior to the Court's opinion, there was a legal question whether UNEF and ONUC expenses were to be included in computing these arrearages.

Assuming General Assembly acceptance of the Court's opinion, however, there is no question that a failure to pay UNEF and ONUC expenses is, for the purposes of Article 19, the same as a failure to pay regular assessments.

Article 19 is, by its terms, mandatory and automatic. It says quite simply that when a member is in arrears by a certain amount, that member "shall have no vote in the General Assembly." No action by the General Asembly is needed to deprive a member of its vote under this article. However, the General Assembly may affirmatively permit a member to vote if it is satisfied that the arrearages are "due to conditions beyond the control of the member."

The impact of the Court's decision is already apparent. Shortly before the Court's opinion was handed down seven members were in arrears in an amount sufficient to result in the loss of their vote in the General Assembly this fall. Five of these have now paid enough of their arrearages to prevent the application of article 19; and it is anticipated that the other two will pay a substantial portion of their arrears, and by the time the General Assembly meets in September, will be in the clear under article 19.

The Secretary-General, reinforced by the opinion of the Court and after acceptance of this opinion by the General Assembly, will have solid backing for pressing vigorously for the payment of the organization's arrears. The position of the United States on these matters is clear and has been stated often; we will exert our greatest efforts to insure that the Court's opinion is accepted by the General Assembly, that article 19 is applied automatically to any member which is in arrears by 2 years or more, and that the Secretary-General's efforts to collect arrearages are successful.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have no workable alternative but to help the United Nations meet its financial crisis and move on to more solid ground. The amount of money involved is relatively small; the stakes in terms of world peace are very high. I am hopeful that this bill will pass in the House by an overwhelming majority.

Unilateral Action a Must for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the United States are rightfully concerned with the unmolested buildup by the Soviet Union of its forces in Cuba, and the inability of the administration to develop a program that has even faint possibilities of restoring freedom to that island.

This subject of course is being discussed throughout the country, and it is apparent that public reaction is overwhelming in its demand that an effective policy on Cuba be developed.

One of the most exceptional articles on the subject was written by Milburn P. Akers in the Chicago Sun-Times of Monday, September 17, 1962, which I insert under unanimous consent, into the RECORD at this point:

UNILATERAL ACTION A MUST FOR UNITED STATES

(By Milburn P. Akers)

The Kennedy administration's effort to obtain support from Latin American countries for a tougher policy toward Cuba appears to be getting nowhere. It is, as was to be expected, Punta del Este all over again.

Over the years, the United States has forsworn unilateral action in most world areas. In so doing it has created a difficult, almost impossible situation for itself. As the lone challenger to Soviet expansion, the United States continually is called upon to act and, as continuously, has to consult with and, in many cases, obtain the approval of lesser nations before it can do so.

The U.S. State Department long has been convinced that such is the proper course. As a consequence, the United States, the only nation capable of restraining the Soviet bloc, is continually on the defensive in the cold war.

Forced by circumstances into leadership of the Western World, and possessed of the only military capability which the Soviets respect, the United States too frequently conducts itself in the manner of a chairman of a board who has only minority support among his directors.

For several decades we have been busy establishing and supporting regional organizations, as well as the United Nations, to meet regional and world problems. In democratic theory, such procedure is good. But it is becoming evident that in practice the theory is not workable in a world constituted as ours presently is.

We have voluntarily limited our course of action to a degree that the approval of the Latin American members of the Organization of American States is considered essential before we feel free to embark on a new course toward Cuba. And it is now apparent that the Latin American nations are today no more ready for a tough policy insofar as Cuba is concerned than they were at the Punta del Este Conference.

In our pursuit of brotherly love among the Latins we have ended up with few brothers and little love, plus a quantity of I O U's. But we continue our efforts to solve the Western Hemisphere's political bankruptcy by consultation with debtors rather than considering the needs of the solvent creditor. As a consequence the solvent creditor is rapidly getting into trouble.

A concerted action by Western Hemisphere nations insofar as the present Cuban situation is concerned is desirable. Such action would be better understood elsewhere in the free world and among its uncommitted nations. But such concerted action is unlikely. Punta del Este demonstrated that. And now it is being again demonstrated. Meanwhile, the Soviet buildup in Cuba goes on, aided, of course, by those European allies of ours who have provided the Soviets with sufficient ships to carry military hardware and foodstuffs to Fidel Castro's Cuba.

The Cuban situation could have been solved long ago, were the United States free to act on its own motion.

But the philosophy which long has dominated the State Department and still does is that no action is better than unilateral action. And so we go from bad to worse in Cuba and elsewhere as we seek to checkmate a resourceful enemy that imposes no such limitation on itself. A somewhat similar situation in southeast Asia led to the Lao compromise, a deal under which a Communist takeover is an almost certain eventuality.

If the United States is to be an effective leader of the Western World in any test of strength with Communist Russia the United States must be free, legally and morally, to act when action is required. Our obsession with the idea that we can act only as we act with the approval of Cambodia, Mali, or Bolivia, or similar nations, is going to be our undoing. It is one thing to be concerned with their welfare. It is another to permit them to control ours.

Sooner or later, the Kennedy administration will have to face reality. That administration inherited the regional commitments which limit our power to act. That administration inherited the State Department's philosophy that unilateral action is indefensible. It is responsible, however, to the extent that it is satisfied with its inheritance.

Ordinarily, concerted action by the nations of the free world would be preferable. But when concerted action cannot be had inaction should not result. Unilateral action by the only nation capable of taking unilateral action where the Soviets are involved becomes imperative.

Our Forgotten Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, recently, I have been privileged to receive a copy of a most inspiring speech. The speech was delivered by Miss Jean Kathleen LeVander, of South St. Paul., Minn., as a contestant in the American Legion National High School Oratorical Contest of 1962. Out of some 90 entries, it was the winning oration in the State of Minnesota.

The Good Book says that a little child shall lead us. Although Miss LeVander is no longer a child and indeed is a very fine young lady, one cannot but be impressed with the fact that so wise a message comes from one so young.

Jean's speech speaks for itself; there is no need for me to summarize it. I simply want to add that it is a wonderful summary of what has made America great in the past; of the awesome responsibility we have toward the rest of the world; and of how we can renew our greatness and carry out our responsibility.

I am certain that all of our colleagues will benefit from being able to read Jean's speech which I am including at this point.

The speech follows:

OUR FORGOTTEN CONSTITUTION

This has been a year of expanding horizons for the United States. Twenty-four days ago Col. John Glenn circled the earth 3 times in a little over 4 hours. After traveling 17,500 miles per hour, he landed 9 seconds behind schedule. Truly his was a fantastic accomplishment.

Or contemplate the recent announcement by the medical professions that they expect to be able to extend the life span to over 100 years.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-two will also witness tremendous engineering marvels. We will see the completion of the $10 million Denver tunnel which bores 23 miles straight down through rugged mountains to reach a water supply.

Think a moment of the advancement in mechanical precision. A 100-inch camera took a picture of a putting green of a Fort Worth golf course from 8 miles in the sky which showed clearly two golf balls on the green.

Consider the growing use of computers which now solve problems in 18 seconds that formerly took a group of mathematicians weeks to calculate.

Truly the collective advancements and inventions in the industrial field have made America preeminent in the technological sphere.

But not only have we excelled industrially, we have grown militarily. An examination of the boxscore of our missile and nuclear program will demonstrate that we are unquestionably ahead of Russia.

Coinciding with our growing industrial, scientific, and military supremacy there has been a simultaneous expansion of our political influence in the world.

We are looked upon today as the leader of the free world as well as the most powerful and wealthy Nation on earth.

But so rapid has been our widening sphere of achievement and influence that we have been unable to make adequate preparation for the accompanying responsibilities.

We are somewhat in the same position as the inexperienced shepherds of Judea in the Old Testament times. Being accustomed to flat pastures of their local area when they had to move to rugged hillsides, where high winds were continually blowing, they found difficulty in pitching their tents so that they wouldn't blow over in a high wind. They had been used to using only as short a rope as possible from the tent pole to the ground and anchoring the rope to a short stake driven only a few inches into the soil. It was then the wise old prophet Isaiah gave them the sage advice, "Lengthen your ropes but be sure to strengthen and drive deep your stakes." I admit we are lengthening the ropes of our technological, industrial, and political influence, but have we given any attention to our stakes in this process?

What are the stakes that have anchored the structure of America. I contend they are the principles embodied in our Constitution.

Individual freedom by the 10 amendments we call the Bill of Rights. Separation of power into three branches of Government; the executive, the legislative, the judicial. Two Houses, one immediately responsive to the electorate. The courts with power to declare laws unconstitutional making a Government of laws instead of men.

A federation of States with certain powers exercised close to home yet the National Government to speak in foreign affairs, defense, coinage of money, and regulating commerce. The freedom of religion.

These are but a few of the stakes that have allowed and protected liberty, fostered a free enterprise economic system and encouraged our citizens to have ambition for self-improvement.

But the irony of our day is that we who have built the greatest Nation on eath upon these principles are now becoming less and less concerned about keeping them constantly in the minds of our people, while the poorest nations on earth are fervently seeking to establish them in the fabric of their society.

Witness Nigeria's Constitution providing for a speedy judicial trial confronted by your accuser but no one being compelled to testify against himself; Burma's Constitution providing for a legislative body of two houses; Malaya's Constitution providing revenue measures must originate in the lower house; the Republic of Cameroun's Constitution providing for separation of church and state; Cyprus Constitution containing a bill of rights; India's Constitution setting up an electoral college for the selection of the President.

Whose principles have these countries been studying? Ours.

But what study are we Americans making of our Constitution and the reasons it has the provisions it contains?

Let us make a confession. I have learned more about our Constitution in a week of study preparing this talk than I have in the 12 years attending school. And I suspect I speak for every contestant here tonight.

How many high school graduates can name the principal drafter? How many can tell you Delaware was the first to ratify and that it became effective upon the ratification by New Hampshire? How many could outline the difference between the Virginia or Patterson plan? How is the Constitution amended? Who was the oldest delegate at the Convention? How many delegates were there?

Or how many adults even though they be interested in politics and active in their party can tell why judicial appointments are made by the President and approved by the Senate, why constitutional lawyers claim there is no provision justifying Federal aid to education.

The United States has now attained a position of greatness. Historians are becoming concerned that wealth, indifference, and complacency will make us fat and dissipated. They fear we will crumble and fall into the same fate as Egypt, Greece and Rome.

Today, when we are looked up to as a model by every emerging and new born democracy, when our influence is felt in every corner of the world when we are called on to compare our foundations with those of the communists, today when we have greatly lengthened our ropes, we have need as never before to strengthen our stakes.

How shall we make the Constitution known to Americans and thereby give moral strength to our country? How shall we prevent the predictions of modern historians from coming true? First our schools must require a study in depth of the provisions, the history, the drafters, the debates, the safeguards, the prohibitions, the checks, and balances of the Constitution. This is not to be hurried over in a week but should be at least 6 weeks or preferable a whole semester.

Every American boy and girl who graduates from high school must be given a thorough knowledge, understanding and familiarity with the document that forms the cornerstone of our Government. How else can we expect voters to properly analyze how they should vote? How else are they to choose between those who would destroy our liberty or those who would preserve it?

Secondly, our political parties through their caucuses and workshops must provide a continual adult educational program, discussing, enlightening and informing our citizens about what Lord MacCauley has termed the greatest government document penned by man. This must be done because it is easy to forget and vigilance must be eternal if freedom is to be preserved.

Thirdly, your organization, the American Legion, its counterpart, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and all similar organizations who have a deep and abiding love of their country must be encouraged to continue and expand contests such as these. They must also constitute themselves as watch dogs to see that our schools, our political parties, our service organizations are used as vehicles to educate, inform and inspire all Americans, young and old, concerning the virtue of our Constitution.

Lastly, I plead with each one of you as a citizen, as a voter, as an American, to make it your personal resolution that you are going to make it your avocation to be thoroughly familar with the Constitution. Get out your history book, your "World Book." Make a trip to the library but above all, see to it that you and your children understand the philosophy of our God.

Then as America assumes its mature position of leadership among the nations of the world and as we broaden our influence, we will do so on sound foundations and we will have heeded the advice of the wise old prophet Isaiah.

We will assure ourselves and all mankind that we can safely continue to lengthen our ropes because we are at the same time strengthening our stakes.

The Housing Shortage in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, one of the best ways to help the people of Latin America is attaining a higher standard of living, stability, and a degree of security, is to provide them with housing. There is a crying need for housing in every Latin American country. Here is an opportunity where we can render a great service from the social and humanitarian standpoint in helping our neighbors, as well as from the political standpoint in helping to safeguard the future of the Western Hemishpere.

In recent months I have inserted into the RECORD several articles by Mr. Fred A. Orleans, who is thoroughly familiar with Latin America, its people and their problems, having lived in those countries for a number of years. Today I am pleased to insert another article of his in which he discusses the housing shortage. I urge all my colleagues to read it. Not only does it point up the situation existing in Latin America, but it also indicates a most realistic way how we can help the people of Latin America.

The article reads:

LATIN AMERICA NEEDS HOUSING

(By Fred A. Orleans)

In my articles "A Latin American Program" which appeared in the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 5, 1962, I touched upon section 224 of the "Act for International Development" which relates to the establishment of self-liquidating pilot housing projects through investments by private U.S. capital in Latin American countries, protected through a guarantee from the U.S. Government. At this time I would like to go a little deeper into the subject of the need for low-cost housing for low-income groups in Latin America and related matters.

Housing, or the lack of it, represents the most serious problem in the nations of the Americas. Although some progress has been made in attempting to solve this most critical problem, it has been made even more severe by the mass migration of people from rural areas to cities which lack sufficient homes suitable for human habitation to even meet the requirements of the original inhabitants for housing. The new influx of large bodies of individuals results in the cre-

ation of a large population who are homeless or at best live in the worst imaginable kinds of slum areas which spring up around major Latin American cities. These slums areas are comprised of shacks and shanties which rarely have floors but are thrown up directly on dirt, and consists of the most flimsy and "jerry-built" construction imaginable. Construction, if we can even call it such, merely consists of throwing together odds and ends and any pieces of scraps which can be picked up from the garbage dumps including packing crates, sheet metal, pieces of cardboard, old boards, all combined with a few old bricks and perhaps a piece or two of concrete slab or block. Needless to say that, aside from being an eyesore, these shacks are not fit for human habitation and even lack basic sanitary facilities and water. There is, of course, no provision for sewage nor any basic utilities as gas or electricity.

Accordingly, the acutely serious housing situation in Latin America stems from unrestricted population increases coupled with continuous migration from rural areas to the cities. This migration creates other problems which will not be covered at this time, including the development of shortages among agricultural workers and a corresponding decrease in agricultural production, as well as a saturation of the labor forces in city areas resulting in the acute problem of chronic unemployment.

Accurate statistics from Latin America are not available but it appears that the annual rate of new housing construction in that area is only sufficient to meet the requirements of one-third of the annual population increase with no consideration being given to the large numbers of existing homes that are substandard or those which are destroyed by fire, earthquakes, floods, etc. It can readily be determined that the housing shortage in Latin America is continuously increasing and not in the least decreasing and is already beginning to reach alarming proportions.

Latin America is one of the fastest population-growing areas in the world with an average growth of approximately 2.4 percent per year. The population of Mexico alone, which at present is approximately 34 million, is expected to reach 100 million by the end of this century and Latin America in general 600 million. The extent of this population explosion can be better understood when measured against the population of the United States. At present the population of Latin America is approximately 10 percent greater than that of the United States, but by the end of the century, if present growth rates continue, it will be double that of the United States, based on an expected U.S. population growth to 300 million people. The large scale migration from rural to urban areas has resulted in even greater population increases in the cities with annual increase reaching as high as 5 percent.

Accurate statistics as to the exact housing needs in Latin America have not been fully compiled but it has been indicated that Mexico, which is one of the more advanced countries of Latin America, has a shortage of well over 3 milion homes for the low-income groups and of the existing homes in Latin American countries, two out of three are below the minimum requirements for human habitation. In urban areas of Latin America, approximately 90 million people dwell in 18 million housing units. The mere replacing of the units not meeting minimum housing standards would involve an investment which could reach as high as $30 billion. In addition, new homes to keep pace with the growth of the cities would require approximately $4 billion yearly additional investment. The needs covered above are merely for urban areas and do not cover the rural areas as well.

The following supplements the figures already given and helps to bring into sharp focus the severity of the problem.

The housing shortage in Brazil is estimated at a minimum of 8 million homes with 400,000 required annually to meet the population increase. Venezuela requires approximately 800,000 homes plus an additional minimum of 40,000 homes annually for the expanding population. Colombia is short approximately 300,000 housing units in cities without taking into consideration rural needs. Statistics regarding the quality of housing in Mexico City, which is a city of approximately 5 million inhabitants, indicate that only about 20 percent of the homes for low-income groups are classified as being of good quality while approximately 41 percent of the people live in urban slums or shacks.

The solution to the overall problems, originating from the need for substantial construction of low-cost housing in Latin America, cannot emanate from the United States in its entirety, but for the most part will have to originate within the individual countries involved. While admittedly, technical know-how relating to newest, quickest, and most economical methods to construct homes in mass production basis must originate from the United States, actual construction of homes must be done by local builders who are established in each locality and possess the necessary experience and local organizations to do the job. While seed capital as well as the guarantees to make initial funds available for pilot projects, must originate from the United States, it is not even suggested that U.S. Government sources or private investment sources even attempt to entirely provide the tremendous amount of capital which will be required to meet current construction needs in Latin America and keep abreast of the future needs of an area in the midst of such a great population explosion. Capital from within will have to be accumulated in each Latin American country, through savings of the people in order to meet the bulk of this capital need.

The housing needs of Latin America can definitely be met through the establishment of savings and loan associations which will be able to provide the funds needed from increased and new savings. If a substantial increase in savings does not take place, it would be necessary to provide a substantial diversion of investment funds from other uses to housing, which is something that cannot be done in Latin America, in view of the minimum amount of investment funds presently available to meet the requirements of the various countries. In addition, the diversion of resources from other forms of investment would result in a drastic reduction of the overall growth in output which would prove most detrimental to the countries involved, and would hardly offset for the gain in housing.

It has been estimated that at least one-half or more of the 18 million families residing in urban areas in Latin America can afford to either buy a home or rent a new home. What is needed is a home both meeting the requirements of being inhabitable and available at a low price, coupled with availability of financing under equitable terms.

Although there is a misconception in many circles where it is assumed that the solution to the housing problems of Latin America rests with the governments of the various countries and that somehow the governments will provide mass production of low-cost housing to meet the needs of the people, this cannot succeed since the tremendous expenditures involved would necessitate the governments substantially increasing their sources of funds through selling bonds to the public, increasing taxes or through actual loans from abroad. Any of these means would result in inflationary developments, which would be highly detrimental to the long-range plans and programs of the various countries. Accordingly, private initiative will have to provide the greater part of the housing needs of Latin America.

An example of what can be done in the field of savings and loan has been amply demonstrated in Peru where Father Dan McClellan has set the wheels in motion for the establishment of numerous savings and loan associations to finance long-term mortgages. Savings and loan associations are presently being established in other countries of Latin America through "seed" capital being provided by the Agency for International Development and matched by contributions from the governments of the various Latin American countries applicable.

People saving for a home which they will eventually own are given hope and tend to lose the feeling of futility and desperation had by many who lack decent homes in which to live and who do not see any possibility of ever improving this situation. The feeling of hope can in itself provide a great stabilizing influence in the lives of people who had no hope before.

A partial solution to the housing needs of Latin America can be provided by the strong determination of the people to own their own homes. This determination must be coupled with the availability of large numbers of local builders ready and able to devote their efforts to the mass construction of low-cost homes, technical know-how from the United States on how to finance mass home construction, the injection into the populaces of Latin America a strong desire to save their money on a regular basis as in the United States, and moreover, substantial amounts of working capital.

Urban planning methods in Latin America are for the most part not advanced as in the United States. The Latin American countries must learn more about modern methods in urban planning as well as the most suitable methods of land assembly, mass construction at minimum costs and providing the maximum quality, proper selling methods, and the employment of adequate financing procedures. The aforementioned, plus cooperation from government on local and national levels, must be implemented in Latin America if solutions to the critical housing needs are to be found in the near future.

It is my personal opinion, based on many years of firsthand observation, that it is now extremely late to successfully cope with the acute Latin American housing problems. If a complete breakdown of orderly government is to be avoided in areas which are in the midst of tremendous population explosions, the people must be, as a very minimum, provided with decent homes, sanitation systems and potable water. Concrete assistance from the United States to date has been very slight, taking into consideration the magnitude of the overall problem. There have been an insignificant number of homes built in Latin America with U.S. assistance, compared to the unfilled need. It is obvious that well planned and concrete action should have been taken many years ago and the U.S. Government is long overdue in undertaking a program to encourage international investments in mortgages in Latin America through the organization of international organizations to provide the means through which private, long-term investment capital can be invested in Latin American mortgages.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, through his S. 582 has proposed the organization of an International Home Loan Bank which would provide, among other things, the means through which some of the resources of American savings and loan associations could be invested in Latin American mortgages.

The lack of concrete congressional action on this most vital legislation coupled with far too little emphasis being given in the past by the U.S. Government to the need for doing something specific about the most serious Latin American housing needs, and the general indifference which has existed in Government circles, based on the belief that the problem is far too vast to be solved, has resulted in the present situation. If any further deterioration is allowed and prompt action not undertaken, there can be consequences most detrimental to the best interests of the United States.

It must be realized that the provision of adequate housing is by far the most important economic problem of any society and that political stability is most emphatically affected by housing conditions in any country. In our modern and most complex society it has become even more important than in the past that good housing be provided the people since the conditions under which people live has a great influence on their dignity as human beings and the outlook they have on the society in which they live.

Concrete, specific, and well directed action must be taken. Homes must be built now and in large numbers or all the efforts of the United States to help Latin America through the Alliance for Progress will be in vain. Those who can do the job, must be allowed to proceed and any and all redtape must be eliminated.

Rogers Calls for Return to Jeffersonian Concept of Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the observance today of the 175th anniversary of the adoption of our Constitution is reason sufficient for jubilation, and I wholeheartedly rejoice with every free American on this great occasion. But as I reflect upon the real significance of this event, my heart tells me that we, as legislators, must redouble our efforts to return to the true concepts of the Constitution. I speak not as a Democrat but as an American to Americans. Patriotism is universal and transcends all narrow partisan confines. Let us unite in marking this day with a vow to heed the danger signals that are so prevalent today and resolve to restore the principles of constitutional government expounded by Thomas Jefferson, one of the founders of our great American democracy.

Historians regard Jefferson as the sculptor of the first 10 amendments which we commonly refer to today as the Bill of Rights—the real key to Americanism.

Otherwise this great document has been amended 13 times. But just a few weeks ago, right here in this Chamber, under parliamentary procedure which blocked free and open debate, another amendment to the Constitution was approved. But approved, I might point out, over the protestations of Members like I who believed that the abolition of the poll tax was just one more abrogation of States rights—and another insult to Thomas Jefferson who said, as long ago as 1825:

I see * * * with the deepest affliction, the rapid strides with which the Federal branches of our Government is advancing toward the usurpation of all the rights reserved to the States.

This is not to suggest that I have lost faith in the Constitution nor in the American people. On the contrary, the Constitution has withstood the fire and brimstone of practically daily attack from both within and without and, I am proud to say, it stands today as the bedrock of the government of free man. It is the perfect answer to communism or any other ideology of those who would subject mankind to slavery.

The theme of my protest is rather that "the people, to whom all authority belongs," as Jefferson put it, are being robbed. The authority of the people, according to the Constitution, should be voiced through duly elected representatives in Congress. But the prerogative of the Congress, if we are not more prudent, will be further encroached upon by the executive and judicial branches. Did we not have repeated examples of this piracy during the reign of the reorganization plans when the executive branch sought repeatedly to vest adjudicative powers in civil service employees?

And the judiciary branch has sought by "constructions" to usurp the rights reserved to the States. Certain decisions of the Supreme Court in recent years have absolutely nullified many State laws by the doctrine of Federal preemption which is predicated upon the supremacy clause contained in the Constitution. I do not propose that we alter that. However, there is an area of concurrent legislative juridiction where both the Federal Government and the State government may constitutionally legislate and where both a Federal and State law may be effective at the same time. It is from this area that the Supreme Court by its "constructions" is evicting the jurisdiction of the States.

Thus it remains for us, the legislative branch, to protect the people whom we represent and whose rights are thus being usurped. This we have attempted to do and will continue to pursue either by Congressman HOWARD SMITH'S bill, H.R. 3, the States rights bill, or any other proper legislative means. To correct this trend, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 70 which proposes an amendment to the Constitution to empower Congress, by statute, to limit the authority of the courts of the United States to determine that statutes of the United States or of any State are repugnant to the Constitution.

If left unchecked, the Supreme Court can stray far afield of the powers given to it under the Constitution. Should it do so, and many recent decisions would indicate a definite trend in that direction, we may witness proof of the soundness of the fears of Thomas Jefferson when he warned:

The germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in the constitution of the Judiciary * * * a * * * body * * * working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief, over the fields of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the Government of all be consolidated into one.

Let us, proudly in our full constitutional right to do so, and humbly as mere mortals, pray to God to help us return to the concepts of our Constitution, the concepts for which our fathers, sons, and brothers have laid down their lives, and the concepts which have so nobly guided us for 175 years.

Conflict Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a most incisive and penetrating series of four articles on positive methods which American businessmen and the private sector of our Nation's economy can adopt and apply to counter and to debilitate the massive propaganda and subversion of Sino-Soviet communism.

This series of thought-provoking articles was written by Edward Scannell Butler, for Challenge, the official weekly publication of the Young Men's Business Club of Jefferson Parish, the newest and fastest-growing civic organization in the New Orleans, La., area. Mr. Butler is a founding member and the staff director of the Information Council of the Americas—Inca—and a member of the Young Men's Business Club of Jefferson; as a specialist in Sino-Soviet fourth dimensional warfare, he has presented his ideas on positive strategy for defeating communism before more than 25 civic, professional, and religious groups in the New Orleans area, and I have been assured that his thoughts have been favorably received.

I might point out here that as staff director of Information Council of the Americas, with its headquarters in New Orleans, Mr. Butler is actively engaged in the defeat of the Communist movement in Latin America through Information Council of the Americas "Truth Tapes" program—a program which provides scores of refugees from Communist tyranny the opportunity and the forum to relate their experiences on tape recordings for broadcast by radio stations throughout the Americas. In this worthy counterattack, Mr. Butler has been joined by many highly-respected private citizens in my community, including Dr. Alton Ochsner, president of Information Council of the Americas and internationally famous surgeon from New Orleans. Such a program is a solid, forceful way to counteract Red propaganda, infiltration, and subversion in Latin America, and I know it is being well received.

The Young Men's Business Club of Jefferson has endorsed and is supporting wholeheartedly the Information Council of the Americas and its "Truth Tapes" program; and through its publication, Challenge, the Young Men's Business Club of Jefferson has provided a public service by publishing Mr. Butler's articles on "Conflict Management" in last month's issues.

The first of Mr. Butler's four articles on "Conflict Management" entitled "Part I—Agitprop Against America," follows; the other three articles will follow it on successive days in the RECORD:

[From Challenge magazine, July 31, 1962]

CONFLICT MANAGEMENTS PART I—AGITPROP AGAINST AMERICA

(By Edward Scannell Butler)

(NOTE.—With this issue, Challenge begins an exciting new four part series dealing with the greatest challenge of our time, and the way we businessmen can personally meet it.

The author, Edward Scannell Butler, is a specialist in Sino-Soviet fourth dimensional warfare. A former advertising executive, he has published articles in Public Relations Journal and other professional magazines, which describe positive strategies for the defeat of communism. Mr. Butler is a founding member and staff director of the Information Council of the Americas (INCA), a member of the National Advisory Committee of the Cold War Council, and a member of the Young Men's Business Club of Jefferson.)

Discover a new need, fulfill it, and you'll make a million. So goes the old slogan. Yet for 16 years a crying need—a need that increases daily, matters deeply to 3 billion people, and involves the wealth of the whole world—this tragic need has been virtually ignored by those who have the most to gain or to lose from it.

The need of course, is a practical method of counteracting Communist colonialism, and liberating the 1 billion people the Red empire now dominates, without triggering a hot war.

American businessmen do have the most to gain, and have already lost millions, because the average businessman just doesn't consider the cold war his business, or realize that he holds the way to win at his fingertips.

THE DISORGANIZED ORGANIZATION MAN

One outmoded idea stands between America and cold war victory.

In spite of the Constitution's statement that "We the people * * * shall provide for the common defense" the average businessman believes that our limited Government should do the job—alone. He is more or less willing to help with tax dollars, but he feels his responsibility ends there, and that his time, talent and personal profit are not needed or necessary to win.

Unfortunately, in 1903 Nicolai Lenin disregarded our tradition of "nation versus nation" general warfare, waged by uniformed, salaried soldiers. Instead he thought of war as class versus class, and developed a second, new kind of international army to wage this sort of nibbling war.

The global Communist Party now mobilizes 36 million civilian conflict managers in 81 nations, who riot and revolutionize, using words as weapons, and pay dues for the privilege of destroying the societies in which they live.

Every Communist Party member is trained to manage class conflict. So today the Reds not only have the Red Army and diplomats, but a monopoly of the biggest business in the world—"conflict management"—the profession of revolution. This conflict cartel at the mass level is the key to Communist success.

Here are the present odds:

Manpower: Our limited government of about 3 million people and our population of 180 million is confronted by the forced output of over 1 billion Communist subjects, plus 36 million trained Communists operating from 81 distinct parties within all of our alliances and the United States itself. Even in the unlikely event that every government employee, from paratrooper to postman were trained as Communist conflict managers are, the Reds would still have 12 to 1 manpower advantage vis-a-vis the United States.

Organization: We have seen Cuba, Eastern Europe, and China colonized, the Peace Corps paralyzed with a post card, our former Vice President smeared with student spit, and the annexation of Algeria nearly accomplished. Much of this has been done by the use of native conflict managers waging psychological and guerrilla warfare for the Soviet Union by proxy. The Soviets have thousands of front groups and conflict organizations arrayed against us. The organizational odds are so overwhelming they defy computation.

Money: The total budget for the U.S. Information Agency is about $125 million per year. The Soviets spend an estimated $4.5 billion to do all that USIA can do, plus much more. The budgets of the few private organizations are relatively minute, and in money spent the odds are 36 to 1 against us.

President Kennedy himself has revealed the deep flaw in a purely governmental approach; speaking from the official viewpoint he recently said: "We can assist these [threatened] countries by our guarantees * * * against outright military invasion. We can assist them through economic assistance to improve the life of their people [and] through defense support against internal guerrillas.

"But in the final analysis—and we cannot do it for them—they have to organize the political and social life of their countries in such a way that they maintain the support of their people. There is a limit beyond which our efforts cannot go."

It is precisely beyond the limit, where no government can go, where the Communist parties can go and work hardest, to disorganize the political and social life of free countries. This is where the Reds have gained their victories with riots and demonstrations, posters and placards, and mobs as militants.

If there is a solution, it is most likely to be found (1) in an analysis of Red organization, and (2) in the development and support of adequate organized competition which can work at the base of power—with the people. That is where capitalists and Communists, but not diplomats or dictators, work. These are the organizational tasks of the American organization man.

THE MARKET AREAS

As Col. William Kintner puts it, in a well-known book of the same name, the front is everywhere. However, the Reds have pointed the organizational way for us by dividing conflict management into two broad market areas, domestic and foreign.

THE MODEL MACHINE

In 1939 the Soviets finally evolved, after much trial and error, the master component in their great leap forward toward international human automation. World War II delayed its use briefly, but afterward the machine shifted into high gear. We know the results.

Few businessmen have even heard the name of the Communist's not-so-secret weapon for thought control—but the human machine grinds out victories day after day. Its primary target, directly or indirectly, is American businessmen, because it seeks to destroy the civilization they represent. The machine for mental manipulation of masses is called Agitprop.

Agitprop (Section for Agitation and Propaganda) is the external conflict management machine for all the Communist parties. It functions through a maze of front organizations, subsidized authors and artists mass media and local party cells throughout the free world. Agitprop sells international markets. Glavlit, the internal machine, sells domestic markets. In combination the Reds have perfected a most appropriate means of organizing brains for bondage at home and abroad.

Add these two thought-control machines to a well-equipped secret police and military establishment, all based on the same kind of forced-draft inhumanity that helped the Egyptians build their pyramids on the bodies of galley slaves centuries ago—and you have the answer to Communist victories today. Under communism life and liberty are luxury items. They can be, and often are, traded for the necessity item—power. Organization is power.

United Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the August 23, 1962, issue of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., there appeared a thoughtful article on the defense of Western Europe by Mr. Anthony Harrigan, associate editor of that influential newspaper.

In this article, written by Mr. Harrigan as part of a series during naval maneuvers off Portugal, he emphasizes with strategic insight the importance of the Iberian Peninsula in the defense of Europe.

The article follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Aug. 23, 1962]

A UNITED DEFENSE

(By Anthony Harrigan)

WITH THE NATO STRIKING FLEET.—"Europe's main reason for Atlantic unity is a military one."

That's the view of a Netherlands parliamentarian, and it's realistic. But Western Europe is a long way from making an all-out military effort, especially in naval defense. Several countries have the capability of augmenting NATO sea forces. In concert, these countries have a military capacity equal to their economic capacity.

But impediments to full development of Western Europe's military potential are many. The Kennedy administration's nuclear policy is a blocking factor, but it isn't the only one. Old European divisions and reluctance to sacrifice for security are part of the overall cause.

France has one carrier and three destroyers in Exercise Riptide III. The fleet commander reports excellent cooperation from the French. Yet France is still one of the world's leading naval powers. Why France isn't more heavily represented is a key question.

But France has had grave internal troubles. Maybe the French Government felt that it might be necessary to run warships

to Algeria to evacuate French citizens from a country controlled by the Ben Bella politbureau. Whatever the reason, good or bad, the French impact in the Atlantic is not particularly strong at this time.

While there is plenty of talk about need for West Germany to assume a larger share of the economic burden in defense of Europe, no one talks about the equal need for West German seapower.

The German Navy has come back fast—much faster than the American public realizes. She has acquired six U.S. destroyers in recent years. She is building 12 new destroyers on her own designs. Her new fast frigate *Emden* is one of the most advanced small warships in the world, driven by an experimental combination of diesels and gas turbines.

The smaller countries of Western Europe are not without valuable warships. Portugal has a first-class antisubmarine frigate built a few years ago in Italy. The Netherlands has an excellent aircraft carrier, 2 cruisers, and 12 first-class destroyers. Belgium has a large number of minesweepers. Denmark has two new frigates. Other countries have vessels to contribute.

If some of these ships lack modern missiles, that's not a lag impossible to overcome. France sells missiles overseas to South Africa. Sweden also manufacturers missiles for sale. There's no question about German know-how. Three German scientists recently designed missiles for Egypt.

Two key NATO countries are France and Germany. Together, they have the scientific and industrial skills to produce all the armaments needed in the 1960's. France has exploded nuclear devices. The Germans have keyed their thinking to nuclear war conditions, though they lack tactical atomic weapons at the present.

Clearly, there must be a German presence in the Atlantic in the years ahead. As one of the great trading nations of the World, Germany has markets in South America, Africa, and in the Near East. To the extent that Germany fails to make a bigger contribution at sea, Germany is depending on the United States and the United Kingdom. Nor is it proper that Germany's naval effort be confined to the Baltic and the North Sea. It is needed in the Atlantic as well. It is absurd for the most powerful anti-Communist nation in Europe to have a naval commitment on a par with a small power. The other side of the issue is that all restrictions should be removed from German naval construction.

If France and Germany have the skills and the means, Portugal and Spain occupy the strategic territories. And if Western Europe is a beachhead on the Eurasian continent, Iberia is the beachhead area of Europe. It is an arrow pointing at Africa and, at the same time, the zone of opportunity for communist aggressors from the south. In addition, Spain and Portugal are the semideveloped countries of Europe—countries deficient in economic resources and politically most in danger of Communist subversive attack. Spain and Portugal are in need of NATO assistance in many ways. First of all, in the case of Spain, NATO membership is needed. To have the key strategic country of southern Europe outside of NATO is to leave a gap in the West's defenses.

Spain is a test case of Western thinking about NATO. Either there is an Atlantic community, or there is not; either Spain belongs in NATO and Portugal deserves full support, or the community is a myth. It makes no sense to defend part of the European perimeter and leave one part undefended or shabbily treated. Logic dictates a NATO Atlantic-Iberian command.

Western defense demands community and continuity. It calls for military alliance from Norway south to Spain; from the Arctic to the Mediterranean. The communists are moving their power down the North African land bridge, with Iberia as the goal before striking at the heart of Europe beyond the Pyrenees. It must not come to pass that the road to Paris and Bonn is through Madrid and Lisbon. NATO military power, especially its seapower, provides the ideal deterrent and determinant—the floating barrier for Europe.

No part of Western Europe is expendable, certainly not strategic Portugal and Spain—the gateway to France. Nothing but a military united Europe can preserve a politically united Europe. This means full cooperation with Portugal and Spain to an extent not contemplated in recent years.

If the two countries of Iberia aren't against the other Western countries, then they are with us and deserve full support from the rest of the Atlantic community—economic, political and military—three dimensional support.

The Centennial of the Battle of Antietam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, today, September 17, 1962, marks the centennial of the Battle of Antietam. On this day, 100 years ago, 22,700 Americans gave their lives for their own concept of constitutional government.

Yesterday, in the company of our colleague, the Honorable J. GLENN BEALL, Senator from Maryland, and many distinguished Members of this House and of the other body, I witnessed a reenactment of the Battle of Antietam. The scene was the same as it had been 100 years before. The reenactment was conducted with dignity and was impressive for its historical accuracy and serious purpose. I, for one, feel that I understand better today some of the story of what happened at Antietam and appreciate more the courage and the sacrifice of those who died there.

The ceremonies on September 16 were opened with an invocation delivered by the Right Reverend Noble C. Powell, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Maryland. Bishop Powell's prayer so well expresses the feeling of those who attended this climax of the centennial commemoration that I am appending it herewith in order that the Congress and the country can know of the sincere feeling and the reverent interest which accompanied the centennial anniversary of the Battle of Antietam.

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE BATTLE OF ANTIETAM

Almighty God, creator and ruler of men, we commend this Nation to Thy gracious keeping. O Thou who turnest men's puny plans and efforts to Thy glory, lighten our minds with a deeper understanding of what men did on this ground, hallowed by its baptism in the blood of our fathers.

In this hour of confusion and timidity before the great issues of justice, brotherhood, righteousness, and freedom, may we see more clearly the height of courage to which men may climb, and inspire our hearts to follow where they have led the way.

In this day when clamorous voices would lure us into the byways of life, enable us to hear the summons to a cause sufficiently great and noble for the investment of our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor, and enlist us in that cause.

Now, when the hearts of men yearn with passion for comradeship, give us deeper and clearer knowledge of ourselves and of our fellowmen, the work of Thy fingers.

Here, where men made the last great sacrifice of life's greatest treasures—life itself—teach us the meaning of sacrifice and strengthen us that we may be ready to give and not to count the cost, to fight and not to heed the wounds, to labor and to ask for no reward; save Thy "well done."

Strengthen in us the aspirations toward noble and spacious thinking; in Thy good time bring us to Thy holy hill where, listed above the clouds of prejudice and the mists of passion, we shall love and serve there with all our hearts and minds and souls and strength, and to Tee shall be the praise and glory forever and ever. Amen.

Speech by Gen. Wilfred Kitching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 16, Gen. Wilfred Kitching, the distinguished world leader of the Salvation Army, delivered a brief spiritual message to the people of New York. I am pleased to bring his fine address to the attention of my colleagues:

SPEECH BY GEN. WILFRED KITCHING GIVEN AT ROCKEFELLER PLAZA, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1962

Thank you, Governor Langlie, for your very kind words which I accept not as a person but as a representative of the Salvation Army.

Here, in this world-famous spot, amidst the achievements of man's mind and ingenuity, it would be difficult to imagine the reality of the problems facing mankind. Somehow it seems more understandable when such sorrow is reflected upon in more uncivilized surroundings.

And yet reality must be faced—and face it we will. We live in a day of rapidly decaying moral values and in a day when virtues are attacked and crumble with every beat of the passing second. Perhaps the most disturbing feature is the apparent piecemeal solutions that are offered and proffered as real answers to the gnawing need of man to know himself and to know his God. Pills, powders, mental gymnastics are among only a few of the more extreme suggestions while parliaments, preachers, and pacts are in session often to find the answer to a more durable and lasting peace.

But man needs more than legislation and programs—he must realize more than reform and rehabilitation and refurbishing. Man needs redemption and pardon and peace. Man needs a Saviour.

The Salvation Army in each of its 86 national expressions remains true to its basic reason for existence. True indeed to the spirit of the Master who said, as if in direct answer to the known need of this day, "He who finds himself shall lose himself. He who loses himself for my sake and the Gospel shall find himself."

Man cannot find redemption in parts—he finds it in a wholeness. We need hospitals and schools and mental clinics, boys' clubs, camps and rehabilitation centers—and the Army has all of these but these alone are not enough, man is a total entity—body, soul, and spirit—and the Salvation Army, if it is to truly serve mankind, must minister to the whole man.

A man without God is lost. A world without God is without hope.

Our message in this hour is the same here in New York, in Berlin, in Tokyo, in Calcutta—that every child of man needs a Saviour—and the great message of the Christian church is that the Saviour is able to meet every need of the human heart. The hope of the world is Jesus.

Thank you once again, my dear Governor, for this opportunity along with the hundreds of other Salvationists joined here in New York in this congress, for the privilege of sharing our message.

Random Thoughts on President's Remarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most comprehensive summaries of the President's recent speech to the Nation which I have read was a recent editorial in the Winona Daily News, Winona, Minn. For the benefit of all of our colleagues, I am including the entire editorial at this point.

The editorial follows:

[From the Winona (Minn.) Daily News, Sept. 5, 1962]

RANDOM THOUGHTS ON PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

In a recent television talk, President Kennedy said he would not ask this Congress for a tax cut. Here are some random thoughts on his comments.

Tax reform: The President said he would submit a comprehensive tax reform to Congress in January of 1963. This is reminiscent of his words spoken over 16 months ago on April 20, 1961: "I am directing the Secretary of Treasury to undertake the research and preparation of a comprehensive tax reform program to be placed before the next session of Congress." No such program was submitted.

Economy: The President said that the gross national product "has gone up 10 percent" since he took office. Actually, this represents the rise from the trough to a peak; the actual increase in the gross national product from 1960 to 1961 was 1.8 percent; for 1962 over 1961, it will be about 5 percent.

Historical: The President said that, when he came into office, the country was in a recession and "we have since made a recovery from that recession." The mild recession of 1960–61 reached bottom in February 1961, a month after the President took office, and recovery began before any Presidential or congressional action took place. On July 19, Leon Keyserling, economic adviser to President Truman, said that Mr. Kennedy had inherited "the beginnings of a recovery from President Eisenhower and had only succeeded in turning it into the shortest recovery since World War II."

Unemployment: The President said that the unemployment rate has gone down 23 percent, which is true enough, although the decrease has been substantially less than in other recoveries. What he did not mention was the fact that the civilian labor force, for an unexplained reason, for the first time since 1929 at least, declined in 1962. The drop was over 280,000 in contrast to increases averaging a million a year in recent years.

Savings: The President said that $3 billion a year can be saved in the Defense Department and similar savings can be made in other departments. This would indeed be good news if true, but the fact is that the Defense budget will rise to record peacetime heights this year and so will the budgets of other governmental agencies.

Training: The President said that 400,000 unemployed men are receiving retraining so they can find new work. Actually, there are no unemployed receiving retraining under the Republican-written Manpower Retraining Act because Congress only recently provided funds for a start on the program. If the President was referring to the retraining of unemployed under the depressed areas program, the total of trainees on June 30 was only 9,000.

Public works: The President said he needed a bill to step up local and Federal public works. His administration has on hand over $2 billion in authorized funds for various works and construction programs; only recently were $1.9 billion in highway funds unfrozen.

Blame: The President made scathing reference to the "opponents of progress" in Congress who "veto every forward move" but it it not known at this point whether he was referring to Southern Democrats who have bottled up his rights program or to Northern Democrats who held up all Senate business for 20 days by filibustering against the administration's Telstar bill.

Government spending under the Kennedy administration is soaring, and apparently will continue to do so, at a steady rate of more than $6 billion a year. Actual Federal expenditures for the last fiscal year (1962) hit a peacetime peak of $87.7 billion—up $6.2 billion from the previous year. Unofficial but authoritative administration sources estimate today that spending this year (fiscal 1963) will top $94 billion—another $6.3 billion increase.

At this rate by next June 30, after 2½ years in the White House, Mr. Kennedy will have boosted Federal spending $17.5 billion above the level of fiscal 1960—the last year that President Eisenhower was in complete command of the budget. It will mean that by next year (fiscal 1964) Government spending will rise above $100 billion for the first time in history, in war as well as peace.

General von Steuben: German-American Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country today the Steuben Society of America is celebrating the anniversary of the birth of Maj. Gen. Frederick William von Steuben, the firm ally of the American Revolution whose efforts helped launch our country. Many States have proclaimed today, which is also Constitution Day, as Steuben Day in honor of this great German military leader whose part in giving America its freedom is taught along with the deeds of George Washington and Lafayette.

The creed of the Steuben Society and the emphasis of the celebration of his birthday center entirely on the theme of Americanism. Although a German, Von Steuben was an American patriot and those who honor him do so as an expression of their loyalty to America and to the principles for which the general fought.

I am happy to join with those in all parts of America who look upon today as a day of rededication to the ideals of this country. I commend the spirit of General von Steuben in coming to the aid of a battered, rag-tag Army, but an Army fighting for a great principle. And I commend those who, in honoring him, once again turn themselves toward the great principle of the American Revolution.

House Resolution 211: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I intoduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thought and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to

House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BALTIMORE WOMAN'S COMMITTEE FOR CUBAN FREEDOM,
Baltimore, Md., June 25, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I, Mr. Marta Cuervo, member of the Baltimore Committee for Cuban Freedom, take this opportunity to ask and wonder why Cuba is not considered as a Captive Nation.

We, Cubans that live in the exile, beg you not to forget our country is living under the terror of a Communist regime.

We pray and urge for the establishment of your House Resolution 211, and thank your interest for this human cause.

Yours very truly,
MRS. MARTA CUERVO.

JUNE 26, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I, Nikandr Moltschanow, a Cossack by origin, lawfully admitted to and residing presently in the United States, respectfully urge you to support favorably the enactment of the Flood resolution to create a special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Very truly yours,
NIKANDR MOLTSCHANOW.

UKRANIAN SPORT CLUB,
Detroit, Mich., June 23, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Our organization, the Ukrainian Sport Club "Chernyk" in Detroit, Mich., wholeheartedly supports the resolution (H. Res. 211) calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

We ask you to consider favorably House Resolution 211 in your House of Representatives. It would supply us with necessary information on the various captive nations in the U.S.S.R. and thus help us to formulate our policy toward all nations enslaved by the Soviet Russian empire.

We strongly oppose the views of Mr. Dean Rusk, our Secretary of State, to such a committee because they show a basic lack of information with respect to the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain, especially Ukraine.

With kind respect from all of us, we remain,

Respectfully yours,
ZENON BREZDEN,
Secretary.
WALTER KIZYMA,
Chairman.

JUNE 23, 1962.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am in favor of House Resolution 211 creating a Captive Nation's Committee. I have participated in the observance of Captive Nation's Week in Chicago.

We must do all in our power to liberate the nations that are subjugated by communism. This is an effective way to do so.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,
VINCENT L. KNAUS.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 12, 1962.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I believe your measure, House Resolution 211, to be the best and the most appropriate at the present time to defeat the Russian totalitarians in Moscow.

Sincerely yours,
SOFIA MAJDRANSKI.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

A Young American's Interpretation of Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, anyone who might have a tendency to become depressed over current world affairs will find a pleasant stimulant in an essay on Americanism prepared by Carol Gay Powers, of Portage, Cambria County, Pa. It is a tribute to the patriotic fervor and scholastic genius of this young Portage High School student, a proud reflection on the leadership qualities of her teachers, and another bright light in the beacon of accomplishment of the American Legion auxiliary, sponsor of a contest which prompted this winning manuscript.

We who are exposed to blatant preachments in favor of subordinating America's sovereignty to world government find Miss Powers' observations especially refreshing. I can assure you that her sentiments represent the prevailing and eternal attitude of the vast majority of citizens in our communities in Pennsylvania.

I commend this excellent essay, which won third place in State competition to the attention of all my colleagues:

AMERICANISM: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME
(By Carol Gay Powers)

Americanism, to me, expresses a feeling that develops in an individual as a result of living in America. This feeling is like a circle divided into three equal parts, one part marked "physical," another marked "mental," and the remaining marked "emotional." The circumference of the circle might be marked "devotion."

The physical part of Americanism is a result of environment, contacts, and vicarious experiences which make this land real and tangible. It includes for me the town in which I live, the places I have visited, the oceans I have seen from our shores, and the pictures and stories I have encountered throughout my life. It also includes the people I have known or seen. The mental part of this feeling concerns my ability to compare my land with others, to understand how a democracy ranks with other forms of government, and to constantly strive to think deeply and clearly about issues in which my country is involved. The emotional part of Americanism is the part that gives it heart and makes it live. It is made up of love and honor and devotion. It expresses itself at the sight of the stars and stripes waving in the breeze, or the Statue of Liberty standing in New York Harbor. It makes Americans willing and proud to shed blood when such a need is justified.

Americanism is a big thing composed of many small things. Americanism is the lump in the throat when the band plays "The Star-Spangled Banner." It is the walk up the avenue, noticing the cars standing like silent servants at even the lowliest of dwellings. It is the evening paper thrown on the doorsteps of the people privileged to know what is going on in this big whirling ball. It is the Little League baseball team, with the whole community turning out to cheer. It is the wallet, sometimes filled, sometimes empty, but carrying hospitalization cards, social security cards, book-club membership cards, doctor and dental appointment slips, and of course, green stamps. It is the bowling team, striving to win the championship. It is the county fair with pigs, paintings, pumpkins, and pizza.

Yes, Americanism is all of this, and more. It is the spirit that collects food and clothing for a burned-out family. It is the generosity that donates money, time, and effort to find two boys lost in a mine. It is the desire to help other countries through gifts of money, food, clothing, and medical supplies. It is the zeal which prompts surviving missionaries to continue their work after some of their number are murdered by unfriendly tribes.

Americanism is a bundle of lovely sunsets and purple mountains sprinkled by deserts and streaked with rivers. At its center is a love and respect for all mankind, and a desire for peace on earth. Holding it firmly are the arms of God, who created this world and peopled it with creatures in His own image. It is too big and too great to describe, but so real and so personal that it dwells within the heart of every true American. This is what Americanism means to me.

Youth in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Youth in Politics," delivered by W. P. Shofstall, dean of men, Arizona State University, Tempe, Ariz., before a meeting of Young Americans for Freedom, held in Phoenix, Ariz., last Saturday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH IN POLITICS
(By W. P. Shofstall)

I stood by the Berlin wall August 13, 1962. The next day I talked with people in the East Berlin "paradise." I also saw the West Berlin memorials for those who lost their lives trying to escape from this paradise. On these 2 days I saw clear evidence of the difference between the theory of a Socialist paradise and the reality of a Socialist concentration camp.

There is a powerful trend in the United States toward the same kind of paradise I saw behind the Iron Curtain. This fact plus my experience this past summer convinced me that politics in 1962 is not a game. Politics has become a matter of life or death, freedom or slavery.

Let's take a brief look at American history. In 1936 the Liberty League was a well-organized, well-financed, and powerful group of conservatives determined to defeat those who were at that time promising us "paradise on earth." But this fine, conservative organization failed to get a majority vote in the 1936 presidential election, anywhere, except in Maine and Vermont.

Why did the Liberty League fail in politics? They had noble objectives. But, the Liberty Leaguers did not see then and many people do not see now that "tides cannot be changed by blowing upon the surface of the waters," or that to cure a disease we must remove the cause and not just the symptoms. Consequently, the Liberty Leaguers did not win then nor can conservatives win today only by narrow concentration on an election. In order to win, we must change the mind-set of the majority, which involves something deeper and more than getting out the vote.

The Liberty Leaguers felt they could "save the Constitution" merely by the effective broadcasting of sound principles of government, economics, and freedom. But, this theory failed because voters had already given up their belief in such things as States rights, the sanctity of economic contract and the divinity of human rights years before the Liberty League was organized. During the 1930's the trouble went much deeper than the New Deal legislation and goes more deeply today than the superficial proposals of the so-called liberals, whether they be Democrats or Republicans. The Liberty League was preoccupied with symptoms instead of the causes of the disease. Errors in action are always preceeded by errors in belief.

For example, in 1913 we legislated a confiscatory tax. Today nearly 50 years later, most of us now accept as right the belief that what a man can keep of his paycheck, is a matter for the Government to decide. The demagog who preaches such ideas as the redistribution of wealth, the welfare state, or the classless society will get a majority of the votes so long as people take for granted that a man no longer has a right to his property. How long can it be before he will also have no right to his life or his liberty?

What can young people interested in politics learn from experience such as that of the Liberty League? We can all learn that the task of saving the individual from chronic manipulation by socialistic bureaucrats is a matter of recreating a philosophical fabric before we can hope to elect good men to office. This means some of us must first carefully recheck our own beliefs. To recreate a philosophical fabric is essentially a personal problem of belief for you and me.

In other words, the way we can most effectively influence Government to change is by personal example. The people who have been effective leaders have always been those who have known clearly what they believe, why they believed it, and, especially those who believe so strongly they were willing to die for their beliefs, if necessary. This clarity of purpose and conviction was true for Roosevelt, Hitler, Stalin, and Churchill. The same clarity of purpose and conviction

is true for Khrushchev, DeGaulle, Adenauer, Sweitzer, Nehru, and any other effective leaders of our time.

If you have clear-cut convictions, you can also change your Government, personally, by merely waiting. Time is on the side of the well-informed young man or woman. You will soon be the Government.

Clarity of purpose and conviction, therefore, is the key to effective leadership. But, effective leadership is not necessarily good leadership in the right direction. Conservatism is the key to good leadership. So, what is conservatism? Conservatism is the dedicated use of intelligence with respect for time-tested principles in the solution of our problems by ourselves. By contrast, liberalism is the dedicated use of intelligence without respect for time-tested principles in the solution of our problems by Government.

In conclusion, the conservative youth in politics should accept both in theory and practice the truth of the often repeated quotation of Santayana: "Those who will not learn from history are doomed to repeat it."

All we have learned from history about the physical world is called science. All we have learned from history about the spiritual world is called religion and all we have learned from history about the world of politics is called conservatism. Science alone is materialism. Religion alone is dogma. Science, religion, and conservatism combined are the keys to our progress and our survival.

I challenge you to be politically conservative, scientifically efficient, and religiously convinced. If you accept this challenge you will apply all your intelligence in the use of the history of the past or time-tested principles in solving the problems of the future welfare of all mankind for the glory of God.

We are beginning to know the truth about the paradise being promised by pseudo-liberals and Socialists nowadays. To paraphrase the words of Abraham Lincoln, "To sin by apathy, when they should act, makes cowards of men."

Memorable Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, all of the free world mourns the death of Thomas Masaryk 25 years ago. He was a great statesman and, as one of Czechoslovakia's outstanding leaders, he played a prominent role in the development of that nation after the First World War.

An editorial, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on September 14, 1962, embraces the thoughts and ideals of the people who hope and pray that some day all nations will be free.

The editorial follows:

MEMORABLE ANNIVERSARY

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, founder of the Czechoslovak Republic, died 25 years ago today, believing he had laid the foundation of the only durable democracy in Eastern Europe. It did, indeed, survive the inroads of fascism, only to fall prey to the long tentacles of communism.

A patriot as well grounded in democracy's principles as our own Jefferson, Masaryk is still the inspiration of those trapped behind the Iron Curtain as well as champions of freedom everywhere. Educator, philosopher, statesman, Masaryk, in the words of one admirer "taught the nation to accept democracy as the only modern and satisfactory way of public and private life."

He was a humanitarian who spent a lifetime seeking, and living, the truth; fighting for his country's liberation while gently teaching the creed of "Love thy neighbor as thyself." We join with the Council of Free Czechoslovakia in honoring the memory of a noble and eloquent man, who said: "If people could understand each other, we should have had democracy at one stroke; without mutual understanding, without tolerance, there is no freedom. Only when we are completely truthful and open with one another can we learn to know one another; but without love there is no truth; without truth and love we cannot know our fellows."

Knowledge: The Key to a Century of Agricultural Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently at a joint USDA-Purdue centennial observance, Claude R. Wickard, former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture and a native Hoosier, delivered an important and thoughtful address entitled "Knowledge: The Key to a Century of Agricultural Progress."

In his remarks, Mr. Wickard outlined the parallel between the progress of American agriculture and the advancement of the United States to a position as world leader. He pointed out, however, that despite the efforts and advances by the Department of Agriculture in the last 100 years, "return per dollar invested and income per hour of work is lower in farming than for other essential industries. If farmers cannot receive enough financial return to further increase their investments, farm progress will slow down, sooner or later, and the American agriculture system will be in real jeopardy." He stated also that he believes we should continue to preserve America's traditional land policy.

Mr. President, I believe our former Secretary's statements and conclusions are significant and noteworthy and I ask unanimous consent that the text of this important address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOWLEDGE: THE KEY TO A CENTURY OF AGRICULTURAL PROGRESS

(Address by Claude R. Wickard, USDA-Purdue Centennial Celebration, Purdue University, July 27, 1962)

It is fitting that we celebrate this USDA-Purdue Centennial. This celebration will be useful and profitable if it gives us occasion to reflect upon what has been accomplished during the last century and how it has been accomplished. Such reflection should help us plan the future more wisely.

Progress in American agriculture during the last century has played a most important part in the advancement of our Nation during the same period, to the position of the world's leading Nation.

Agriculture was the foundation for bridging our continent. It has furnished manpower, raw materials and purchasing power to build our Nation's economy. Its unequaled efficiency has made the American consumers the best fed in the world, at the lowest cost in terms of their disposable incomes. It has sustained this Nation and its Allies during two world wars. American agriculture is a most potent force in today's worldwide struggle to influence the lives and minds of men.

I do not have to prove that the American agricultural system is the most successful in the world. Khrushchev admits it. He has repeatedly promised the Russian people that someday his communistic agriculture will catch up with American agriculture. His pronouncements have drawn the attention of the entire world to the superiority of the American agricultural system. He has even done much to correct an apathetic and even critical attitude of many of our own citizens toward American agriculture.

I have little confidence in my ability to see far or clearly into the future of American agriculture. I am not too apologetic about my lack of foresight. I feel that it is widely shared. I am positive that those statesmen who so wisely sponsored the legislation creating the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 100 years ago, had little conception of most of the activities undertaken by the Department in more recent years. Perhaps it was just as well. I doubt that this legislation would have been enacted if anyone could have foreseen that the Department, several decades later, would actively engage in the slaughter of millions of innocent little pigs.

Lack of ability to see the problems of agriculture in future years should not deter us in trying to agree upon an overall goal for American agriculture. I think our goal should be to constantly improve the American agricultural system so that it will enable American agriculture to make its maximum contribution to our national welfare and to the peace, freedom, and happiness of the world.

If this is our goal, it seems that it would be wise to retain the tenets of the American agricultural system which has served the Nation so well in the past. Briefly, the key to the success of the American agricultural system is that it has provided the incentive, the knowledge, and the means for American farmers to constantly improve their farming methods.

The incentive to better farming in America is the hope and belief that better farming is rewarding. It means more security for the farm family and more opportunity to share in the good things of life that this Nation has to offer.

Much of this incentive arises from what I choose to call the American land policy. Under this policy almost all of our farms are operated by the farm families who live upon them, and in the great majority of cases, own them. Through this land policy we have avoided land reform movements which have caused costly revolutions in many nations. Lack of land reform is the greatest obstacle to progress in several other countries.

American land policy has been a controversial issue in our Nation's history. When the Nation was new, it was confronted with the question of disposition of the public lands in the Northwest Territory. Wealthy and powerful interests advocated the selling of these lands in large blocks to the highest bidders. These interests stood to benefit in many ways by their proposal. Their Federal taxes would be lower because of the receipts from such sales. They would obtain control

of much of the Nation's resources and be in a position to reap large speculative profits. It would be much easier to control wages and working conditions for workers in the industrial areas, along the eastern seaboard, because it would be difficult for such workers to escape low wages and intolerable living conditions by taking up homestead claims in rich agricultural areas, west of the Allegheny Mountains. Those who favored homesteading won more victories than their opponents in the disposition of land in the Northwest Territory. Then came the question of disposing of the public lands west of the Mississippi River and the renewal of the controversy over land policy. The homestead bill, not slavery, was the big issue in the 1860 political campaign when Lincoln was elected President. It played an important part in his victory and led to the passage of the Homestead Act 100 years ago.

It is impossible to comprehend how much the development of this Nation would have been retarded if the opponents of our national land policy had been successful in their efforts. An interesting question is whether the turning over of public lands to speculators and to large land holding companies would not have made the financing of the founding of the land grant colleges impractical and unacceptable. There is the further question of whether there would have been a demand or a need for these great institutions as we now know them. It may be significant that the Land Grant College Act was passed just a few weeks after the Homestead Act was passed 100 years ago.

There are today some forces which tend to eliminate or change our traditional land policy.

There are those who believe that our agriculture would be more efficient and less of an economic problem if farming was done under large scale operations, using centralized financing, management, and control such as has already taken place in the poultry industry and in some instances in the cattle industry.

Quite recently the Committee for Economic Development issued recommendations to solve the agricultural economic problem. These recommendations received much publicity and considerable acclaim. It seems to me that the methods suggested are impractical and the objectives most undesirable.

To train and transfer to cities in the next 5 years 2 million farmworkers, two-thirds of whom are over 45 years of age, seems most difficult and even inhuman with millions of unemployed already in the cities. Under the recommendations of the committee those who remain would find it increasingly difficult to meet the financial burdens of larger units and lower prices. Conditions would be created which would decidedly change the American system of farming which has proven itself during the last 100 years.

One of the greatest threats now to our traditional farming pattern is the difficulty our enterprising farm boys and girls who want to farm have in establishing themselves as farmowners and operators. Even if financing can be arranged, the low returns for capital and labor make the commitments involved hazardous. Personally I have much more faith in the ability and willingness of farm boys and girls to preserve and improve the American agricultural system than I have in those who would replace them as owners and operators of our farms under the recommendations of those who believe the American farming system is inefficient, outmoded and obsolete.

In this connection I would like to call the attention of those who think we should go to some kind of large-scale financing and operation of agriculture that the efficiency of American industry under such a system has not increased as fast as that of agriculture under its present system. Furthermore I would like to warn the consumers of the Nation how much more their food will cost under a system where return for investment and pay for executives and workers is as high as it is under the industrial system of production.

The most serious aspect of large-scale operations, financing and control is that it destroys the incentives for farm families to work hard, and to farm better. This lack of incentive is the root of weakness in the systems of agriculture in many other nations and the cause of the failure of communistic farming in Russia and China.

I now turn to the phase of the American agricultural system which has provided the knowledge which has made the system so successful. The first great strides in this direction were made 100 years ago by the passage of the acts creating the U.S. Department of Agriculture and establishing the land-grant educational institutions. These acts, together with later acts, providing for the establishment of State agricultural experimental stations and the creation of the cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics have given this Nation the most far-reaching and effective means of gathering and disseminating knowledge the world has ever known.

The act signed by President Lincoln 100 years ago creating the U.S. Department of Agriculture contained these words. I quote them: "Be it enacted that there is hereby established at the seat of Government of the United States, a Department of Agriculture, the designs and duties of which shall be to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States, useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants."

During the first half of the past century there was considerable evidence that the Members of Congress and their constituents were more enthusiastic about the procurement and distribution of seeds than about the acquisition and diffusion of information.

The acquisition, packaging and distribution of millions of packages of seeds became a costly and laborious task for the Department of Agriculture. In 1894 the Secretary of Agriculture called attention to this fact and also to the fact that in reality the seeds were not new because they could be procured on the commercial markets. He recommended to the Congress that the practice be stopped and that farmers bulletins be distributed instead. In his words "new ideas were of more permanent value than old seeds." The Congress did not accept the Secretary's suggestion that no more funds be appropriated for seed distribution. It added bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines and cuttings to the list for distribution and this language to the appropriation act for free distribution: "The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, empowered, directed, and required to expend said sum."

I do not know if this was the first congressional rebuke to a Secretary of Agriculture but I do know it was not the last because a half of a century later, I gained some firsthand knowledge about the sting of such rebukes.

Although the free distribution of seeds continued until 1923, the Congress did appropriate some money for the distribution of farmers bulletins in 1895. However, the Congress has never appropriated as much money annually for these bulletins as it did many years for seeds.

I think it appropriate to note that the Department and the land-grant college scientists are today engaged in the propagation of new varieties of seeds, to the great benefit of the Nation, and the seeds are really new and valuable. The yields gained from these seeds are much higher than anyone would have believed possible even a few years ago.

During this centennial year, I have often heard or read the statement than no one today can imagine what farming was like 100 years ago. I am forced to take exception to that statement. I don't have to draw upon my imagination to know what it was like. I merely draw upon my memory which goes back almost two-thirds of a century. From what I learned from my ancestors there was not too much change in farming or farm living during the first third of the last century.

My first awareness that there was some kind of an agricultural etsablishment "at the seat of Government of the United States" arose from the receipt each spring, when I was a boy, of a sizable package of what we called free Government seeds, mostly garden seeds. In those days my grandfather was the technician in charge of the family garden. I was the boy with the hoe. Sometimes we received more than one package of free seeds and my hoeing increased proportionately.

My grandfather's chief source of technical knowledge was the Hagerstown Almanac. It contained general information and monthly suggestions for the husbandman. Most important of all it gave detailed information on the moon phases and signs of the zodiac. My grandfather, like most farmers of his age, did not undertake anything without consulting the almanac to be sure that the phases of the moon and the signs of the zodiac were right for the undertaking. He may have been a little more expert in interpreting the almanac than some because he had gone to college and had taught school for several years. He knew the exact day for doing such farm jobs as farm butchering, putting the pork cuts in the brine, pruning the fruit trees, deadening the trees in the clearing, laying the worm for the new rail fence, altering the male animals on the farm, and above all, planting the free Government seeds.

If the seeds did not germinate or yield properly, the Government, not the almanac, was blamed.

When I graduated from high school a little over a half a century ago I told my father that I wanted to go to Purdue to take an agricultural course. This did not make sense to him and others including my high school principal whom I consulted. If I wanted to be a professional man like a doctor or a lawyer, I should go to college. It was a waste of time and money to go to college to learn to farm. I only had to follow the methods of my father and other successful farmers in the neighborhood.

In addition there was the danger that I would acquire theories which would prove impractical in application. I do not want to seem critical because the farmers of half a century ago were often very skeptical about the information and advice offered them by the USDA and the land-grant colleges. The farmers of those days had suffered the hardships and the frustrations of pioneer families. They had gone through periods of very low prices. They felt they could not take chances on unproven methods. Only those who worked hard, were cautious, and were frugal, could be successful.

As we plan the future, the important consideration is what were the factors which caused the farmers of the Nation to become so responsive to the USDA and the land-grant colleges. Why have they become so eager to obtain the knowledge which these institutions have to offer them—the knowledge which has set the American farmer apart from those in all other parts of the world.

I would say first that farmers have learned that this knowledge is based upon thorough scientific and reliable research.

Demonstrations at the local levels have broken the barriers of suspicion and disbelief. Seeing is believing.

Enlistment of local groups in the educational and administrative processes has increased neighborhood awareness and interest in what the land-grant colleges have to offer. Vocational training, 4-H Clubs, and for the youths in agriculture and homemaking have been one of the most effective, perhaps the most effective, means of creating interest in better methods.

During the past half century there has been a huge expansion in the mediums of communication between the farmers and the land-grant college institutions. The daily rural mail delivery, the farm press, the automobile, the telephone, the schools, the radio, and now television have reached into every corner of rural America to impart the knowledge without which the American farming efficiency could not set the standard for the world.

I wish to refer to another reason why the confidence of farmers in their land-grant colleges has grown so much. These institutions have been remarkably free from the influence of partisan politics, and from the influence of speculative and commercial interests whose designs and purposes are inimical to those of farmers. These interests in recent years have become powerful and strongly entrenched. In the future sound judgment and strong courage will be required to resist the pressure of those interests in their endeavors to enhance their profits and positions at the expense of producers and consumers.

Very probably the great majority of our citizens believe that the farmers have been the chief beneficiary of the USDA and the land-grant colleges' very successful efforts at acquiring and diffusing information among all the people. I think a good argument could be made that farmers have benefited less than anyone because better farming methods have usually meant increased production, and increased production has meant lower prices. It does seem clear that the consumers have benefited much more than farmers. Dr. Byron Shaw, Administrator of Agricultural Reserach of the USDA, said recently the average yearly cost of food for American families would be $288 higher if farmers today were using the same farming methods they were using 20 years ago. The total annual costs for all the U.S. consumers would be $13 billion higher than it is now. That is about twice the amount of all money spent on agricultural research during the last 100 years.

I do not want to leave the impression that many governmental programs have not been of direct and substantial benefit to the people who live on the land. I refer to such activities as those of the credit agencies, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Farm Cooperative Division, the Marketing Service and the helpful but controversial programs to support farm prices, including increased export opportunities.

Despite these efforts return per dollar invested and income per hour of work is lower in farming than for other essential industries. Farmer indebtedness has been increasing during recent years for several reasons. One is lower farm commodity prices. Another is increased costs due first to the increased prices paid by farmers for materials and services and second, to the increased investments required by modern farming methods. The investment per farm worker is higher now than it is for industrial workers and if farmers cannot receive enough financial return to further increase their investments, farm progress will slow down, sooner or later, and the American agricultural system will be in real jeopardy.

It is a rather severe indictment of the agricultural leadership of our Nation when it cannot devise and agree upon an effective and economical program for maintaining farm income at a level which will provide the means for continuing progress on the farms of America and for the preservation and strengthening of the American farming system.

Farm income and farm living must be kept attractive so that a good portion of our farm boys and girls will want to come to Purdue and other land-grant colleges to obtain the knowledge which is available here and which is so essential to the attainment of our goal of constant improvement of the American agricultural system.

During the latter half of the last century, I have had the opportunity to be fairly closely associated with the agricultural part of Purdue University. This association has been most pleasant and profitable. I am most grateful for it. It has given me an opportunity to see how much this State and other States have benefited by the land-grant institutions.

For 20 years I was involved in administrative work in the U.S. Department of Agriculture at about all levels. This gave me an unusual opportunity to observe the great contributions which were being made to our national welfare by the various bureaus and divisions of this Department.

I hope that this years' centennial celebrations will serve to better acquaint all Americans with the accomplishments of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges. I am sure much will be written and said about these accomplishments. Before I conclude, I wish to say something which I fear won't be said often, if at all.

I have had an unusual opportunity to observe the people who work in the U.S. Department of Agriculture and land-grant colleges and to compare them with other workers in and out of Government. It is my conviction that no workers are more capable, more devoted to their tasks, and more anxious to be of service to their fellow citizens. I am just giving credit where credit is due—in this case long overdue.

In conclusion I again want to refer to the acquisition of and diffusion of knowledge among all the people. Man's most precious possession is knowledge. He will never have a surplus of it. In fact, he will never have enough.

Right now we seem to have a singular shortage of knowledge as to how best to use the knowledge we now have for the benefit of mankind everywhere.

If we are to meet the challenges of the future as well as we have met the challenges of the past century, we must relentlessly pursue the acquisition of knowledge, be positive that it is diffused widely, and unselfishly, and provide wise, and effective means for its application.

Community and Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the fine community of Albany, Ga., was recently invaded by a group of clergymen with the evident design of gaining a bit of national publicity for themselves. In this respect they have done right well. The national press, radio, and television carried numerous reports and photographs of their public prayer demonstrations. I do not believe, however, that they have been accorded any space in the RECORD. How shameful. Indeed, they should be accorded this courtesy. So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to accommodate by including in the RECORD a statement made about them by Mr. Thurmond Sensing, of the Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.

I feel sure that Members will find this statement most interesting; and I know that clergymen will appreciate it as it provides a type of publicity which they evidently were seeking.

The statement follows:

COMMUNITY AND CONSCIENCE

Responsible moderate people throughout the country have had reason to look with disgust and dismay at the caravans of would-be martyrs who have invaded the law-abiding community of Albany, Ga., in recent weeks.

This is, it is generally acknowledged, the age of publicity seeking. Confirmation of this truth can be found in the number of northern clergymen who have gone to Albany by the busload with the hope of getting their names and pictures in the metropolitan press.

Certainly, the clerical invaders of Albany have not gone to that community to offer religious witness. For they have not gone in the role of missionaries who wanted to find a place in the community and minister to the needs of its people. The martyrdom envisioned is strictly of the quickie kind—perhaps a fine at the police station or a night in jail. The witness is invariably in a position in front of a wire service or news magazine cameraman.

This kind of hypocritical publicity seeking is disgusting and dismaying to genuinely religious Americans because it is contrary to the traditions of the Christian religion. The founder of Christianity went to great pains to deplore the action of those who make a spectacle of prayer.

This is not to say that the commotion over Albany has been without questions of conscience. Thoughtful citizens must ask themselves what is in the minds of those northern clergymen who chose to take heavily publicized bus rides to Albany. How could clergymen, in good conscience, suggest by such a ride that the sin center of the United States is Albany? How could they believe that no need existed for missionary efforts in their own communities and that the big moral cleanup was needed in a small southern city?

Those who took the ride to Albany must have suffered an attack of moral blindness. They came from Chicago and New York City, to cite only two great metropolitan cities. Yet these cities are notorious for their crime conditions and for the extent and depth of entrenched vice.

Haven't the clerical riders to Albany read the newspapers of Chicago and Manhattan in recent years? Aren't they aware of the callgirl scandals, the existence of organized prostitution, the growth of the narcotics racket, and the waves of violence against persons and property? Only a few years ago, the Chicago Police Force—the supposed guardians of that city's law and order—were found to have thieves in their midst. Is sin conquered in Chicago? Is lawlessness at an end in New York City?

One can hardly believe that the clerical riders have no duties or obligations at home that could stir their conscience to activity. The New York Journal American has been publishing a series of stories detailing the number of rapes and robberies in the public housing projects of New York City. The

Chicago press continues to describe vice conditions.

Countless opportunities exist for northern clergymen to display their conscience, to engage their minds and efforts in crusades to return their own people to a more law-abiding and respectable order of civic and personal life. But, instead, large contingents run off to Albany, Ga., to condemn those citizens who are obeying the laws of their community.

It is a sad example that the clerygmen on their roving prayer vigils have set for their own congregations and communities. One's first task in life should be to set one's own house in order. If moral conditions are awry in this country, then the leaders of morality should start in their own bailiwick. After they have cleaned up the moral mess in their own backyard, then they can properly advance to offer assistance to other communities. But to leave an ugly mess of vice and crime behind, to ignore the moral disease in one's own city and State, and to point a finger of blame at some far-distant community, that is reprehensible in the extreme.

It is to the credit of southern clergymen that they do not go to the Harlems of the North and conduct prayer pilgrimages and prayer vigils for the sins of the Harlems, where crime and vice exist on every hand Nevertheless, those who have made ill-considered clerical freedom rides to the South should somehow acquire a sense of shame and express regret for their actions, which are without justification.

America's Power System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the struggle against communism, we, as a Nation, need not only to promote maximum progress but also to evaluate as well as possible our competitive position with the Communist world, particularly its leader, the Soviet Union.

Recently, the Green Bay Press-Gazette published an editorial entitled: "America's Power System."

The editorial reflects thoughtfully upon the comparative production of electrical power in the United States and the Soviet Union. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S POWER SYSTEM

The United States, with one-sixteenth of the world's population, has one-third of the world's power capacity. The total electric power capacity of the United States is 174,098,000 kilowatts. This is more than the total capacity for Russia, Great Britain, West Germany, Canada, and Japan.

This information is given in a small booklet published by the Investor-Owned Electric Utility Industry. It points out that more than three-fourths of the powerplant capacity in the United States is furnished by some 400 investor-owned companies. The remainder of the capacity is furnished by Government-financed power suppliers. Approximately 300 companies pool their resources with one another in order to provide good service, efficiency, and at a reasonable price to the public. An example of how the pooling operates is supplied by 12 companies supplying electric power in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland. They have a total capacity of 15 million kilowatts in an area of about 48,000 square miles and serve a population of 19 million persons.

One of the interersting facts about the American power system is its growth. The booklet shows this development in a series of maps beginning with 1908 when the lines were few and far between, following along successively through the years until the lines upon the map in the eastern part of the United States extending out possibly to the Mississippi River and slightly beyond were so cluttered with lines as to appear almost black. The lines correspond almost exactly with the development of the population of the Nation. In the beginning there were but few small powerplants serving individual communities. Later on, the development of the transmission lines permitted the replacement of the small plants with a large central station serving many communities. Then, as the power companies began interconnecting their lines, giant power pools were developed which today supply power for all of the needs of the particular area in which the companies have pooled their resources.

The growth of the net production of electrical energy in the United States has averaged about 7.15 percent compounded per year. The growth during the postwar years has been at an average rate of 8.6 percent. This, the booklet points out, is about 2½ times the rate of growth of the whole economy as measured by the gross national product (GNP). The booklet points out that the transmission lines and power capacities follow the population densities closely. However, the powerplant and transmission capability has always remained ahead of the demand for electricity.

The investor-owned utility companies have invested $46 billion in power facilities. The money for this purpose has come from the people's savings. In order to attract such investments of course it is necessary for the utilities to offer a rate of return comparable to that offered by other companies with similar risks. The utility industry has been spending about $3.2 billion per year for new plants and equipment. This is about 10 percent of the new construction for all American business.

The United States with a total of 3,022,387 square miles of area has a total of 304,000 miles of transmission lines. Russia on the other hand with an area of 8,607,553 square miles has only 62,000 miles of transmission lines.

Thus America with about one-third of the area of Russia has about five times the miles of transmission lines. Production of electricity per capita in the United States is about three times that of the U.S.S.R. And since the United States is building at an increasing capacity Russia will fall further behind in the immediate future. The American home uses about eight times the electricity of the Russian home and Americans use twice as much for lighting as the Russians do.

There are approximately $46 billion invested in electrical plants and facilities at the moment. It is estimated that by 1970 there will be an investment of $88 billion and by 1920, $168 billion will be invested. Since the increases in electrical production capacity usually coincide with the increases in population and business development, the outlook for business in America is bright indeed.

It should be noted that America's favorable position is due to the free enterprise system. Its continued expansion can be expected so long as this system is preserved in America.

The U.S. Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 175th anniversary of the signing of the U.S. Constitution. In this connection, Congressman PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois, recently gave a particularly outstanding talk on the Constitution before the weekly prayer breakfast group of the House of Representatives. The talk was so excellent and presented such a comprehensive historical background of the deliberations which led to the drafting and signing of the Constitution that I would like to insert it in the RECORD for the information of the thousands of our citizens who read the RECORD daily:

AMERICA'S GREATEST INVENTION

(By Hon. PAUL FINDLEY of Illinois)

Have you ever considered this question: What was America's greatest invention?

Was it Alexander Graham Bell's telephone, which opened a new era in communications? Was it Thomas A. Edison's electric light, which turned a world of flickering nightime into one in which night can be as brilliant as day? Was it the Wright brothers' airplane, which gave mankind wings, for good and for ill? Was it Henry Ford's assembly line which led to a mass production and a sharply rising standard of living? Was it atomic energy, which ushered in an age that is now only beginning to unfold?

Each has a claim to greatness. Each is uniquely American. Each has contributed immensely to progress. Which would you choose?

My choice may surprise you. It is none of these. My choice is nothing more tangible than a manuscript, and yet it has become the most vital force for freedom and progress history has known. It is uniquely an American invention. It is the Federal Union plan for Government as embodied in the U.S. Constitution.

The laboratory where Federal Union was created was Independence Hall in Philadelphia. The year was 1787. In the same hall 11 years earlier had been signed the Declaration of Independence, the vital spark that was to ignite this torch of freedom.

The inventors were farmers, professors, businessmen, lawyers—39 men representing 12 American States.

In 3 months they created the Federal Union idea, an accomplishment which Historian John Fiske called "The 'Iliad,' the Parthenon, the 'Fifth Symphony' of statesmanship."

You have all seen Christy's massive painting of the signing of the Constitution. It shows a room filled with distinguished bewigged gentlemen. At the Speaker's desk with austere bearing is George Washington. One has the feeling that here were the beloved statesmen of the Colonies commissioned by a grateful people to fashion a new government now that the British yoke had been lifted. It is an illusion of peace, unity, good feeling, solidarity, confidence and high purpose untainted by usual human frailties.

The true picture was one of disunity, open warfare between States, rebellion within States, bitterness and sectional strife, and in Independence Hall itself, a constant struggle between lofty purpose and provincialism, between freedom and slavery.

The American States were on the verge of anarchy. The Central Government, organized under the Articles of Confederation, was weak, nearly bankrupt and without support abroad. The league was unable to meet its own current expenses and too weak to enforce payment of debts, public or private. The league was so weak foreign governments refused to enter into agreements. Barbary pirates were seizing American ships and American citizens. The league was too poor to build a Navy, and too poor to buy off the pirates.

States erected a maze of foolish discriminatory tariff walls among themselves. New York levied a high import duty on Connecticut firewood, for example, so Connecticut voted to forbid all trade with New York.

Connecticut and Pennsylvania quarreled over a river valley. One winter and spring was especially rough on the valley. Floods, ice floes, and storm were almost devastating. Under the pretext of helping the population, Pennsylvania sent a militia into the area. Their conduct would have disgraced barbarians. They stole and plundered, naturally got violence in return. On one occasion, the militia emptied a Connecticut town of 500 people, burned the homes and at bayonet point forced the inhabitants, children and all, into the wilderness.

Currency collapsed in most of the States, and efforts to establish fiat paper currency led to rebellion, a new high in bitterness, hatred. The only sound currency was a meager and assorted supply of foreign coins, called specie. Clipping of coins was so common, many people carried scales with them to verify weight of gold coins before accepting them.

In Rhode Island, money-hungry citizens forced the legislature to issue paper money, even thought it was doomed to failure. Realizing there was no public confidence in paper money, merchants refused to accept it at the same value as hard money, or specie. Laws were passed providing fines or imprisonment for refusing to accept paper money at the same value as hard money. Rather than go to prison, merchants shut up shop.

In defiance to merchants, farmers dumped their produce, burned corn for fuel and tried to starve city people into accepting paper money at face value. All trade, except on a barter basis, stopped. In 6 months, paper money dropped in exchange value from $1 to 16 cents. There was virtually no money to pay debts, and imprisonment for debt became commonplace.

In Massachusetts, a mob angry over currency collapse, took it out on established authority. The mob stormed the courts and forced the State supreme court to leave town. Rebels seized leading citizens as hostages in other communities.

Such was the American mood and times in 1787, the eve of America's greatest invention: An impotent Central Government, unable to defend American rights abroad, or to make foreign agreement, unable to meet its own expenses; bloody warfare between States, and rebellion within States, a maze of tariff walls separating one State from another; looming anarchy because of the collapse of currency; jealousy, hatred, chaos, rebellion, anarchy.

What was the mood of delegates at Independence Hall? The mood was despair. A year earlier a convention had been called for the purpose of strengthening the Central Government. The convention ended before it began, because only five States sent delegates.

The second convention was called for May 14. There was very little interest in it among the State governments. Indeed, New York thought so little of it that State did not send its best men as delegates. John Jay, who could have added strength to the Convention, was left at home.

The one fact which added hope to this second convention was the news that General Washington was to be in the Virginia delegation.

Washington arrived at Convention Hall on schedule. So did 28 other delegates. They had to wait 11 days before delegates from the seventh State arrived, providing a quorum. Before the Convention was concluded, 12 States participated. Rhode Island never did send delegates.

The night before the Convention was to have its opening session, some of the delegates were gathered before the fireplace shooting the breeze. The Convention was called for the purpose simply of revising the Articles of Confederation, and several delegates warned that the country was in no mood for any radical changes in the Central Government. It would be better for the Convention to deal with mild changes, and avoid anything very sweeping.

Washington could not bear this talk in silence. He rose and delivered his shortest and one of his greatest speeches. He said, "It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work?"

Perhaps thinking of the border warfare, the low estate to which America had fallen in the eyes of the world, the rebellion in Massachusetts and elsewhere, the crying need for a strong Central Government, Washington added these words, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God."

But in the Convention, the outlook fell from bad to worse. Big States vied with little States. Southern interests opposed New England. The longer the delegates debated, the more remote seemed agreement.

After 6 weeks, Washington wrote a note to Alexander Hamilton, who had left the Convention for a few days' business in New York. In the note Washington said, "I almost despair seeing a favorable issue to the proceeedings and do therefore repent having had any agency in the business."

At a critical moment when the Convention appeared to be on the verge of collapse, Ben Franklin had this to say: "In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illuminate our understandings? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for the divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity, and have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Or do we imagine that we no longer need his assistance? I have lived a long time and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without his concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel: we shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and byword down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, and conquest.

"I therefore beg leave to move—that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of heaven, and its blessings on our deliberations, be heard in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service."

Franklin's suggestion was adopted, and without doubt the daily prayer helped to calm frayed nerves and added the inspiration needed for perseverance.

Tempers were snapping. Angry words were heard. Delegations threatened to go home. But out of desperation and adversity, one by one, were hammered out the great principles which formed America's greatest invention:

The United States was to be a Union of people, not a Union of States. The citizen was to be the sovereign power, and he was to have dual citizenship, being a citizen of a State and a citizen of the Nation.

The Central Government was to have strictly limited powers, with a balance of these powers among the two Houses of Congress, the executive, and the judiciary.

Senators and Congressmen were to vote individually and not by State blocs. This permitted a vigorous party system to develop in the United States.

States were to have equal representation in the Senate, and Congressmen were to be chosen on the basis of population. This was the result of compromise, and the agreement was reached only after long dispute, and because the final debate occurred on a day when the New York delegation happened to be absent.

Laws and treaties of the Central Government were to be supreme.

Free trade was to be established throughout the area of the Union. It was the first time a group of sovereign States had agreed to abolish all tariffs. This act made possible America's tremendous economic growth and our sharply rising standard of living.

But it was a gain not without cost. The price paid for free trade and for the right of the Central Government to control foreign commerce was a grisly deal that later was to haunt the United States.

Involved was the problem of the slave trade. Ten of the twelve States—including Virginia—favored stopping import of slaves, and many freely predicted that slavery would soon be abolished.

Only South Carolina and Georgia resisted. There rice was the principal crop, and the death rate in the sickly rice swamps was so high, the planters needed a steady supply of new slaves to replace those who died.

So a compromise provided that import of slaves could not be halted for another 20 years. By that time, the cotton gin had changed the principal crop of the South to cotton, and a new expanding demand for slaves was created.

It is ironic that much of the opposition to the deal was from Virginia, soon to become a center of slave activity. George Mason was so incensed that he refused to sign the Constitution, despite Washington's fervent appeal for unity. Said Mason, "I would sooner chop off my right hand than put it to the Constitution as it stands."

Yet, without this and other compromises, the Federal Union would not have been created in the summer of 1787. America would likely have gone the way of Europe with numerous small warring States. Instead of one war on a great moral issue, there would have probably been several wars on petty issues. But for this slave deal, a mighty force for freedom might never have been created.

And who is to say it was a wrong compromise?

America's greatest invention was a creature of compromise from start to finish, and yet the invention created a strong Central Government, and protected the liberty of citizens and retained the authority of the States.

William Gladstone said the U.S. Constitution was the greatest work ever struck off by the mind of man.

Considering the obstacles, the rivalries, open warfare, suspicion among the States, it is all the more remarkable that the Convention of 1787 should have produced this "Fifth Symphony" of statesmanship. As Washington had predicted the event was in the hand of God.

Surely a power greater than man contrived to resolve the antagonisms of the day and to inspire those 39 men to create in this greatest of all American inventions a shield for liberty that would survive the test of time and become an example for others to follow.

Here indeed was raised a standard to which the wise and honest can repair—in 1787—and in 1962. How fully we understand and appreciate this great charter will determine in large measure how well we fulfill our stewardship in keeping high the torch of freedom.

The great historian of ths period, John Fiske, concluding his study entitled "The Critical Period of American History," had this to say: "In some future still grandeur convention we trust the same thing will be done between States that have been wholly sovereign, whereby peace may gain and violence be diminished over other lands than this which has set the example."

Fiske wrote these words 80 years ago. And today leaders in both political parties speak hopefully and confidently of this still grander convention Fiske foretold.

"Sail on, O ship of state.
Sail on, Union strong and free.
Humanity in all its fears
In all its hopes for future years
Hangs breathless on thy fate."

Cuba: Watchful Waiting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am glad that Walter Lippmann, with his usual clarity and good sense, has spoken up on the Cuba issue. I commend his article appearing today in the Washington Post to the attention of my colleagues—and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBA: WATCHFUL WAITING
(By Walter Lippmann)

Although there are some who say that we are doing nothing about Cuba, the fact is that we are doing just about everything that can be done short of going to war.

Besides the economic embargo, we are keeping the island under surveillance. We are watching every ship that comes to and goes from the island, and we are keeping a close watch on the loading and unloading of these ships. We have accurate and current records of building operations and the deployment of aircraft and tanks and artillery.

There may be some doubt whether we have located every missile site in the vastness of the Soviet Union. But in Cuba, unless our cameras are failing us, we are completely informed.

As a result, we are quite able to know about the development of anything like a Soviet missile base directed against the United States, and what may be more realistic, we are able to spot anything like an expeditionary force against Cuba's neighbors in the islands and in the Caribbean.

Our policy at the present is to keep ourselves completely informed, and to wait and see whether Castro and his Soviet helpers do any overt act, against the United States or its neighbors. Beyond this, there is no serious action the United States can taken to remove him that would not be an act of war.

The United States is, of course, able easily to blockade Cuba. But stopping ships under threat of seizure or sinking would be an act of war not only against Cuba but against the Soviet Union. For we would be seizing or sinking Soviet ships.

The invasion of Cuba would, of course, be an act of war against Cuba. To be sure, the United States could easily win a war against Cuba. We could close the Cuban ports within a few hours and we could occupy very quickly Havana and a few big cities. The countryside might be another story.

But what we could not be sure of doing is to prevent the retaliatory moves to which we would have laid ourselves wide open, moves against Berlin, or against Turkey, or against Iran.

For we would have acted on the rule that a possible threat against our security or our interests justifies us in going to war.

We would be saying that because Cuba, which is only 90 miles away, is in the grip of an unfriendly European power, we have a right to blockade or occupy the island; we would be saying too that the Soviet Union has no such right to act against the American military positions in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, right on her own frontier.

Let us not fool ourselves. Such an argument will not wash. It would be rejected, probably even laughed at, not only by all neutrals but by powerful elements among our closest allies.

There are some who think foreign opinion doesn't matter. But when it comes to war, it means a great deal to the belligerent who is for him and who is against him. We could go to war if Castro injures us. But we cannot go to war, even against Castro, because of what he may conceivably do in the future.

We cannot wage a preventive war against Castro without establishing the rule that a preventive war is legitimate against our military position in Berlin, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Thailand, South Vietnam, Taiwan, Okinawa, South Korea and Japan.

It is true, of course, that the Soviet lodgment in Cuba is a gross violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Yet we cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine. Why not?

The Monroe Doctrine declares that "any interposition" by a European power in this hemisphere would be "the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

But, and this is the crucial point, the American claim for the isolation of the Western Hemisphere was coupled with a renunciation of American interest in the Eastern Hemisphere: "In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do."

This fundamental passage in Monroe's message is, of course, a restatement of the principle laid down by Washington in his farewell address: "Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or a very remote relation."

This basis of the Monroe Doctrine disappeared in the 20th century, in the two World Wars, the Korean war, and the cold war, We cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine without meeting the question of what we are doing all over Europe and Asia.

Our right to put Cuba under surveillance, and if necessary to blockade and invade it, rests not on the Monroe Doctrine but on the elementary right of a people to insure its own security.

For two centuries the British felt that way about the occupation of Belgium by an unfriendly power. The Russians felt that way about Turkey. This right can, however, be exercised only when there is a clear and present danger.

Castro is an insulting nuisance but is not, and is not now remotely capable of becoming a clear and present danger to the United States. So we must practice watchful waiting, and hold ourselves in readiness, never for a moment forgetting the vastly greater dangers elsewhere.

In a time of watchful waiting, Congress and the newspapers are compelled to remember that the President is conducting a delicate and dangerous operation, and that he is seriously interferred with if he is forced to dot every "i" and to cross every "t" in advance of a decision.

The President should not be asked to say whether he will go to war. He should not be driven to say that he won't go to war.

A certain mystery and uncertainty are desirable, and will be deterrent to our adversaries.

Role of Lawyer in Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no organization has as potent an influence on hemispheric thinking as the Inter-American Bar Association. William Roy Vallance is the secretary general of the association. Mr. Vallance retired a year or so ago after an outstandingly distinguished career with the State Department.

By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an address by F. V. Garcia-Amador at a meeting of the Inter-American Bar Association on September 13, 1962, at the National Lawyers' Club in Washington. Mr. Garcia-Amador is the Director of the Department of Legal Affairs of the Organization of American States.

His address follows:

The great undertaking in the hemisphere today, the one to which all our attention is turned, is the Alliance for Progress. As you are well aware, the Alliance for Progress programs for economic development and social improvement are of such magnitude that profound transformations in the legal institutions of the Latin American countries are inevitable. As a matter of fact, these changes, particularly as to land reform and taxation, are explicitly contemplated in the Punta del Este Charter. The question which concerns us is what is the role of the lawyer in this program? What can we do to aid the transformation and adaptation of the exist-

ing legal institutions so that they can better serve the ends and the aims of the Alliance?

We, at the Pan American Union, occupy a very strategic role in the development of the Alliance. We have the facilities of the entire hemisphere at our disposal, and we can speak in an impartial voice to the entire hemisphere. We recognize our role; we recognize our responsibilities. It is, however, so vast an undertaking that we cannot possibly begin to do it all ourselves. To the contrary, it is a never-ending task in which the more help we will have, the more we will have to do. That is why the most important thing which I have to say to you today is that we of the legal department at the Pan American Union welcome your help. We welcome your suggestions, your cooperation. We welcome you and invite you to join with us in attacking these problems which must be solved before the political stability and well-being of our entire hemisphere is to be secure.

What are some of these problems? Let me name a few to you. To begin at the base of the structure there are the legal rights and role of the new national planning agencies. These agencies are comparatively new in administrative law. What is their legal status to be? What will their administrative role be? Are they to be created simply to make recommendations, formulate plans, and then disintegrate? Should they take the form of an overall commission on the order of the great Tennessee Valley Authority here in this country? Is it better, in the alternative, that they become some sort of superagency to oversee and administer other agencies which will carry out the work? If so, what sort of powers will be available to them to insure that their plans and recommendations are properly carried out? Will they be able to investigate, to correct and compel? Should they be insulated from political pressures and influence? And if that is a desirable end, how can it be accomplished? We have here, you see, a myriad of problems relating to this one initial aspect of the program, the purpose, role, and functioning of the development agency itself.

In the substantive field, the list is potentially endless, and it touches all phases of economic activity and cooperation. To mention just a few there is the pressing problem of agrarian reform. What are the different possibilities in fair and equitable yet uncumbersome agrarian reform laws? What legal protection can be devised for the new land owners, many of whom will be illiterate, against those who may seek to take advantage of them, while, at the same time, safeguarding bona fide creditors' rights. How shall the new programs of agricultural credit be administered and protected? What about insuring good title, and simplifying methods for clearing title?

In tax law, I don't have to describe the problems to you. Even the most developed of developed countries have their share of problems here. What kind of tax laws most effectively suit the needs of the Latin American nations: Direct taxes as you have in the United States, or indirect? What are the rights to be established to ascertain that all levels of Government, National, State, and local, get their proportional share of the revenues, and to what extent is it possible to insure that those revenues are properly allocated on the local levels. The obvious problems of improving the administration of tax laws and the elimination of tax evasion are ever present in our consideration. There is also the great problem, as economic activity between nations increases, of avoiding double taxation and inadvertent burdens on the type of economic activity which we desire to encourage. Much fine work is already being done on the problem, especially by the Harvard University tax program. But the work is still unfinished.

There are also the problems of commercial law, techniques of public control of business, including the problems of monopoly and restraint of trade about which you here have so much to teach us. The problem of expropriations and of nationalizations is one which will be with us for a long time. How can this be handled in a fair manner with aggravating international tensions? What can the law do to promote and facilitate the flow of capital across national borders?

What means can be devised for encouraging small business while, at the same time, preventing fradulent operators and professional manipulators from taking advantage of those laws? What are the possibilities for protecting international creditors, improving the security of secured transactions? Is there a possibility for paving the legal road to international security transactions in stocks and bonds so that private investors may be encouraged to put their money into the public securities of foreign firms? What about labor law and protection for honest, responsible labor unions?

There are, gentlemen, all these and more, I haven't even begun to mention the possibilities in banking regulations; improvement of judicial procedures and remedies both within the individual countries and in international intercourse; improvement of the civil service laws; the problems of the law of civil rights; methods for improving the election laws and procedures, and many others. Some of these problems are already being dealt with in respect to individual countries; in others general studies are well underway.

Many thing remain to be done. Preliminary studies will have to be made. There are no general solutions which will serve in all countries. The existing record will have to be detailed so that we can know the existing situation in all of the Latin American States. This means research and digging at a moment when we have little time for research and digging. We must begin to act, but we have also to understand fully the kind of action we must take. We must know what we are talking about—what problems we are facing—and what we are going to do about it. We must acquaint the lawyers of the hemisphere with these problems. This means discussion, seminars, exchange of ideas.

We at the legal department of the Pan American Union are getting ready to undertake a vast program in this sphere. It is simmering now, and we invite you to join with us in making it a reality. We invite your suggestions and proposals of topics, plans of action, and methods of disseminating our call to the lawyers of the hemisphere. You have a conference scheduled in Panama early next year. That conference could make a tremendous contribution to our progress and we should like very much to discuss the possibilities with those of your officers who are responsible for it. Together, let us hope, we can begin to chip away at the tremendous task in front of us.

I thank you.

Captioned Films for the Deaf

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this legislation in the House and as chairman of the subcommittee that considered this bill, I am an enthusiastic supporter of the proposal to expand the program of captioned films for the deaf.

The New Jersey State School for the Deaf, which is outstanding among such institutions in this country, is located in my district and I have long had an interest in its work. They use the present loan service of captioned films to the fullest extent possible, but they are well aware of the great potential in this medium for making significant strides forward in the education and training of the deaf.

The value of this legislation to the deaf population of our country has been well stated by Mr. August P. Herdtfelder, from the National Fraternal Society of the Deaf. I would like to include at this point Mr. Herdtfelder's statement to my subcommittee:

Representative THOMPSON and honorable members of the committee, I am August P. Herdtfelder, of Silver Spring, Md., and the appointed representative of the National Fraternal Society of the Deaf, a fraternal life insurance association of deaf men and women. This society is based on the lodge system and has branch lodges, called divisions, in over 100 principal cities in the United States.

The National Fraternal Society of the Deaf is strongly in favor of the legislation now being considered by your committee to expand the captioned films for the deaf program. Thousands of deaf people of all ages stand to benefit from an expanded program. Since its inception 3 years ago, the captioned films program has played an increasingly important role in the lives of deaf people everywhere. The realization that the present program is inadequate is the basic reason for the wide, general movement for a larger organization better adapted to meet the social, cultural, educational, and training needs of the deaf.

Educationally the deaf child stands to benefit the most. There is much potential for enhancing his educational achievement through the use of captioned educational films. The young deaf child does not acquire language through normal channels and often does not acquire any language at all until taught by special methods when first attending a school for the deaf at approximately 6 years of age. This lag in the development of language is difficult to overcome, but through the use of captioned educational films the deaf child will be exposed to experiences and language simultaneously providing an opportunity for growth and understanding.

We, deaf people, have always been proud of our independent role in that we have held full-time jobs, raised families, owned homes, driven cars, and paid taxes just like anyone else. And just like anyone else we are concerned with the advent of automation which will undoubtedly result in the loss of jobs for the deaf worker as well as the normal-hearing worker. Retraining of the deaf worker will not be so easy because of the communication problem. Thus there is a growing need for specialized materials for the adult deaf and an increased captioned films program will be able to take the proper steps toward the development of training and educational films for the adult deaf resulting in the opportunity for the deaf to prepare themselves for technical changes and the chance to compete on the labor market.

I strongly urge in behalf of the deaf of America that every consideration toward the enactment of this legislation be given.

Part I: Cuba's Soviet Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Daily News, whose editorial policy I consider to be one of the outstanding for America, is running a series of articles by Anthony Burton, its reporter, who was in Cuba just a few days ago.

The New York Daily News is rendering a great public service in bringing to the American people the facts of the situation and not the fancy that some of the Kennedy idealists seem to want to dish out.

The situation is serious, even if the President doesn't think so.

Following Mr. Burton's article, I include the editorial which appeared in today's issue of the New York Daily News:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News, Sept. 17, 1962]

BEHIND CUBA'S SOVIET CURTAIN FIDEL LAUNCHES CRASH PROGRAM TO HOUSE HORDES OF REDS

(NOTE.—This is the first eyewitness report to an American newspaper from behind the "Calypso Curtain" since Cuba all but totally blocked communications with the free world more than a week ago.

(News Staffer Anthony Burton entered Cuba 8 days ago. "Only by slipping away unnoticed from Castro's G–2 agents was I able to risk the dash to the Russian camps outside Havana," Burton reported. "The next day three agents shadowed me everywhere I moved." Yesterday morning Burton flew to Miami from Havana—"I was so glad to get out of that place, for a time I thought I wouldn't." The following is the first of a series of inside Cuba stories he will file.)

(By Anthony Burton)

MIAMI, September 16.—So many Russians are landing in fortress Cuba that Premier Fidel Castro has been forced to launch a crash program to house them.

I can reveal this after flying here today from the Sovietized island.

Large buildings are being expanded hastily and converted into barracks for the Russians who are landing by sea and air in the Soviet's first bastion in the Western Hemisphere. Clearly, the men from the East are in Cuba to stay.

Now packed in field tents, their bunks only a few inches apart, they already have been troubled by tropical rains, which can turn a trampled field into a mudbath in minutes.

PUPILS TURNED OUT OF SCHOOL FOR RUSSIANS

About 10 miles southwest of Havana, near Chico, a few days ago I saw workers being urged to greater speed as they labored on the conversion of a large school for the use of Russians encamped nearby. The pupils were turned out of the school a few weeks ago.

More than 800 Russians are in this square-mile area alone, living in three tent towns, with field kitchens.

Their camps, not seen by Western observers until last week, lie along little-used country lanes and are invisible to main highway traffic.

The camps lie between Chico and El Cano.

Only the bravery of a Cuban prepared to risk imprisonment enabled me to find them.

Walking along the lanes last week were two fairhaired girls, poorly dressed and in their late teens or early twenties. My guide insisted that they were Russians and said the Reds have other women with them.

I can also reveal that Castro is ramming new dirt roads through the rugged back country to strategic points near the coast.

He is worried that a beachhead might be established at an inaccessible point and a defense perimeter thrown out before his army and militia could smash the invaders back to the sea.

SOVIET TRUCKS BEING MASSED

Castro's concern about the need for a highly mobile strike force—he described the throwing up of his ramparts last week as "extraordinary defense measures"—could explain the huge number of Russian trucks now leaving Cuban docks.

Their olive-drab outlines can be seen parked in fields and woods as in the buildup in England before D–Day.

Yesterday, yet another truck convoy escorted by motorcycles was driven west along the sea road from Havana.

While the buildup goes on, Castro, angered by newspaper reports of the Russian camps, has tossed away his last pretense at press freedom in Cuba.

Agents from G–2, his secret police, arrested and jailed two Western newsmen and held them without charges, refusing at first even to admit they were being held.

The two—John Bland of Reuters and John Barnes of Newsweek—were finally deported to Kingston, Jamaica, yesterday. Both are British subjects.

When I left Havana this morning, two Cuban nationals—Raul Casanas and his wife, Sarita—were still being held. Employed by the New York Times and the National Broadcasting Co., they had done nothing more than acompany British reporter Bland on an auto ride in the country.

Knwing they were being tailed, the three kept clear of Russian camps and military installations, but G–2 seized them anyway. The other Western reporter, Barnes, was dragged from his hotel bed at 3 a.m. by agents with drawn guns.

A third prisoner, Nicholas Lacey, an English student still in his teens, was arrested September 5 after an argument with some young Cubans about the regime. Lacey had been hitchhiking through the United States and Mexico before he went to Cuba.

HELD PRISONER AND THEN BOOTED

He had visited Miramar to inspect damage done by a hit-and-run sea raid by Cuban refugees. When the argument became heated, one Cuban said: "Come with me around the corner where the Cuban position will be explained."

Lacey went. Around the corner was G–2 headquarters. There the Cuban denounced the Briton, who was held in jail until yesterday. He was expelled with the reporters.

Although Government officials had promised me every help in covering last week's Castro speech, I was ejected from the meeting only a few minutes after entering.

The cold-eyed G–2 men behind the scenes who thrust me out were in startling contrast to the row of benevolent faces on the dais smiling at the applause of their stage-managed supporters.

Later, I had some questions for Senor Lazo, the charming young Foreign Ministry official who deals with foreign visitors.

Sitting in an air-conditioned office guarded by armed militia, he said the questions would have to be submitted on paper.

After 2½ hours of waiting he finally saw me, merely to accept the questions.

Told that at least Cuba had learned one thing swiftly from the Russians—weaving the strands of bureaucracy—he lost his bland manner and exploded that I should remember I was a guest in his country.

Answers came to none of the questions. The officials were always busy from that moment on.

The Castro meeting itself at the Chaplin Theater, in the immediate area of the hit-and-run sea raid, was frightening.

Early in the evening, claques gathered on the sidewalks in Havana and clapped and sang revolutionary songs before converging on the theater.

The area was thick with young militiamen, many in their teens. As I approached I could hear from half a mile away the loudspeaker broadcast. At the theater the noise was deafening, the harsh voices grating the eardrums.

MOST OF THEM YOUNG

Inside, the audience was nearly all young people—the main support of the regime. At the nod of their leader, each section burst into song. Immediately arc lights shone on the group for the benefit of the television cameras.

The expressions on the faces of the audience were like those seen in audiences at evangelical meetings. Above it all, Fidel Castro, the father image, smiled down in approval.

I didn't hear his words in person because of the expulsion, but his voice was inescapable. Every television and radio station was tuned inexorably to his hour-long lecture.

OVERSEA PHONES BUSY

Press communications from Cuba have been cut before, but never so drastically as last week, after reports about the Russian camps got out.

Newsmen in Havana found that whenever they tried to telephone overseas the lines were busy. They tapped out messages on their teletype machines which were never received. Cables also were blocked, so that the newsmen were left frustrated and helpless.

Newsmen leaving Cuba ran the risk of being stripped and searched at the airport to prevent tape recordings, photographs, and the like from being smuggled out to the free press.

Exactly that did happen to Tetlow of the London Daily Telegraph, who was flying to New York.

Only by slipping away unnoticed by Castro's G–2 agents was I able to risk the dash to the Russian camps outside Havana. The next day three agents shadowed me everywhere I moved.

In fact, hunting Russians in Cuba is no trick since they are all over the damned island—in hotels, in the streets, driving convoys or riding packed in the backs of trucks.

Except for the Russians and the Czechs with their inevitable briefcases staying in the once-plush Havana hotels—who may really be technicians—all wear the same type of open-necked checkered shirt and slacks.

Their faces are burning an unbecoming red and their tow hair is bleaching under the Caribbean sun.

AT LEAST 10,000 THERE

Their numbers are only a matter of guess since travel outside Havana has become restricted by shadowing and the threat of sudden arrest.

But conservative observers who poohpoohed early figures now believe there must be more than 10,000 on the island. And that is a minimum figure.

HOW MANY ARE THERE?

(News military editor Jerry Greene had reported from Washington on August 23 that 18,000 Russians were said to have reached Cuba. President Kennedy on September 4 had put at 3,500 the number of Soviet military technicians who were in Cuba or en route there. But others, including Senator KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York, have said that close to 5,000 men in Soviet uniforms have landed in Cuba.)

Their presence may be able to ward off invasion attempts—and make no mistake, only a full-scale mass landing now has any hope of success—but it will be years before the tottering economy can be revived.

Cuba is slipping deeper and deeper into economic morass. Food is scarcer than it ever has been. The sugar crop estimates this year predict such a low yield that if export quotas are to be filled, rationing of this native crop will have to be initiated. And the smear of Communism is making the whole country run to seed.

At the end of the customs table just before I left Cuba this morning was a box in which lay personal belongings stripped from refugees before they were allowed to leave their country. There were jewelry and perfume and a few well-worn coats—that was all.

But Cuba was so desperate that it took these pathetic items from its own people as a farewell gesture.

Perhaps the story of Cuba today lies in that box at the end of the customs table.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News, Sept. 18, 1962]

NEWEST CAPTIVE NATION

Your attention is urgently asked to Anthony Burton's series of articles on Cuba, now running in the News. Mr. Burton spent a week in Cuba, got out Sunday morning, and filed his dispatches from Miami.

The Burton reports constitute the latest evidence to date that N. S. Khrushchev is turning Cuba into a Communist slave state and building up its defense so as to make the price of rescuing it as high as he can.

Cuba, in short, is fast becoming the Kremlin's newest captive nation, and the first in the Western Hemisphere.

If Khrushchev's plans are not interrupted, he will use the island as a base from which to finance and equip native Communist revolutions in mainland Latin America and/or other Caribbean islands. Each country where such an uprising succeeds will be turned into another captive nation.

This is the plain, perilous, and spreading violation of the Monroe Doctrine which President John F. Kennedy up to now refuses to combat, saying it is no threat as yet to the Western Hemisphere.

It must be delightful to be as carefree as all that; but somehow we can not share the President's nonchalance, and we don't think many of our fellow Americans can, either.

Susquehanna River in Pittston Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles A. McCarthy, a historian of my congressional district, has written a highly informative series of articles on the early history of the Susquehanna River, particularly in the Pittston area. The latest installment in this series appeared in the Pittston Sunday Dispatch on September 16, 1962, and as part of my remarks today I quote the text of that article.

The article follows:

FROM LOCAL HISTORY: SUSQUEHANNA RIVER IN PITTSTON REGION—MOTORISTS GOING OVER BRIDGE, FASTER THAN WALK FINED

(By Charles A. McCarthy)

A fire destroyed spans 6, 7, and 8 on the eastern side of the Pittston Ferry Bridge on July 20, 1885.

The day after the fire John Berry, a civil engineer, offered to rebuild the three spans, including masonry, painting, etc., for $4,300. Instead, a temporary span was installed. On May 4, 1894, Attorney James L. Morris appeared before Pittston Borough Council and requested a permit to rebuild that segment of the bridge. Permission was granted and after years of litigation the actual work was completed in July 1896.

On January 18, 1896, Judge John Lynch, of the Luzerne County Court ordered the Ferry Bridge Co. to remove the temporary bridge piers from Carbondale Road.

The ferry bridge was out of commission on March 7, 1904, due to high flood waters. Train service on the Lehigh Valley Railroad was stopped for 3 days.

On September 9, 1909, arrests were made for violation of the ordinance forbidding the driving of automobiles over the Pittston bridges at a speed faster than a walk. At the same time, a warning was issued against the running or trotting of horses while crossing the bridges.

On Sunday, August 19, 1876, a day on which no toll fees were charged, 400 vehicles crossed the ferry bridge, between the hours of 8 and 11 a.m.

A traffic count made between the hours of 6 a.m. and 1 p.m. on July 23, 1914, enumerated 500 wagons and 80 automobiles.

Bridge traffic on Fort Jenkins Bridge, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. on November 20, 1926, totaled 2,971 motor vehicles and 45 horse-drawn wagons.

TRAFFIC MOUNTS

The average daily traffic count on the Fort Jenkins Bridge in 1954 was 15,736 vehicles.

L. B. Ensign, superintendent of the Pittston Gas Co. was preparing to install gas pipes, to light the bridge, on May 7, 1863. However, before the lights were turned on, the bridge was torn down.

Gas lights were being installed on this bridge August 7, 1871. They were turned on the following evening. At this time, the lights were left on each evening until midnight.

The 1844 act of the Pennsylvania Legislature regarding bridges which was amended on April 12, 1855, at which time reference was made to the Pittston Ferry Bridge Co., was further amended on April 8, 1873, to include data on bridge lighting.

MONEY FOR SCHOOLS

Section 2 of this amendment provided that: "On and after passage of this act the Pittston Ferry Bridge is to be lighted by at least five good lamps of the capacity of ordinary street lamps 'from dusk of the evening till dawn of the following day and any failure to comply with the provision or to keep the bridge properly lighted, shall be punished by a fine of not less than $5 for each and every offense, to be collected in the same manner as other debts now collected by law and when so collected to be paid by the alderman or justice of the peace before who judgment is had to the school directors of Pittston Borough, for the use of school purposes.'"

LIGHTING DEVELOPS

A single electric light, the first use of this type of power to light the bridge, was placed on the east side of the bridge on Thursday, December 18, 1884. By Wednesday, January 15, 1885, the entire structure was completely lighted by electricity.

In 1886 a total of four electric lights was used on the bridge. Each lamp cost 30 cents per week and was lighted every weekday night until midnight.

Gas lights were again being used on this bridge in 1888. They were lighted each night until midnight.

Electric lights were again in use on this bridge in 1890. Light was furnished all night.

COLLECTING TOLLS

The Ferry Bridge Co. began collecting tolls on the new bridge on January 12, 1877.

In 1882 the two Pittston toll bridge companies pooled their interests; Water Street Bridge Co. receiving 52½ percent and Ferry Bridge Co. 47½ percent of all income. The total income in 1897 was $1,000.

Toll charges in 1887 were 1 cent per foot passenger and 20 cents per team.

Special rates were offered by the bridge companies on August 3, 1898. Foot commutation tickets for a family were reduced in half to $2.50; a total of 20 crossings was permitted for $1.

FREE BRIDGES

At a Pittston Borough Council meeting held on December 17, 1894, the borough solicitor was instructed to begin proceedings toward making Pittston bridges free of toll.

Ou August 12, 1907, Attorney William White Hall, counsel for the Pittston Merchants Protective Association, prepared a petition for presentation to Luzerne County officials requesting that both Pittston bridges be made free bridges.

Luzerne County Court approved the purchase of Pittston Ferry Bridge in January 1908, at a stipulated price of $75,000. On October 21, 1908, stockholders of the Pittston Ferry Bridge Co. voted to sell the bridge to the county.

On Thanksgiving Day, November 26, 1908, the ferry bridge was made free to the public.

Pennsylvania Department of Highways took over the maintenance of this structure in 1938.

Knowles China To Liquidate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on June 28, 1962, the House approved a sweeping, far-ranging, and unprecedented foreign-trade bill, the so-called Trade Expansion Act of 1962, H.R. 11970.

On September 6, 1962, the Washington Post carried a small item reporting that one of the oldest china manufacturers in the country was planning to liquidate its activities. The manufacturer is the Knowles China Co., an important employer in my home district. The reason for the liquidation: present tariff policies of the U.S. Government.

Inasmuch as the foreign-trade legislation passed by this body earlier in the year clearly presents a much greater threat to American industry than any previous legislation in this field, I shudder to think of the industrial decimation that will occur if H.R. 11970 becomes law. As a foretaste of what we will be reading daily in our newspapers in that unhappy circumstance, I include the newspaper report:

KNOWLES CHINA TO LIQUIDATE

EAST LIVERPOOL, Ohio.—Stockholders of one of the oldest dinnerware manufacturers in the Nation will vote at a special meeting September 13 on a plan to liquidate the Knowles China Co. of nearby Newell, W. Va.

Directors of the 63-year-old corporation said present tariff policies make it impossible for the company to continue operating or to make a profit in the near future. The board, given stockholders' approval in March to sell

the corporation, said it was unable to find a purchaser.

The plant now has 500 on its payroll and has been operating on a curtailed basis for some time, a company spokesman said.

Movement of Communist Supplies to Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, while it is being widely publicized that ocean vessels under registry of some of our NATO allies are carrying, under charter, Communist goods to Cuba, less attention is being given to this Government's consultation with its allies on the problems such commerce imposes.

In a dispatch from Moscow, September 15, the Soviet Minister of Sea Transport is quoted as boasting that the United States is failing to influence its allies in the matter of stemming supplies to the Castro government. I think this boast is premature.

As chairman of the House Select Committee on Export Control, and as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am concerned with the movement of material to any Soviet bloc country which would strengthen their economic or military potential to the detriment of the United States. I believe that there is evidence that our allies in Europe, South America, and the Far East would support an embargo of Cuba if ever this Government decided that to be necessary.

While I take a decidedly dim view of the movement of Communists goods to Cuba in ships of Western European registry, and certainly to the movement of any materials of either economic or military cold war significance, this country has not yet laid the groundwork or applied full diplomatic pressure to isolate Cuba from free world trade.

Late in August and again this month, the President has expressed concern over the chartering of Allied ships by the Soviet bloc to move Communist goods to Castro. Reportedly Norway, Britain, West Germany, and Italy are making inquiries into the part vessels under their registration are taking in this Cuban buildup.

While at present these inquiries may actually be little more than polite diplomatic response to this country's disturbed view of commerce with Cuba, more direct consultations with the NATO countries are underway, I am informed.

This week a top diplomatic spokesman for Peru indicated that country would go along with a U.S. blockade of Cuba and predicted other OAS countries would do likewise. Not every move being made by this Government is being shouted from the housetops.

Before Castro turned Cuba into a Soviet satellite, we supplied 80 percent of Cuba's imports. This country and my own State of North Carolina sacrificed millions in profitable trade with Cuba and we recognize that as part of the payment of leadership in Communist containment. Our food and drug exports to Cuba now amount to a trickle of little more than $50,000 a month.

It is understandable that American producers look askance while countries like Canada and the Netherlands double their Cuban trade and ocean tonnage of Allied nations is put at the disposal of Soviet countries to carry Iron Curtain commodities to the Caribbean.

However, a progress report received by the House Select Committee on Export Controls indicates that a much tighter clamp is being put on the movement of strategically significant goods to Communist countries including Cuba since Congress amended the Export Control Act this year. Now there is some indication that the President's concern over Allied commerce with Cuba is getting some attention abroad despite Moscow's claim to the contrary.

The select committee is charged with watchdogging the movement of goods, economic and military, which would prove detrimental to the interests of the United States. The committee intends to make further inquiries into the Cuban buildup and expects to inform Congress of its findings before adjournment.

Concern Over Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the concern of the American people over the increasingly dangerous situation in Cuba is illustrated by the September 12, 1962, editorial in the Livingston County Press, Howell, Mich. This reaction to an analysis of the President's recent remarks makes clear that recent events are most disturbing to thoughtful American people:

IGNORANCE NO LONGER BLISS

It should be reassuring to all Americans to hear from President Kennedy's own lips in his latest televised press conference that: "The Monroe Doctrine means what it has meant since President Monroe and John Quincy Adams enunciated it, and that is that we would oppose a foreign power extending its power to the Western Hemisphere. And that's why we oppose what is happening in Cuba today."

But it is disturbing to hear from the same source at the same time (in reply to other questions on Cuba) that the White House does not know whether there are an Russian troops in Cuba, whether antiaircraft missiles have been shipped in—yet in the absence of information on what is going on, that there is no thought at the Commander in Chief's level of invading Cuba.

When it is admitted that shipping into Cuba has grown so sharply that NATO ships have been pressed into service to aid Russian ships in delivering whatever mysterious cargoes of men and goods they are carrying; that the Soviets are supporting the Castro regime against economic collapse; that the island is crawling with Russian technicians, why—in the name of the billions that have been spent on intelligence over recent years—don't we know what goes on?

And, more basically, when we know from bitter experience that every Communist of whatever calling is a faceless, order-taking minion of the Red menace, why do we have to know his name, rank and regiment to know whether he is an enemy? Why do we have to know whether the technicians are working on airstrips for fighters or bombers, or on submarine shelters, or on sabotage plans, or on Cubans who may still cherish dreams of freedom, in order to brand them for what they are? And finally, why should we cling to the myth that Castro retains any authority in Cuba when he has bragged for so long of his sellout to the Kremlin?

But, as the President has said, we are opposing "what is happening in Cuba today," because of the Monroe Doctrine. This opposition, he pointed out, has consisted of cutting off trade with Cuba, working in the OAS "and in other ways to isolate the Communist menace in Cuba." The rising tempo of the Red buildup, however, should suggest that our opposition is not working very well.

Thus, it is cold comfort to know that the Monroe Doctrine—swept under the rug by Eisenhower—has reappeared as a toothless instrument of U.S. policy.

Views on a Proposal To Designate September 17 as Constitution Day and as a Legal Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 27, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from a capable, conscientious editor of a distinguished weekly in my district in which she expresses her views on a proposal to designate September 17 as Constitution Day and as a legal holiday.

I ask that the letter from Fern Hilson, editor of the Sellwood-Moreland Bee, of Portland, Oreg., be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in order that all views on the proposal be brought to the attention of the Congress.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that recognition of the Constitution is a most commendable goal. I fear, however, that it may be doing a disservice to the Constitution, a hallmark in the development of human freedom and political institutions, by assigning it a recognition in the form of a holiday. I would be afraid such a holiday would become one of those half-hearted holidays marked by hollow oratory and lipservice of which we have a surfeit already.

I suggest that the best tribute to our Constitution is a daily observance of its principles by all Americans. Our inspiring Constitution will be more honored if we work toward the many unrealized aspects of the philosophy imbedded in it—equal justice for all, equal representation for all citizens in our legislative halls, and equal treatment for all wheth-

er at the polling booth or in the factory or in the schools.

The letter follows:

SELLWOOD-MORELAND BEE,
Portland, Oreg., September 5, 1962.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: In a recent news story it was reported that the U.S. Senate has passed a resolution calling for September 17 to be designated as a legal holiday. The story said this matter would now be considered by the House of Representatives.

I wish to enter a strong protest. Designation of the day as Constitution Day would reult in nothing more than a day off with pay for Government employees and for those people who could get the holiday added to employer cotracts. It would not add one bit of significance to the anniversary of the signing of the Constitution. It would be of particular inconvenience because it comes so soon after Labor Day, which does not disrupt industry and business too much because it always falls on a Monday, while this day would vary from year to year. It would also detract from the beginning of the school term, inserting a holiday within a week of the beginning of the year.

I have observed that the schools pay no attention to Veterans' Day, other than to give the teachers a day off, and see no reason to believe Constitution Day would be any different.

Disruption of the work schedules of business and industry, suspension of mail delivery and other legal business and the cost to the taxpayers for the holiday for public employees are all strong arguments against the resolution. I also believe workers would much prefer to move toward shorter hours, by the day or week, than to have additional holidays which often cannot be utilized for any real leisure.

I hope you and the other Oregon Representatives will not only vote against this resolution but use your influence against it.

Sincerely,

FERN HILSON,
Editor, Sellwood-Moreland Bee.

International Farm Youth Exchange Delegate Reports From Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, Bill Frederickson, of Moses Lake, Wash., is spending 8 months in Germany as an international farm youth exchange delegate. He has written of some of his experiences, and I feel his letter is one of interest. Bill is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Bill Frederickson, of Moses Lake, Wash.

His letter follows:

ERDING, GERMANY.

DEAR FRIENDS: I am now spending a month in the heart of Bavaria in southern Germany. I am living on a fully mechanized farm. The farm is a little larger than the average farm in Germany. My host father's farm is 70 acres and the average farm in Germany is 20 acres. The farm is fully run by the Richard Von Dall'armi family. The family owns two tractors, which do most of the work. On this farm there is very little handwork.

Every morning we chop alfalfa with a new hay chopper. Many new and modern machines are used on my host father's farm. The farm is too small for my host father to own a potato or a wheat harvester. But he has it done with new and very efficient loan machines.

The crops that are grown on my father's farm are: Hay, potatoes, wheat, oats, barley, and pasture. Also some sugarbeets are grown. But they and most of the other crops are used to feed the livestock on the farm.

My host family has 16 cows, which are milked twice a day. The milk is then sold to the people in the city and to a local dairy. They also have 20 other young cattle, 200 pigs, which are grown to sell on the market.

In addition to the cows and swine, they have 400 chickens. The eggs are sold to a college in a nearby town.

The farm was built in 1959, so all the equipment is very modern. They have a new American pipeline milker in the dairy barn.

The house is very typical of German houses. It is a large two story house. On the first floor there are the dining rooms and kitchen, upstairs are the bedrooms and bathrooms. The whole house is filled with beautiful flowers. The house is very nice in appearance and is kept very clean. Outside the house there is a large garden and some fruit trees. They have apple and cherry trees as well as strawberries.

All the family help do the work on the farm or in the house. The family members are Mr. and Mrs. Dall'armi and three children. The girls are 12 and 8 and Herman is 5. The two girls go to school from 8 to 12 6 days a week and 10 months a year. In the afternoon they are expected to do their homework as well as help around the house.

So far I have lived on a large and a small farm, as well as an average farm. My next host family has a very large farm near Heidelberg.

BILL FREDERICKSON.

Bill's personal notes are so interesting that we wish to share some of them with you. He apologizes for not having written more often—we think he has done a fine job.

I just haven't been able to write. I know it seems easy. When I was at home in Washington I thought I would be able to write two or three letters a day. And two or three reports a month.

To give you an idea of what our day was like (on the farm described above). First we got up at 5 a.m., then we worked till 8. Boy, we worked, then we ate, and at 8:30 we were working again. We then worked without a break till 12. We ate again and went back to work. Then at 6 we milked and at 7:30 we ate. After eating we then started cleaning and boxing eggs till 10:30 or 11.

But I really liked it very much there. I want to return to see the family in November for a few days. I worked 7 days a week with the family and I really got to know them. After I was finished with work I didn't even feel like sleeping. I really learned how to work. But I really loved it. It is so hard to write and tell someone this without them getting the wrong idea.

Supports Balanced Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, of particular concern to me and the people of my congressional district is the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area which straddles the Cascade Divide for some 30 miles. This area is about 20 miles wide and is situated in the Mount Baker and Wenatchee National Forests.

This 458,505-acre wilderness in addition to the 801,000 North Cascades Primitive Area will provide adequately for the wilderness needs in the national forests of northern Washington in years to come. These are areas put aside by the Forest Service under the principles of multiple use.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the Mount Vernon, Wash., Skagit Valley Herald on August 24, 1962. The editorial presents a strong case for what it calls balanced management, another name for multiple use. I believe this editorial will interest the Members of Congress and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD:

FOREST MANAGEMENT

One of the last battles in the winning of the West is being fought today here in our own North Cascades in Skagit and neighboring counties.

The issue is whether these magnificent countains with their glacier-worn peaks and timbered slopes are to be preserved in large measure as a wilderness national park or managed, as they have been for years, by the U.S. Forest Service as a balanced resource for commercial logging, mining, grazing and outdoor recreation.

The Skagit Valley Herald emphatically supports the balanced management of the North Cascades under the multiuse policies and practices of the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service. In the face of massive group pressures from wilderness advocates, both within our State and throughout the United States, the Forest Service job is made far more difficult than it should be.

The organized supporters of wilderness concepts have proposed that a large area of the North Cascades be made into a national park in which no logging or other commercial development of the resources of the North Cascades be permitted. In this campaign they have enlisted the support of some Western Congressmen, including a few from Washington State.

Congressman PELLY, on June 19 of this year, wrote a letter to Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, urgently petitioning that the Secretary halt all logging in certain areas of the North Cascades which, in the opinion of Mr. PELLY, and others, should be designated national park areas. There are 20 of these zones in all, totaling some 350 square miles of area.

Learning of the Pelly letter, our own Congressman, JACK WESTLAND, on August 15, wrote a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman requesting that the Secretary "ignore Mr. PELLY'S letter and continue to

manage our national forests as you have in the past." Mr. WESTLAND made the important point that the livelihood of thousands of people in the area of the northern Cascades depends upon the commercial harvest of the resources of the national forest. "These people," Congressman WESTLAND points out, "believe in the multiple use of our forest, not a single use for a few. They believe in the use of our forests for recreation, wilderness and commercial purposes. They do not want their means of livelihood taken away from them."

We should be thankful that we have a Congressman who is going to bat for the preservation of this important part of our area's economic base. The National Forest Service has long experience in the management of the forest for the good of all people. We have today, under the direction of the U.S. Forest Service, several large areas in the North Cascades set aside for scenic wildlife and outdoor recreation preservation. These areas are the 425,000-acre Glacier Peak Wilderness Area and the 850,000-acre North Cascades Primitive Area.

The wilderness proponents are not satisfied with more than 1 million acres in wilderness and primitive area, but want to place most of the high Cascade country north of Glacier Peak and the Canadian border in a national park.

Such an area would remove much potential timberland from commercial development and would restrict the logging potential in this area. It's time that northwest Washingtonians join in his great battle for our self-interest by letting our Congressman and Secretary Freeman know that the wilderness proponents are not the only ones who can write letters.

To let Secretary Freeman, Congressman WESTLAND and our Senators know exactly how you feel, write them and tell them. Secretary Freeman's address is: The Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. JACK WESTLAND'S is: Room 1419, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Union-Made Racial Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful students of job discrimination in America today is Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the NAACP. The September 15, 1962, editorial page of the Saturday Evening Post has its lead editorial on the subject of "Union-Made Racial Discrimination." Because this is one of the most serious problems facing our Nation both at home and abroad, I wish to bring Mr. Hill's remarks and those of the editors of the Saturday Evening Post to the attention of my colleagues:

UNION-MADE RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

One form of discrimination that affects the American Negro more directly than anything else—including segregated schools, lily-white lunch counters, Jim Crow buses, and unequal voting rights—is job discrimination, the denial of economic opportunity because of race. Last month the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People announced an all-out attack, starting in the fall, against this form of bias. The target of the NAACP's attack will be a longtime vocal champion of civil rights: organized labor. The national labor secretary of the NAACP, Herbert Hill, charges the unions with four categories of discrimination: (1) Outright exclusion of Negroes; (2) segregation of locals; (3) adhering to separate racial seniority lines in collective-bargaining arrangements; (4) exclusion of Negroes from vital apprenticeship programs.

"The pattern of union responsibility for job discrimination," says Mr. Hill, "is not limited to any one area of the country or to some few industries or union jurisdictions, but involves many unions in a wide variety of occupations in manufacturing industries, skilled crafts, railroads, and maritime trades * * *. There is a profound disparity between the public image presented by the national AFL–CIO and the day-to-day realities as experienced by many Negro workers." The NAACP's attack, says Mr. Hill, will be two-pronged—through the courts and the National Labor Relations Board. Its purpose "is to attempt to devolp a new body of labor law or legal theory which in the long run will be as significant as the Supreme Court decision in the school segregation cases."

The AFL–CIO, as might be expected, emphatically denies Mr. Hill's charges. Boris Shishkin, director of the Department of Civil Rights, terms them "uncalled-for distortion." "There is discrimination," says Mr. Shishkin, "but it is much greater in non-unionized employment. We are making every effort to eliminate it in union ranks." He points to the detailed civil-rights program adopted by the AFL-CIO's convention last December, to labor's long espousal of civil rights and to the success (in some cases) of the AFL-CIO's efforts to eliminate discrimination at the State and local levels.

"There are 131 national and international unions in the AFL-CIO," Mr. Shiskin says. "We have no punitive powers. All we can do is to throw the unions out. What we are trying to do is to bring them around to our point of view, and we are making a great deal of headway in that area."

Even so, there is widespread discrimination in union ranks, especially among the old AFL craft unions. Last year the U.S. Civil Rights Commission reported: "A 1957 Urban League study of Negro membership in construction unions in 32 cities showed a uniform pattern of exclusion from certain craft unions. Commission studies reveal the same pattern." Negroes still are generally excluded from white plumbers, electricians, and steamfitters locals, among others. The situation isn't much better among the sheet-metal workers and carpenters.

When the affluent AFL–CIO put up its handsome new national headquarters building in Washington a few years ago, Negro electricians were excluded from working on the building by the lily-white local 26 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. The same situation applied later to the new House of Representatives Office building and to Federal Office Building No. 6, where the Office of Education and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration are housed, although one Negro was temporarily employed. Local 26 is an AFL-CIO affiliate, but to this day it does not have a single Negro member.

If some of the fervor that characterized organized labor's origins could be aroused in behalf of the Negro, labor could put its house in order much faster. At the same time it could wipe out an ugly blot on democracy's record.

The Story of Our First Surrender in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is important to refresh the recollection of the American people concerning the powerful Communist buildup in Cuba.

In the September 17 issue of U.S. News & World Report, President Kennedy's decision to retreat from the Communists is described in detail. His decision is now plaguing the United States through our shattered prestige, resulting from this inept handling of an invasion which could have been successful, with very few casualties.

The U.S. News & World Report article follows:

THE INSIDE STORY—KENNEDY'S FATEFUL DECISION: THE NIGHT THE REDS CLINCHED CUBA

Look at Castro's Cuba now: a Communist base. To see how it got that way: Look back to 1961—to an invasion that failed and left Castro even stronger than before. The story of that invasion, as revealed by insiders, shows the far-reaching effect of a President's decision.

A fateful decision, made by President Kennedy on Sunday, April 16, 1961, is rising now to plague the United States.

On that Sunday evening, an armed force of Cuban refugees, trained by the United States, was at sea, sailing secretly to invade Fidel Castro's Cuba. The American President, a few hours earlier, had given final approval to that invasion.

Only the day before, on April 15, a surprise attack by B–26 bombing planes belonging to the invaders had knocked out all but seven planes of Castro's tiny air force.

A second air strike was scheduled for Monday morning, April 17. It was to coincide with the landing of the invaders. It was supposed to finish the job of wiping out Castro's planes and to provide air support for the invasion.

Secure in this assurance of air support, the invaders went ashore in the early-morning darkness of Monday, April 17. Their landing was successful: 1,400 armed men reached the beaches of a place called the Bay of Pigs.

In the battle that followed, Castro's troops suffered heavy casualties. Castro's tanks, coming up to the battle, were sitting ducks for an attack by air. Confidently, the little invading force waited for its air support to arrive. Its leaders had assurance of that support. It was provided in the pre-invasion planning.

Hours before, on Sunday evening, a small but potent force of B–26's was sitting in readiness on an airfield 500 miles away, waiting to take off for the Bay of Pigs. Those were planes of the invasion force, with Cuban pilots.

But those planes didn't take off.

The reason: President Kennedy forbade their use.

That was the fateful decision President Kennedy made on that Sunday evening. He decided that the anti-Castro Cubans could not have the support of their own air force during the invasion. Without that support, the invasion failed.

When the invasion began, in the predawn hours of Monday, the need of air support became apparent. Worried, the nonmilitary officials in Washington who were running the invasion went to President Kennedy for a new decision. They suggested that U.S. Navy planes from a U.S. aircraft carrier be used to fly air support for the invaders.

Two U.S. carriers, their decks loaded with fighting planes, were standing by not far away throughout the entire invasion. Their planes were readily available.

In the planning of the invasion—planning begun under the Eisenhower administration—the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff had recommended the use of U.S. air support. President Kennedy vetoed the idea. He insisted that there was to be no direct American participation. Now, with the outcome possibly hanging in the balance, military and nonmilitary men joined in renewing the plea.

ANOTHER "NO"

Once again, in the early-morning hours of Monday, April 17, President Kennedy made a fateful decision. He said "No" to the use of U.S. planes.

On the beaches, in the Bay of Pigs, the invaders fought on. They did not know that an American President in Washington, 1,400 miles away, was in tight control of their every military move. They were not aware that President Kennedy had taken away their air cover.

With no air support, the invasion soon began to run into trouble. Castro brought up the few planes he had left. Castro jets—made in America—bombed and sank two of the five ships of the invasion fleet. One carried most of the invaders' reserve of ammunition. The other was their communications center. Castro tanks, safe from attack by air, moved into effective action.

In the face of this situation, President Kennedy took the wraps off the Cuban fliers. On Monday noon he said they could go into action. But bad weather interfered at first. Finally, an air strike was set up for early Wednesday.

On Tuesday, however, the situation continued to deteriorate. The invaders, fighting without air support, were driven back under pressure of Castro's superior numbers.

By Tuesday night, April 18, a crisis was clearly at hand. Once again there was an appeal to President Kennedy.

On this night the President, in white tie and tails, was playing host at a congressional reception in the White House. He left the party to confer with his advisers—both civilian and military. Again it was proposed to use U.S. planes to save the invasion.

This time the President relented slightly. He consented to using one carrier's planes for just 1 hour on Wednesday morning—just long enough to provide cover for the invaders to land some supplies and for their planes to make a quick strike. U.S. planes, still, were not to attack land targets.

Even this limited plan for U.S. aid went awry. There were communications mixups. The Cuban fliers mistimed their strike. The U.S. planes never got into action. And anyway, it developed, it was too late.

By sundown of Wednesday, April 19, the invasion was a failure. The invaders inflicted close to 2,000 casualties on Castro's forces, suffered only a hundred or so casualties of their own. But without air support, the invaders could not hold out. Most of them wound up as Castro captives.

American military officials who followed this operation closely say that it came within a hair's breadth of success. They say: Given early air support, the invaders could have destroyed Castro's air force and tanks. Defections from his militia, which had started, would have spread. Underground forces, waiting for word of success before rising against Castro, would have sprung into action. When that word did not come, they remained underground.

It was in the White House that the decision was made that guided the course of that unsuccessful invasion.

Out of that fateful decision of the President have flowed many of today's problems. Soviet Russia today is entrenched in Cuba, a few miles from continental United States. Some Members of Congress charge that the Monroe Doctrine, which guided U.S. policy in Latin America for 139 years, is now, in effect, being turned into a scrap of paper. With a base in Cuba, Communist forces are penetrating deeply into the Western Hemisphere, building up their base for more takeovers.

What lay back of that fateful Kennedy decision?

The record suggests: An important factor was a fear of offending public opinion in Latin America and in the so-called "new nations" of the United Nations.

Throughout the discussions of invasion policy, the idea was put forward repeatedly that the United States must not place itself in the position of using force against a smaller neighbor. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, strongly backed President Kennedy in his decisions.

WHAT MILITARY RECOMMENDED

The U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Nation's top military experts, had no part in the actual military operations. Those military leaders had recommended early that, to insure success, some U.S. armed forces should take part in any invasion, and that air cover and support should be supplied by the United States.

The recommendations of the military leaders were rejected. It was the Central Intelligence Agency and the White House that finally ran the show and fixed the terms on which the anti-Castro Cubans could fight.

The fateful decision was a political decision—not a military decision.

One civilian official who was close to the whole invasion operation now makes this judgment:

"In retrospect, the political decision was wrong."

A military man, also close to the operation, said this:

"If you go back to that time and look at the whole problem, you find that this country faced one fundamental question: Can we permit a Communist country in this Western Hemisphere? Now, if the answer is 'yes,' then you do one thing. If the answer is 'no,' you do another.

"But if you weasel on that answer, start compromising, then you wind up in confusion—with no real answer. One thing we should have learned from the Cuban fiasco is this: You can't run a military operation that way."

TWO OTHER U.S. DECISIONS ON TROUBLE SPOTS

Laos

The decision: After saying on March 15, 1961, that the United States was determined to defend Laos against Communist rebels, Mr. Kennedy, on March 27, agreed to seek a deal with Russia for a neutral Laos.

Today: United States has pulled its marines away from the Lao border; U.S. military advisers are leaving Laos. But Russia shows no sign of taking Communist North Vietnamese out of Laos as agreed. A Red takeover of all Laos behind the screen of neutrality is feared.

Berlin

The decision: When East Germans, at dawn on August 13, 1961, completed barriers cutting Berlin in two, President Kennedy decided against using U.S. troops to knock down these wire barriers by force.

Today: Red barriers dividing Berlin have become a wall of concrete and steel. Some East Germans escape over, through, or under the wall. Others die trying. United State, early in September, found the Berlin crisis warming up over the Communist shootings of East Germans at the wall.

Byron B. Gentry, New Commander in Chief of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on August 17 the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at its annual national convention, held this year in Minneapolis, Minn., elected a new commander in chief. The man who was selected to lead our Nation's largest organization of overseas combat veterans is Mr. Byron B. Gentry, of Pasadena, Calif.

The new commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is a man who is already nationally recognized for his many constructive contributions to the betterment of our Nation. As a leader in veterans activities in California, and later as junior and then senior vice commander in chief, Commander Gentry is known as a highly effective spokesman on issues pertaining to our constitutional concepts, our governmental institutions, and our national security.

In addition to his public service as a VFW leader, Mr. Gentry in private life is recognized as a distinguished lawyer and is currently the city prosecutor of Pasadena, Calif., a position he has held for 10 years.

It will also be recalled that Commander Gentry was a nationally known star of the University of Southern California football team, and had the distinction of playing in two Rose Bowl games. Following graduation from USC, he played professional football and in 1938 was selected as a member of the United Press professional all-American football team out of Pittsburgh. As a professional he participated in two professional bowl games and was a member of the all-American All Stars who toured Japan.

Appropriately, this new commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is a veteran of extensive combat overseas. As a result of campaigns in the European theater in World War II, he was awarded six battle stars, Presidential citation, Belgian Fourragere, and three commendations.

Among his many achievements, Commander Gentry is a noted poet. A collection of his poems has recently been published under the title of "Voices of the Airways," and has received widespread and favorable reviews by the critics.

A very interesting news account concerning Commander Gentry appeared in

the New York Times on Sunday, August 19, 1962. This very informative article by Austin Wehrwein discusses Mr. Gentry's views on pertinent national issues, and, additionally, includes some very interesting observations concerning the Veterans of Foreign Wars which Commander Gentry now heads.

I invite the attention of this House to the article from the New York Times.

The article follows:

NEW VFW CHIEF A POET WITH AIMS—GENTRY ENDORSES REALISTIC APPROACH TO PATRIOTISM

(By Austin Wehrwein)

MINNEAPOLIS, August 18.—Byron B. Gentry, a Pasadena poet, is the new commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He was elected at the annual convention of the 1,300,000-member organization that ended yesterday.

In his new book of published verse, a poem entitled "Americanism" has these lines:

"Invariably the first to recognize
The legal and the moral rights of other men
We yet remain alert to guard our own.
Within these sane and realistic bounds,
Essential to the freedom we hold dear,
We dare to pursue the phantom Golden Rule."

Lest it sound odd that a veterans' organization should be headed by a practicing poet, it should be noted that Mr. Gentry is also a city prosecutor and a former star lineman at the University of Southern California and with the professional Pittsburgh Steelers.

That a poet can become head of the VFW suggests the maturing, expanding scope of the 63-year-old organization.

"We've reached a point," Mr. Gentry said in an interview, "where we are too old and have too many other responsibilities just to gather at a bar and recount our youth."

The resolutions passed at the convention, attended by 25,000, bear on this viewpoint, which is shared by the top leaders and the more thoughtful members. Of 10,000 posts represented, the majority are in small towns east of the Mississippi.

Patriotic nationalism is still the dominant chord. To Mr. Gentry "superpatriotism" is a term of approbation, not mockery. But he said the approach should be "realistic and intelligent."

The group's code of ethics, reaffirmed at the weeklong meeting, says in part: "We will not resort to gossip-mongering, name-calling tactics, or characterize any individual or organization as Communist on our own authority. We regard such actions as threatening the basic freedoms which we are striving to defend."

A high official said privately: "We are taking stands no veterans' organizations would have dared to take a few years ago."

This hardly means that the V.F.W. is walking hand in hand with the Americans for Democratic Action. But the delegates rejected a resolution asking an investigation and a reorganization of the State Department to "eliminate disloyalty and incompetence, affixing individual responsibility for the decisions made," and charging that the Department's policies "served the Communist cause."

They voted to support the participation by competent military personnel in anti-Communist seminars. But they rejected a resolution accusing the administration of imposing a gag rule on the executive branch to balk congressional investigation of "communism in high places in the Government."

Both issues have been favorites with the far right, and the use of the words "competent military personnel" was a cautious limitation by the V.F.W.

BARS BREAK IN RELATIONS

Also rejected was a resolution asking the termination of diplomatic and trade relations with the Soviet Union and its satellites, and with any nation that became identified with the objectives of international communism.

However, the delegates opposed aid to Yugoslavia and to "any nation under Communist control," and also opposed "sending food to our enemy, Red China."

They asked Congress to reappraise U.S. participation in the United Nations, suggesting that withdrawal be considered as a last resort.

On domestic issues, the delegates, backed the House Un-American Activities Committee. They also backed a constitutional amendment to permit the offering of prayers in public schools.

When V.F.W. officals characterize the organization as "middle of the road," Mr. Gentry replies:

"We are middle of the road because Americanism is middle of the road."

The membership is now three-quarters World War II and Korean war veterans, who are mostly in the $6,000–$7,000 income bracket.

Where Milk Loses Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, soon the House will begin debate on the conference report of the agriculture bill. In this regard, all too often people assume that any and all problems that face agriculture today can be solved by Government action. It was interesting for me to read an editorial in the Red Wing Daily Republican Eagle, September 5, entitled "Where Milk Loses Out." This editorial suggests another solution for the problems of the dairy industry and I am sure that it will be of interest to all of our colleagues.

WHERE MILK LOSES OUT

Dairy banquets will be coming up shortly—one in Red Wing September 25—and leaders in the dairy field will be rising to address the dinner audience. A favorite subject on such occasions is America's woefully mediocre record in consuming milk and milk products in comparison with other Western nations.

And this is no joke. Americans like to think of themselves as the best fed people in the world, but we're only 7th in per capita consumption of fluid milk and cream and 11th in cheese. As for butter, the U.S. meager 7½ pounds per person per year is pitifully small in comparison with New Zealand's 43 pounds, Ireland's 38 pounds, Finland's 33, and Australia's 26.

Here are the national figures, as assembled by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, on annual per capita consumption of milk and dairy products in whatever form:

Ireland	1,448
Finland	1,336
New Zealand	1,320
Sweden	1,038
Switzerland	1,007
Denmark	974
Australia	966
Belgium	896
Canada	894
Norway	893
France	853
United Kingdom	835
West Germany	806
Netherlands	725
United States	653
Austria	647
Italy	389

Now why should the United States rank so low?

Howard Carpenter, manager of the big Ellsworth cooperative creamery, touched on one important answer in speaking before Red Wing Kiwanians a little while back. U.S. supermarkets, he pointed out, have such a remarkable variety of foods all competing for space in the consumer's budget and stomach that milk products encounter much tougher going in the marketplace here than in most other countries.

An indication of how true this is—and of where the dairy industry seems to be falling down—showed up in an issue of Food Field Reporter last June. This publication listed, in order of dollar volume, the advertising effort put behind the first 10 product categories commonly found in food stores. Dairy products are obviously far behind in promotion:

	Advertising
Cigarettes	$160,575,000
Soaps and detergents	140,405,000
Beer and ale	91,584,000
Cereals	70,693,000
Soft drinks	53,463,000
Coffee	49,558,000
Bakery products	38,203,000
Prepared mixes	37,645,000
Dairy products	32,022,000
Fats and shortening	31,786,000

Wilkesboro Dam and Reservoir Dedication, September 16, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a timely and instructive address by our distinguished Secretary of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges, delivered at the dedication of the Wilkesboro, N.C., Dam and Reservoir on Sunday, September 16.

I also wish at this time to express to the Congress and the people of the United States the profound thanks and gratitude of the people of North Carolina, and especially the citizenship of the Eighth Congressional District, for the Federal assistance on this splendid flood control and water conservation project.

The pride that I personally feel on the completion and utilization of the Wilkesboro Dam is exceeded only by the vastness of this reservoir and the sustaining waters which it controls.

The long and tedious efforts of all those responsible for this wonderful project is relegated now into the archives of man's efforts to constantly improve his environment and harness the forces of nature to meet his ever-expanding needs.

Progress is born of sacrifice, and sacrifice is the element that makes for a more sincere appreciation of all progressive endeavors.

The community and the area which has provided this lastingly useful project is to be congratulated for giving this

monument of achievement to the State of North Carolina and deserves the congratulations of all. This hard-won project carries with it the great lesson that always where there is a will there is a way.

Secretary Hodges was Governor of North Carolina during a crucial period when this project developed. I am honored to include in the RECORD his remarks on the occasion of the dedication of the Wilkesboro Dam and Reservoir:

SUMMARY OF REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE LUTHER H. HODGES AT DEDICATION OF WILKESBORO, N.C., DAM AND RESERVOIR, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1962

I am delighted to be back in North Carolina for this happy occasion. This is a great day for Wilkes County and for Winston-Salem, and I consider it a privilege to be included in your celebration.

It is more than 2 years since I had an opportunity to speak in Wilkes County. I was here in 1960 to talk to your chamber of commerce—a fine organization which has led the struggle to make this great flood control project a reality.

I came to Wilkes to talk about the development of North Carolina's water resources, and especially to urge you to support local financial participation in this project. I was pleased then when you said you would and I am happy now to see the results of your efforts.

Your vote of 40 to 1 in favor of Wilkes County's participation demonstrated your conviction of the project's importance. Winston-Salem gave similar proof of this project's broad popular support by approving its financial participation in an election in which the five other propositions on the ballot were defeated.

The Wilkesboro Dam and Reservoir have been an ambition of the people of this county for more than two decades.

That is not a long time in the life of a county which is older than the United States. Wilkes was a county and Wilkesboro a town before the U.S. Constitution was ratified and George Washington elected as our first President.

But 20 years is a long time for those who remember the flood of 1940, or the flood of 1916. Only those who know what the floodwaters of the Yadkin can do, can fully appreciate the significance of this control and water supply project.

The farmlands and industrial potential of Wilkes County can now be developed to their fullest, in the presence of an abundant supply of water but free of the flood danger to life and property. The county can anticipate a spur to its growth comparable perhaps to that which followed the arrival of the railroad spur in 1891. That created North Wilkesboro and made it the commercial center of this area of North Carolina.

This great reservoir should add a healthy tourist and recreation business to the county's diversified agriculture and developing industry. I urge you to make the most of all your opportunities because the development of your local economy helps spur the growth of our national economy.

Our national economy is, after all, only the aggregate of a multitude of local and regional economies. What strengthens part of America strengthens the whole.

To Winston-Salem, as well as to Wilkes County, this dam and reservoir bring the realization of a long-time ambition.

Every large metropolitan area—especially when it is the home of major industrial plants—needs an assured supply of fresh water. Water is life for industry, for the farmer's crops, for the suburbanite's lawn. The lack of adequate water can do more to limit the growth potential of a community than the lack of any other natural resource.

Now Winston-Salem's future water needs are assured. This dam will store in its reservoir enough water to maintain the minimum flow of the Yadkin at three times its previous minimum. The water will be there when it is needed, and Winston-Salem, under its agreement with Wilkes County, will have first call on this valuable water supply.

I cannot praise too highly the officials and civic leaders of Wilkes County and Winston-Salem who have worked to make this wonderful dam and reservoir possible.

I especially want to commend the Wilkes County Chamber of Commerce, which has spearheaded this effort since the chamber was organized in 1946. I had the privilege of working with your chamber officials and your State legislators in overcoming some of the legislative hurdles to your local participation in this project, as required by the 1958 Federal law.

I also want to commend your U.S. Senators and Congressmen for their continuing support of this project. Their efforts have made available nearly $7 million in Federal appropriations for this joint Federal and local project.

Many others, I am sure, have made valuable contributions to this whole effort, especially the dedicated men of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. And the contractors who have brought this project to completion months ahead of schedule deserve special mention.

I understand it will be possible to open some of the recreation areas next summer instead of in the summer of 1964 as originally planned. In this connection, I want to commend the chamber of commerce and the county commission for the steps they have already taken in planning and zoning to assure the proper development of the lands around the reservoir. It is much easier to prevent undesirable development than it is to correct it. May I urge that you plan ahead and set high standards for your development.

To all who have had a part in this wonderful project, may I extend my sincerest congratulations and commendations.

You have not only made your dream a reality. You have also been pioneers in developing this type of flood control and water supply project under the 1958 law. You have helped to set a pattern of Federal-local cooperation for North Carolina and the Nation.

This is only the first of the works that will be necessary to assure full control of the waters of the Upper Yadkin. I understand that you are already working for surveys of the river down to High Rock Lake. This is the way we progress in America: never resting on our laurels, but moving on from one accomplishment to the next problem, the next challenge.

This is the way we can get America moving at a rate more in keeping with our needs. We can get growth by planning ahead, by moving ahead with the public and private investments upon which to build future growth, and by working together to accomplish our goals.

In talks around the country President Kennedy has been pointing out how important projects such as this are to the entire Nation. They do not benefit only the people of a single community, or a single State or region. They benefit us all, wherever we live, by developing the resources of the Nation.

The President pointed out that we are one country and one people, "and I believe," he said, "that those programs which make life better for some of our people will make life better for all our people."

I think he summed it up very well when he said: "A rising tide lifts all the boats."

That's what we should all be doing—working together to raise the tide of economic activity in America so we can all prosper and have a better life.

Most of this activity must be through private enterprise. That's where we get the bulk of our solid economic growth—through the efforts of private individuals—businessmen, farmers, workers, and all the rest.

But we must have public investment in our economic future, as well. This dam and reservoir provide a wonderful example of how we can use the instruments of government to strengthen our free enterprise society.

Another example is the $900 million accelerated public works program. This program will help stimulate our economy by speeding up many of our existing Federal works projects and by enabling local communities to move forward with the water and sewer programs, street building, hospital construction, and other projects they have been planning.

Wilkes County is eligible for Federal matching funds under this new program. It is eligible, along with adjoining Surry and Yadkin Counties, because the unemployment rate has been 6 percent or more in 9 of the past 12 months. In addition, all of the North Carolina counties designated as redevelopment areas are eligible.

These matching funds will be available for a wide variety of local projects, although not for schools. An important consideration in project approvals will be how quickly the projects can be started and completed. The aim is to have the bulk of the construction work and employment take place in the next 12 months.

To build a greater America, we must join together—through local, State, and Federal Governments and private organizations and enterprises—to conserve and develop our water supplies, our power resources, our transportation arteries, our recreational opportunities, and improve our schools and hospitals and the other facilities that expand the skills and strengthen the vitality of our greatest resource—our people.

There need be no conflict between the various jurisdictions of government, or between government and business, or business, labor and farmers. We can all work together to serve our country and our fellowmen.

And with the rising tide of a faster growing America our individual boats will be lifted and we can move forward toward our personal goals in life.

This wonderful dam and reservoir shows what we can do. It shows that the cooperation and participation of many people, organizations and official bodies to obtain common objectives is a practical approach to getting things done.

I am delighted to be here for this inspiring dedication of another monument to the capacity of men to build together for the future.

I thank you for inviting me.

Department of Education Should Be Cabinet Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, a topic of major concern to the Congress and the administration is the role of educa-

tion, and the place of the Office of Education in the Federal structure. The Congress has received, and unquestionably will continue to receive, bills calling for the creation of a new Department of Education. Former Secretary Ribicoff advocated the creation of a new Department of Education, Science, and the Arts to bring together the related areas of education and cultural development in one Cabinet-level Department. Sterling M. McMurrin, who recently resigned as Commissioner of Education, evidently believes that the Commissioner of Education should play a greater role in the affairs of the administration. The article which follows and was recently published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch quotes Commissioner McMurrin as favoring a new Cabinet-level Department of Education. Thoughtful citizens everywhere will wish to consider his views.

Under unanimous consent I include this article in the RECORD:

U.S. EDUCATION COMMISSIONER SHOULD HAVE CABINET STATUS IN OPINION OF OUTGOING OFFICIAL—RETIRING CHIEF, STERLING M. MCMURRIN, SAYS SCHOOL OFFICE AND NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION SHOULD MAKE UP NEW AGENCY

(By William K. Wyant, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, September 8.—The United States should have a Department of Education headed by an official of Cabinet rank, in the opinion of the outgoing Commissioner of Education, Sterling M. McMurrin, of Utah.

The major components of the proposed new Department, McMurrin suggested in an interview, should be the Office of Education—now part of the huge Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—and the National Science Foundation.

Together, the two agencies administer a large part of the approximately $2,500 million a year the Federal Government now spends in support of education at various levels. The lion's share of Federal money goes for projects connected with defense and health.

Cabinet status for education has been advocated for a long time, not only to bring order out of chaos, but to emphasize the importance of schools to the Nation. It is controversial because of fears, shared by many, that it might endanger State and local control.

McMurrin's advocacy of a strengthened Department of Education, capable of forward leadership, contrasts with his opposition to the establishment of a National Board of Education. Such a Board would, he believes, bring a real threat of Federal control.

In his brief tenure as Commissioner, McMurrin presided over the streamlining and reorganization of the Office of Education. He fought also for higher standards and voiced sharp and penetrating criticism of the American educational structure.

McMurrin, 48 years old, was academic vice president of the University of Utah when President Kennedy appointed him in 1961. He resigned recently to return to the university as professor of philosophy. He said that he wanted to resume teaching and to do research.

Most of the 14 men who preceded McMurrin as national Commissioners of Education were professional educators—that is, they were associated with colleges of education or had a background of experience as public school administrators.

McMurrin's lack of such background was both a blessing and a hindrance. It left him free to criticize the status quo and struggle against vested interests. But it exposed him to the charge that he was an ivory tower scholar who did not understand the problems of the public schools.

The National Education Association, which has more than 800,000 members, was unenthusiastic about McMurrin at first, but on closer acquaintance came to regard him highly. In fact, an NEA spokesman told the Post-Dispatch this week that McMurrin's departure is a cause for regret.

But the NEA is satisfied with the position of the Office of Education as a part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It thinks the Office should provide "professional leadership in meeting educational problems of nationwide concern."

McMurrin has been emphatic in insisting, like the NEA, that the State and local control must be preserved, but in a farewell speech this week he said this of the Federal Agency: "It must be the chief source of leadership in American education—of leadership in ideas, leadership in incentive, and of genuine inspiration for the forward movement of American education."

In short, McMurrin said, the Office of Education should not be apologetic about playing its national role. He said, "It stands over and above any educational organization that we can identify simply by reason of its being a basic function and Agency of the Federal Government."

The Office of Education dates from 1867 and became a unit of the newly established Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1953. It has tended to serve as a fact-finding, data-gathering and informational agency rather than an originator of national educational policy.

Before World War II, the Agency had fewer than 100 employees. The recent upsurge of interest in education, augmented by Russian scientific exploits, brought sprawling growth without redefinition, to any extent, of the Agency's task.

In the current fiscal year the Office of Education will spend $661 million. This includes $12 million for administration of all research and grant programs. The agency has more than 1,100 employees and is responsible for a multiplicity of grants and loans authorized by Congress for various special purposes.

These programs have international as well as national ramifications. They include a variety of activities carried out under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, school assistance in Federally affected areas, grants-in-aid for vocational education, and others.

Science, the publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, praised McMurrin in its August 10 issue, but called his Office of Education "the most unloved, abused, and timid of all Federal agencies."

As the magazine noted, McMurrin in his short period in office, started a curriculum research program aimed at improving English instruction along lines of the successful science programs carried on by another Government agency, the National Science Foundation.

The National Science Foundation, which McMurrin suggests bringing into the proposed Department of Education, got a boost also from the Russian sputnik. Some of the Foundation's activities closely parallel those of the Office of Education.

For the current fiscal year the Foundation, which has 800 full-time employees, expects to have more than $10 million to spend. Of that, about a third will be channeled into programs aimed in part at helping improve instruction in biology, chemistry, physics, and other sciences.

This summer the National Science Foundation spent $27 million for 421 institutes in which 20,500 secondary school teachers were enrolled. The Foundation has supported the upgrading of high school physics courses and is now doing similar work in mathematics, biology, and chemistry.

As is well known, Congress has been generous in its support of Federal aid to education projects that can be related to national defense—science and language instruction being the foremost examples. It has done little for the humanities.

There are major obstacles standing in the path of any serious move to consolidate the Government's education programs under one roof. The programs now are spread out among eight agencies.

But McMurrin in his departure from office has called attention to an administrative tangle that many educators believe must one day be straightened out if the Nation is to make the kind of progress in education that the future demands.

Soviets Repeatedly Avoid Showdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial from the Flint Journal of September 14, 1962, which recapitulates a series of Russian ultimatums over Berlin and the various excuses or justifications for not acting upon them.

Since it is so easy to let ourselves become alarmed by Soviet threats and warnings, I believe this editorial should remind us that the Communists often use words, not for their truth or validity, but for the effect they will create. The future will no doubt bring other occasions when we will need to remember this Soviet characteristic.

The editorial follows:

SOVIETS REPEATEDLY AVOID REAL SHOWDOWN WITH WEST

In the anxiety over the newly-created Cuban crisis, another Soviet postponement of a showdown over Berlin was missed by many Americans who tremble at the thought of the Russian bogyman. We imagine that the master Soviet stringpuller Nikita Khrushchev hoped that his latest backdown would go completely unnoticed.

Toward that end, the postponement was buried in a yard of threats and propaganda about Cuba.

Nevertheless, the fact is that after blowing hard about running out of time and patience in Berlin, Mr. K announced that he had decided to wait until after the U.S. elections in November before resuming talks about the sticky situation in the divided German city.

For almost 4 years the Soviets have been setting deadlines and then finding excuses not to carry out their threats when the West has refused to be bullied.

In November 1958, Khrushchev gave the West 6 months to come to terms. At the end of the period, having frightened no one into action, he postponed the deadline.

Again in 1960, in the midst of pressing for a Berlin solution, he made the most of the American U–2 spy plane incident to break relations with President Eisenhower. But Khrushchev shied away from a Berlin showdown.

The Soviet leader said he could wait until after the presidential elections and then he would deal with Mr. Eisenhower's successor.

Last year, after his Vienna meeting with President Kennedy, Khrushchev announced another 6-month deadline on Berlin. Again the established date arrived and Khrushchev backed off, denying he had meant his deadline warning as an ultimatum.

Only recently, Khrushchev tried to foment a new Berlin crisis by announcing the Soviets' withdrawal from East Berlin. He insisted henceforth the West must deal directly with the German Democratic Republic.

When this bluff failed to panic the West and the United States in turn talked about a military increase in both money and standby manpower, Khrushchev again decided to pull in his horns. The result was his postponing of further Berlin consideration until after the November congressional elections.

Today Soviet guards in East Berlin bowed to a Western ultimatum and traveled to the Soviet war memorial located in the British sector of West Berlin by bus instead of armored car. This compliance came a day before the Saturday deadline set by the Western allies.

The pattern remains the same. Khrushchev blusters and talks big, but again and again when the showdown comes he backtracks. Of course he tries to cover his compliances by creating a fuss in another area, as in Cuba. But his record shows he has no stomach for pushing the United States to the limit.

This is why it is so important for this country to remain determined without showing any semblance of wavering in the face of tough Soviet talk or threat regardless of the area Khrushchev might pick to create a crisis.

It's the only safe course we dare to follow.

Khrushchev's Smugness Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that Khrushchev believes we do not have the courage of our convictions. President Kennedy has not even been talking a good game about Cuba.

Robert G. Spivack's article and Marguerite Higgins' report, both of which appeared in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune, amply and dramatically point out why Khrushchev is so confident.

The articles follow:

KHRUSHCHEV'S MESSAGE

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINTON.—Robert Frost said on his return from Moscow that N. S. Khrushchev, the amiable ruffian, had given him a secret message for the President. What it was, and how important, we have not been told.

But Khrushchev gave the New England bard another message that was of great significance, for it shows how the Premier sizes up the Kennedy administration and, perhaps, the President personally.

The United States, by which he meant its people and its present administration, is too liberal to fight. Mr. Frost explained that the Soviet dictator regards us as indecisive and vacillating and, inferentially, undedicated. In his taunting peasant manner, Mr. Khrushchev said that we'd "stand there for the next 100 years saying, on the one hand—but on the other hand."

By what logic does Mr. Khrushchev arrive at his conclusion?

The starting point, of course, is the Bay of Pigs and then Mr. Kennedy's visit with Khrushchev at Vienna on June 3 and 4, 1961. There was also former Ambassador Menshikov's appraisal of the American attitude, namely, that Americans would not fight for Berlin. Since then Mr. K., in his own manner, has been saying, in effect, "Berlin? Why Americans aren't even concerned about Cuba."

The dispatch to Cuba of an armada of some 64 ships and about 10,000 Soviet and Eastern bloc technicians undoubtedly has persuaded many in the Communist world that Mr. Khrushchev has sized up the situation correctly.

In talks with American visitors, Mr. Khrushchev has often spoken of "your young man," leaving the impression that he thought Mr. Kennedy was a fine fellow but not a strong opponent.

Is there any reason why he should change his mind? Soviet troops have been permitted to occupy Cuba, without any effort on our part to stop them, or to demand their immediate withdrawal, or even so much as a formal protest. All we have done is to say what we will do if they export communism somewhere else or become aggressive.

The key to understanding Mr. Kennedy, it has long seemed to me, is his frequent comment that this is a technical age, that the problems are very complex and do not lend themselves to the passions of other times. He has said this in a variety of ways in response to critics who have remarked about the absence of passion in his approach to civil rights for Negroes.

Sometimes he seems so preoccupied with techniques one wonders if he is taking a managerial view of the Presidency. While no one expects or wants the President to act rashly or in a rage, there is a danger in being so dispassionate that an opponent thinks you do not feel deeply, or do not care, or are afraid of risking his wrath.

Put another way, the President is not the manager of a huge corporation, of a political campaign manager either. If he wants to hold the people with him and keep their respect, as well as that of people in other lands, he must show by deeds his feeling for principle. That is what ran through his campaign speeches, but seems to be missing now.

It is this apparent unwillingness to stand up to bullying that leads Mr. Khrushchev to equate liberal with indecision.

In corrupting the word liberal as he has democracy, people's republic, and socialism, Mr. Khrushchev demonstrates an ignorance of American history.

Who are the American liberals? When we use the term we think of George Norris, of Nebraska; Ralph McGill, of Atlanta; Herbert Lehman, of New York; ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; Bob LaFollette, of Wisconsin; Martin Luther King, of Alabama; the freedom riders and the sit-in demonstrators.

Whether fighting domestic trusts, or segregationists or foreign enemies, they have always presented profiles in courage. Mr. Khrushchev will have to find another word to convey his thoughts, although his message is clear enough.

KHRUSHCHEV'S NEW FRONTIERS

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—Although it is upsetting to the conventional wisdom prevailing in Washington about Khrushchev's life and hard times, there are some diplomatic mavericks who, undeterred by their lack of impact in high places, persist in the thesis that the Soviet leader has good reason to feel that he is not doing badly for a country boy. Much has been made of Soviet Russia's agricultural difficulties, the challenge of the Common Market, and the pressures to which Mr. Khrushchev is allegedly subjected by the bad, old Stalinists, in and out of Russia. Granted all these realities, they do not obscure the substantial gains made by Mr. Khrushchev in the cold, hard, strategic facts of geography and international politics.

It is, for instance, Mr. Khrushchev who can factually boast to his politburo cronies, Stalinist and non-Stalinist alike, that he has established and consolidated the only new frontiers brought into being on the face of the globe during the past 2 years.

The first new frontier runs right through the middle of Berlin, where 1½ million people who were formerly free to breathe the air of West Berlin any time they chose (and go to its shops, attend its concerts, buy its newspapers, engage in its political arguments) have been enslaved by the wall.

The second new frontier is in Cuba, where (according to the latest figures) some 10,000 Soviet bloc soldiers, sailors, and technicians are helping Castro to install "defensive" missiles, and generally providing the Red army that is invariably required to install Communist-style dictatorship.

The third New Frontier appears to be dawning in Laos, where, with American attention diverted elsewhere, there seems little will to resist a creeping Communist takeover.

Some of Mr. Khrushchev's accomplishments have been more subtle, although they would be properly appreciated in the Soviet bloc where the daily measure of Western responses, or lack of responses, is charted as carefully as a sputnik in flight.

It must have been a source of satisfaction in Moscow to have Mr. Kennedy agree with Mr. Khrushchev's prior public pronouncement that "the Monroe Doctrine is dead"—at least to the extent that the President indicated that it would be unjustifiable to apply it to Cuba under present circumstances. Before the New Frontier theoreticians began thinking up rationale for the exceptions to the rule, the Monroe Doctrine held it to be a threat to this hemisphere for an extracontinental power to control the political institutions of any American state.

But, according to the New Frontier, Moscow's domination of Cuba is tolerable so long as the Soviet military buildup is only defensive. Thus the Monroe Doctrine can be violated so long as the violation is purely defensive.

Not surprisingly, the Soviet press congratulated President Kennedy for that part of his press conference statement implying that those who wish to do something about Cuba (and Khrushchev himself is an expert on the many things there are to do short of such clumsy devices as a declared blockade or outright invasion) are rash and unable to keep their nerves or their heads. The Russians characteristically went the President one better and described the activists on Cuba as Fascists.

Joseph Curran, president of the 40,000-member National Maritime Union of the AFL–CIO and a proletarian who does not cotton to the label Right Wing, is a leader of the "do something" school as evidenced last week when he called for a worldwide boycott of non-Communist ships carrying Soviet supplies to Cuba. This, however, is not likely to disturb Mr. Khrushchev unduly so long as Mr. Curran's Government takes the stand (more pronounced in official Washington in private than in public) that the real problem is not to neutralize the Soviet gains in Cuba but to contain the "hotheads" who want to do the same.

Mr. Khrushchev's self-confidence has not been diminished by all these things. In-

deed, his rough and ready critique of things American reached an extraordinary point in the annals of international relations when he dared to tell Robert Frost, the New Frontier's poet laureate, to his face in Moscow that the American people and the President of the United States have no guts. What else could possibly be the meaning of Khrushchev's taunt that "the American people are too liberal to fight"?

In image-conscious Washington, President Kennedy has gone to great lengths to create the portrait of a man of peace, reasonableness and liberality. Do Moscow's reaction and the gains of Mr. Khrushchev's new frontiers perhaps suggest that the time has come to emphasize the image of an American leader who, when he says "thus far and no further," really, for a change, means it?

Part 2—Tricks of the Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues the second in a series of articles by Edward Scannell Butler on the machinations of the agents of Sino-Soviet communism, and the methods which American businessmen can utilize to help defeat the Reds' plot to conquer the world. Mr. Butler has written these four articles for Challenge, the official weekly publication of the Young Men's Business Club of Jefferson, and his ideas have been very well received by members of civic and professional organizations in the Greater New Orleans area. In this second article Mr. Butler cites the artful tricks used by Communist conflict managers in their efforts to stir unrest, then near revolution in nations throughout the world.

His second article on "Conflict Management" is entitled "Part II—Tricks of the Trade," and follows:

PART II—TRICKS OF THE TRADE

(By Edward Scannell Butler)

Conflict management is political warfare as an operational science. The 36 million trained Communist conflict managers, daily waging political warfare, are the world's greatest threat to peace and progress. Yet what does a Red conflict manager do?

Termite tactics, thought control, mob psychology—these are the Red conflict manager's stock in trade. However, scare words mean little to the average businessman, who may not realize that his immediate profit and long-range prospects are affected by conflict techniques more strongly than by his keenest orthodox competitor.

To understand conflict management, look over the shoulder of a hypothetical Communist conflict manager at work, in the following case study.

THE CASE OF COMRADE X

Comrade X is a Latin American native conflict manager, trained in the Lenin School of Strategic Studies in Moscow. He wears the local garb and speaks the Spanish dialect fluently.

His mission is to destroy a dam which is being built with U.S. technical assistance and matching funds in his Latin nation. To destroy the dam, comrade X doesn't use explosives. He uses explosive words.

Arriving at the dam site, Comrade X hires on as a construction worker (1). He soon hears, or generates, whispers about a rank-and-file desire for higher pay (2). Comrade X helps form a committee which decides to ask for a 20 centavos daily increase (3). A delegation meets with management. This could be collective bargaining at its best, but once "inside" comrade X elbows forward as chief spokesman, demanding, not a 20 centavos but a 200 centavos increase. Management refuses. Granting the demand they say, might upset the labor scale of the entire community. Comrade X makes telling comparisons to high wages paid U.S. workers for similar jobs (3). Management cringes guiltily but holds firm, and comrade X becomes belligerent and abusive. He is finally ejected from the meeting room * * * bodily. The 20 centavos increase is negotiated in his absence. But recalling that comrade X had bargained hard for 200 centavos, the workers feel cheated. Comrade X, "the little man who fought alone against overwhelming odds for our rights" becomes a hero (5).

From the moment comrade X becomes a hero, problems multiply. Comrade X consults his actuarial tables, determines the probability of construction casualties on the dam project, then simply waits for an accident to happen. When an unlucky worker falls from a scaffold and is fatally injured, comrade X soon appears, brandishing a frayed rope and bellowing defiance at the capitalist cutthroats whose greedy negligence has martyred the worker, widowed his wife, and orphaned his six children (6). Other representatives of Agitprop in the Americas—Castro's Prensa Latina—miraculously drive to film piteous group shots of the weeping wife and children. Next morning, the funeral procession is treated to a stirring eulogy by comrade X and becomes an angry mob which stones the USIA building, 3 miles away (7). Cameras grind and presses roll. After the hoopla, the Communist press departs and the dam authority provides a pension for the dead worker's wife and kids—but this doesn't make headlines.

Comrade X eventually produces a forged document, complete with official seals and signatures, which proves a conspiracy between the U.S. State Department and high Latin American government officials to cheat the surrounding farmers, by charging them exorbitant fees for irrigation and electricity (8).

The charge balloons into an international incident. The pro-American Presidente's political opponents, both Communists and opportunists, rise in his legislature to slander him. Pressure mounts. Throughout the country, sympathy riots occur spontaneously (9). Six weeks later the forgery is meticulously exposed. But by then, it's yesterday's news.

CONFLICT BYPRODUCTS

El Presidente, who once saw the dam as a monument to his benevolence, now fears it may become his political headstone. He politely informs the U.S. Ambassador that the dam project must go.

The dam, a half-finished skeleton of Yanqui imperialism is left to mock a ghost town of angry peasants, who only a few months before were anticipating a higher living handard, cheap power, irrigation, and the benefits of burgeoning industry. Millions of dollars of potential purchasing power has evaporated. Worse, increasing pressure is put on El Presidente to reduce Yanqui trade for tempting Sino-Soviet offers (10).

CONCLUSIONS OF CONFLICT

Conflict managers like comrade X probably have their own technical language for the seemingly spontaneous crises they engineer. Here are typical examples of Communist jargon keyed to the numbers in the above story:

(1) Penetration at the mass base.
(2) Identifying problems of the proletariat.
(3) Unifying the toiling masses.
(4) Drawing the lines of class conflict.
(5) Assumption of the proletarian trust.
(6) Creation of the anticause.
(7) Mobilizing the masses in the streets.
(8) Crushing reactionary reformism.
(9) Forming the prerevolutionary surge.
(10) Reorientation toward communism.

The case of Comrade X is a typical example of the way in which one man, backed up by Agitprop, can inexpensively engineer the destruction of a multi-million-dollar foreign aid project.

The lesson is clear. Foreign aid alone is no substitute for conflict management, and in fact is extremely vulnerable to misrepresentation. On the other hand Communist-style conflict management without a worthwhile goal is antidemocratic. Together, conflict management and foreign aid can become a double-pronged spearhead for success.

MORE CONCLUSIONS FROM CONFLICT

Comrade X had little to fear from U.S. officials. As foreign guests, USIA's allegedly biased statements would have been ignored or misinterpreted. So the USIA men wisely kept silent. Even the Voice of America, which can talk against communism, loses much of its audience when it does. Many audiences just don't consider the U.S. Government an objective source for anti-Communist information.

CONFLICT CASE STUDIES

Management case studies by the Harvard Business School and other enlightened institutions, include no pat solution. Neither does the case of Comrade X, nor will similar conflict case studies which could become primary training aids. Different conflict managers will solve problems in different ways. However, clearly necessary for any solution, are trained on-the-spot free conflict managers, backed up by aimed, nonofficial (hence, objective) information.

CONFLICT ENGINEERING

The priorities in Communist thinking are: first destroy the existing order, then build the new. They attack each project with precision. On the other hand our own thinking is imprecise, in that we attempt to build on, and reform, the overall existing order without first destroying the destroyers. So while we build, they bust; and because destruction is inherently quicker and cheaper than construction, the Reds retain the offensive. Hence, the destruction or neutralization of Communist Party organizations—which exploit misery and injustice for power—this is the priority job, if we are ever to have true peace and progress.

International Farm Youth Exchange Delegate Writes From Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on August 28 of this year I read into the RECORD a most interesting letter from Mary McGreevy, International Farm Youth Exchange delegate from Washington State

to Poland. Mary is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. J. F. McGreevy, of Colton, Wash. I have another letter from her, and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

SZOXDRY, POLAND,
August 1, 1962.

DEAR FRIENDS AT HOME: Every morning at 7:15 and noon and at 1:15 the field foreman on my state farm disturbs the peace by ringing the "time to go to work" bell calling the workers from their homes.

You no doubt wonder what a state farm is. There are two types of state farms in Poland: The PGR or Panstwowe (Pan-stove-ve) Gospodarstwa (Gos-po-dar-stva) Rolne (Roll-knee) which means state farm agriculture; and the other type is institute farms. The PGR farm is land that is owned by the state and farmed for the state. The institute farms are similar to the U.S. experiment stations and public institutions.

In an effort to increase production they are starting to group state farms into combines or kombinate with a central head or director. My farm is 1 of 10 in such a kombinate. Each of these farms has its own special agricultural products to raise. Our farm emphasizes the production of grain, breeding sheep, dairy and feeder pigs. A state farm of 300 hectares (750 acres) would be considered small; mine is 927 hectares (2,409), the largest in the Kambinate. The average size is about 600 hectares. (1,500 acres.)

These may seem like large units to you but many of the state farms are located on war devastated land and if you can remember war really destroys soil. I am convinced it would destroy a soil as good as that in the Palouse country and Poland did not start with a soil that good. Everywhere one looks whether walking through the fields or down the road the scars of war are evident and perhaps permanent. As my father explained to me Sunday, "war ruined Poland. First the Germans marched across it and fought on it, then the Russians marched across and fought on it."

My father is manager of this farm and he has a livestock foreman, a mechanical foreman, and 2 field foremen to help him direct the work of his crew of 80 men and 14 women.

You would like our livestock foreman. He is a fellow not much taller than I, completely bald, and was with the American troops in Italy. He has deep respect for the armored tank division and the American soldier in general. His attitude is like that of everyone I've met here. The American soldier is almost a "little God."

We keep on feed about 650 feeder hogs. They maintain the breed is a Polish breed and it no doubt is, but somewhere along the line much Chester White blood got mixed in with them. At 3 months the pigs come to this station, vaccinated and castrated. There are three groups on feed at a time, the finishing group, the middle group, and the starting group.

The swine barn is as modern as any large swine operation in the States. Running water, overhead storage with automatic self-feeders, a central alleyway for cleaning and transporting, cement-floored feeder space, with slats over the cement in the nonfeeding area. Their ration is a potato base supplemented with minerals and vitamins portioned on a protein-to-body basis. These pigs are fed out and exported to England. We recently sold 250 for 19 zloty/kilogram (about $0.36/lb.) and it cost us 18 zloty/kilogram (about $0.34/lb.) to produce the porker.

Most of our dairy stock is young and would be classified as high-grade Holstein stock. The bloodlines were imported from Holland and presently they are using bulls brought over recently to breed artificially. Tuberculosis has been a constant plague to the dairymen in Poland and especially in the Poznan area. We presently are milking 78 cows. One of the reasons for such a small number is that all of these cows are tested Tuberculosis free, one of the few places in the Poznan area where this is so.

One of the most interesting sights of the day is the milk wagon at noon when it passes through the area where the workers live, distributing the noon milking to the people. The shout "Mleko" (Ma-lek'-o) sends someone in every family scurrying to find a container and get to the milk wagon.

The cows are fed a bran and forage ration based on a protein to production ratio. They are tested monthly and milk production records are kept. It costs us about 1.95 zloty per liter (about $0.08 per quart) and we sell for 2.20 zloty per liter (about $0.09 per quart) in summer and 2.50 zloty/liter in winter. However costs are higher in winter. Hence, we have the same price squeeze here that is present in the United States.

The crops are very good this year and very similar to the Columbia Basin area if you can imagine that area with all the natural water it needed. There is so close a similarity that you would think you were in Moses Lake as the dirt rolls when the wind blows, which it does almost continuously, it seems.

I'm right at home with wheat being our largest crop, 136 hectares (354 acres) and most of it winter wheat. Some of the seed is imported from Sweden and this looks very good. Except for the color, which is that of Brevor, you would think you were looking at a field of Rex wheat. My host father tried a Hungarian variety this year and really didn't have much success. However I feel this may develop into a good strain here because it matures early. Most of the wheat needs a good week and a half of ripening weather, however this Hungarian variety is already harvested. This is helpful, because this climate is almost enough to make this "Palouse County farmer" develop ulcers. Much, much rain, if we go 3 days without rain we've had a dry spell. Hence their farming practices must adjust to this factor.

Mowing the grain is necessary in order to let the kernels harden. The grain is then harvested with a "Vistula" a Polish-made self-propelled combine. Our next largest crop, rye (270 acres), is harvested and the straw is stacked. The potatoes and sugarbeets (about 200 acres each) are very good. However, the continued cold weather has caused a problem of cut worms in the sugarbeets. This has also caused a small problem of root rot in the wheat. Oh yes, we have leaf rust in the wheat but so far I have not seen any on the stems. The rest of our acreage is seeded to typical Columbia Basin crops with the corn, which is planted for silage, not very good because of the continued cold weather. Close to 60 acres is allowed for the worker's houses and gardens.

I might explain that a draft showing the plan of my farm hangs in the wall in our office or biuro as it is called. This is so detailed that even I alone could easily figure out the number of hectares in each crop and where it was. Then if I wanted I could figure out how many hectares were out for roads, ditches, buildings and fertilizer pits. Going even further I could figure out how much of a hectare was swept each Saturday in our courtyard. By the way, it's a lot of surface area, over an acre.

With a lump in my throat, I will leave this wonderful family August 7, and join the other three International Farm Youth Exchange youths in Poland at a work camp in Kasmier. According to information I have we will be testing our roadbuilding ability. This will be interesting, I am sure, as this is a youth camp with people present from many European countries, and besides, building roads is one thing I've never done. You might be interested in knowing that one poor fellow here lost a bet because he was certain I wasn't an American.

You will be harvesting or starting to get that harvest fever. My thoughts are with you and I sincerely hope you have a good harvest. Take care and may God be with you.

Your International Farm Youth Exchange in Poland,
MARY MCGREEVY.

The Truth About Our Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, is it not time the American people were told frankly by President Kennedy the actual condition of our gold supply?

I am shocked that there should be so much deceit by this administration on this subject. In yesterday's Washington Daily News, Alice Widener gives us the truth about our dangerously low gold supply and the reasons why we are in such financial danger as a result of the Kennedy policies.

WHY NOT TELL THE TRUTH ABOUT THE RUN ON GOLD?

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK.—Each time the flow of gold from our reserves is temporarily halted, the administration raises our hopes that the flow is stopped. Then comes the alarming news that we have lost more gold, as was announced early this month.

The administration and Congress should reveal the whole truth about our financial situation.

OVERSPENT

Our Nation is bleeding gold because it is suffering from excessive Federal Government spending. The Federal Government is solely responsible for the financial excesses which have impaired the national fiscal health.

The September 1962 National City Bank Letter says that the U.S. dollar is a key currency "not by divine right but only so long as it is sought and retained voluntarily. It has achieved its international standing because of the productivity, flexibility, and efficiency of the American economy, capable of producing exportable goods eagerly in demand throughout the world. Europe today also has strong economies and currencies worthy of respect. This has greatly strengthened the world monetary system, which can be only as strong as each of the individual links in the chain. This calls for policies in the United States that will maintain the dollar as a reliable currency."

We cannot maintain the dollar as a reliable currency without sufficient gold reserves. Most of the principal trading nations of the world keep the bulk of their reserve in gold. We must do so.

OVERTAXED

Tied to currency reliability in the modern industrial society is the private citizens' power to buy goods and save money. This power is being eroded by creeping withholding and other taxes.

Representative Ross ADAIR, Republican, of Indiana, points out that regardless of any new tax bill, "In one segment of the economy, social security, taxes are definitely going up next year. On January 1, 1963, the social security rate will be increased to 3⅝ percent for both employer and the employe; rate for self-employed persons jumps to 5.4 percent on the first $4,800 earned."

Representative ADAIR reports, "With the Federal Government operating in the red and winding up nearly $7 billion more in debt at the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1962, it was truly alarming to discover * * * the total of Federal employment is the highest in the last 10 years. In June 1962, alone, the Federal payroll was up by 34,921 employes. For fiscal 1962, the Federal payroll cost the taxpayers $14 billion—this is $6 billion more than we paid for 3.5 million employes during the alltime peak Federal employment period during World War II."

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce points out in its August 31 Washington Report that contrary to Government bureaucrats' assertions, salaries in private industry are not generally much superior to those in Federal Government. Top executive positions are, but here are the most recent available averages:

	Year 1961
Federal civilian employees	$6,285
Transportation	6,085
Mining	5,835
Communications and public utilities	5,886
Contract construction	5,660
Manufacturing	5,509
Finance, insurance, and real estate	5,035
Wholesale and retail trade	4,523
Services	3,738
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	1,776

Conservative, thrifty politicians, such as Senator HARRY F. BYRD and Representative ROSS ADAIR, are doing their best to save us from falling flat financially through a break in the dollar link of the currencies chain. If we continue to lose gold because of our wrong economic policies, that break will occur.

The administration's chief economists and braintrusters tell us we must discard economic myths and stop thinking of gold as good and unbalanced budgets as bad. But if there is a money crisis, Americans will find out to their chagrin that sound ideas regarded by Presidential Economic Adviser Dr. Walter Heller as myths are actual hellish realities.

House Resolution 211: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

IDEL-URAL INDEPENDENCE COMMITTEE,
Ankara, Turkey, July 10, 1962.

Mr. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congressman, U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our committee represents the aspirations of all Idel-Uralians for freedom and independence; and this is why we, members of the Presidium, are glad to hail Captive Nations Week and to express our best wishes for the success of our common cause, the liberation of all captive nations.

Idel-Ural has every right to be free and independent because of the following:

Idel-Ural, a country of about 1 million square kilometers, includes parts of the former Kingdoms of Kazan, Astrakhan, Nugai, and Siberia. Indigeneous inhabitants of this country, presently known under the names of Tatars, Bashkirs, Chuvashes, Mordvins, Udmurts, Mari, Mishars, Krashens and Nugais, joined together in 1917 in an effort to form an independent state of Idel-Ural with a total population of 10 million, which de facto remained until April 1918. In the past these peoples enjoyed continual national freedom for at least 3,000 years. They formed seven states, of which the three below were the most advanced culturally and economically: (1) Bulgar Khanate, 900 years; (2) Golden Horde, 250 years; (3) the above four kingdoms of Kazan, Astrakhan, Nugai and Siberia, which became victims of Russian imperialism late in the 16th and 17th centuries.

With respect to the present level of technical and cultural development the indigenous population of Idel-Ural is comparable with or higher than the majority of independent nations of today. Reportedly, a number of Tatar engineers and technicians have been sent by the Russians to Afghanistan, Indonesia, Egypt and other Muslim countries to help in their efforts to develop industries Tatar and Bashkir cultural teams had great success while they toured the Middle and Far East. No doubt, without Russian interference they would have accomplished a great deal more.

Very truly yours,

Dr. KEMAL LOKMAN,
President.
ALI AKISH,
Secretary General.
HAYRULLAH BATU,
Treasurer.

BALTIMORE WOMAN'S COMMITTEE
FOR CUBAN FREEDOM,
Baltimore, Md., June 28, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I praise very highly your understanding for the enslaved peoples and hope you will realize that since you are trying to pass your House Resolution 211 my country has been more and more in need for you to include it in this resolution.

Actually it is Cuba, one of the captive nations, that is in more need of the reassurance of the free world that they have not been written off as a lost cause. The spirit of my oppressed people has not been broken. They have not and will not give up their hopes for freedom.

In order to keep alive this spark of resistance these people must know that they have not been forsaken.

I fully suport your Resolution 211. Thank you for it.

Gratefully for the freedom fighters and for my country,

MARTHA ALPENDRE,

SOUTH RIVER, N.J.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I, Nikolay Kaschirin, a Cossack by origin, lawfully admitted to and residing presently in the United States, respectfully, urge you to support favorably the enactment of the Flood resolution to create a special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Very truly yours,

NIKOLAY KASCHIRIN.

WATERBURY, CONN.,
July 8, 1962.

DEAR SIR: I congratulate you on your sponsorship of House Resolution 211, Captive Nations. Never should we in the free world forget the victims of Communist tyranny. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM WALSH.

JACKSON MILLS,
Freehold, N.J., July 5, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As an American citizen of Cossack descent, I would like to ask you for support of the resolution, House Resolution 211, introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, for the establishment of a special Committee on Captive Nations.

I am very glad to see that the resolution included, among the various nations submerged by Moscow, the Cossack Nation and my old homeland, Cossackia.

With best wishes for your work.

Very truly yours,

PAUL MOROZOFF.

United Nations Plan for the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, because of the wide interest in the Congo among my colleagues and the

American people generally, I am extending my remarks to include an address by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Assistance Secretary of State for African Affairs, before the Jewish War Veterans national convention at Detroit, Mich., on August 30, 1962.

The address follows:

Fellow veterans, I am pleased to address a veterans' group today because I want to speak about a country balanced between strife and progress—the Republic of the Congo. I can think of no more timely or more important topic to discuss with you who have experienced past failures to find peaceful solutions.

A United Nations plan for Congo unity was announced on August 20 by Acting Secretary General U Thant, and its early acceptance was indicated by Congolese Prime Minister Cyrille Adoula. Last Friday, Robert Gardiner, chief of the U.N. operation in the Congo, presented the United Nations plan for uniting that unfortunately divided country to representatives of Katanga Province.

Since its presentation to the Katangese provincial government of Mr. Moise Tshombe, Mr. Adoula announced that his government had studied the Secretary General's plan and gave its agreement to it. He noted that his government's only criterion for judging the Congo problem was in the context of 14 million human beings aspiring for a better life, and added:

"We hope all countries will adopt this view and support in all phases the Secretary General's plan, which takes into account our observations and is in accord with the Government of the Congo's point of view. If all of these conditions are realized, we do not doubt an era of peace and prosperity would begin for the Congo, which could, in fruitful cooperation with all nations, make its contribution to the international community."

Over this past weekend, the U.S. Government also announced its support of the Acting Secretary General's efforts to reach a settlement in the Congo.

The U.S. announcement pointed out that the U.N. plan offers a reasonable basis upon which Congolese leaders can settle their differences. Our Government said that the plan offers compelling reasons for other nations to lend their support and that statesmanship in the Congo can put that nation on the road to federal unity and progress.

Such progress, the United States concluded, will enable the United Nations and countries like the United States to devote greater resources to economic and technical assistance in the Congo.

It is gratifying to be able to say today that many interested nations have indicated their firm support for the U.N. plan. For example, last weekend, Britain announced its support of the plan, and on Tuesday the Belgian Government issued a statement of support.

While there has not yet been time for an official acceptance of the United Nations plan from the Provincial government of Katanga, provision for a federal system of government for the Congo enhances the possibility of its acceptance by Katanga. Evariste Kimba, who handles foreign affairs for Mr. Tshombe, said in a letter to Secretary General U Thant following his announcement of the plan on August 20 that the plan "contains a number of positive elements." There is considerable reason to hope that Mr. Tshombe will support the plan. On August 1 and August 21, he stated his belief that Katanga was ready to join a Congolese federation.

On the initial evidence, then, we are hopeful that the U.N. plan is the basis for Congolese unity and can put an end to Katanga's secession.

The resolution of this problem is naturally one which the Congolese themselves must achieve. You will recall the United Nations was invited into the Congo by the Congolese Government to assist that new nation in overcoming postindependence disorders, in safeguarding Congolese unity, and in rebuilding the nation's administrative and economic health. The United Nations prevented unilateral Soviet intervention and succeeded to a large extent in keeping order. It has helped maintain Congolese administrative services and assisted in the reestablishment of parliamentary government.

The principal block to Congolese unity and economic progress today is this Katangan problem. Prime Minister Adoula's government was established under orders from Parliament to end this secession, and no Congolese Government can long hope to remain in office without demonstrating progress toward this goal. Until this is achieved, Congolese resources, both human and material, will be diverted from the essential long-range task of nation building and economic progress. Until unity is achieved, the threats of chaos and renewed Soviet intervention are ever-present dangers.

We welcome the plan put forth by Acting Secretary General U Thant, because it offers a reasonable way to achieve these goals and head off these dangers.

Because this U.N. plan was not widely publicized at the time of its announcement, I would like to take a few minutes this morning to point out its salient features. There are seven principal points in the U.N. plan:

1. The National Government, after consultation with the Provincial governments and interested political groups, will present a Federal Constitution to the Parliament in September. The United Nations is providing legal experts to assist in drafting this document. Under present law, this Constitution cannot become law without a two-thirds vote of the Parliament, in which all Provinces and parties are represented, plus approval by the provincial assemblies. Under the proposed Federal Constitution, certain powers will be delegated to the National Government. These include:

(a) Foreign affairs.

(b) National defense (other than local police functions).

(c) Customs.

(d) Currency, exchange control, and fiscal policy.

(e) Interstate and foreign commerce.

(f) Taxing powers sufficient for National Government needs.

(g) Nationality and immigration.

(h) Post and telecommunications.

Powers not delegated to the National Government will be reserved to the Provincial governments.

2. The National Government, after consultation with the Provincial governments and interested political groups, will present to the Parliament a new law to establish definitive arrangements for division of revenues between the National and Provincial governments, and regulations and procedures for the use of foreign exchange. U.N. experts also will assist in the preparation of this law.

Until that process is completed, the National Government and Katanga should agree to share revenues, duties, and royalties equally, and all foreign exchange earned by any part of the Congo will be paid to the Monetary Council of the National Government or an agreed-upon institution.

The Monetary Council should control use of all foreign exchange and make available for essential needs in Katanga at least 50 percent of the foreign exchange generated in that Province. This provision is of particular importance because upon Congolese independence Katanga generated 50 percent of the Congo's foreign exchange earnings.

3. The National Government will ask the International Monetary Fund to help with a plan for national currency unification, which will be implemented within the shortest possible time.

4. Rapid integration and unification of all military units must be accomplished. A commission composed of representatives from the National Government, Katanga, and the United Nations should prepare a plan within 30 days to go into effect within the following 60 days. Provision is made, however, for the Provinces to retain control of their local police forces.

5. There should be a general amnesty.

6. All Congolese authorities—National, State, and local—should cooperate fully with the United Nations in carrying out U.N. resolutions.

7. The National Government should be reconstituted to provide a suitable representation for all political and Provincial groups.

The U.S. Government believes that this program is eminently reasonable and necessary. It provides for full consultation and hearing of interested groups, and the plan provides for democratic approval of the Constitution and other laws. We believe that if prompt action is taken on this plan by all Congolese authorities, it will get the Congo back on the road to a peaceful and viable future.

This, then, is the Congo situation as it stands at this moment. It is delicate; it is difficult; but it is by no means devoid of hope.

In some respects, the current Congo situation is reminiscent of the young, radical America of 1783, when the Dean of Gloucester said:

"As to the future grandeur of America and its being a rising empire under one head * * * it is one of the idlest and most visionary notions that was ever conceived. * * * The mutual antipathies and clashing interests of the Americans, their difference of governments, habitudes, and manners indicate that they will have no center of union and common interest. They never can be united into one compact empire under any species of government whatever."

However, as our Constitution led us to unity and an integrated nation, so the U.N. plan offers a path to peaceful reconciliation of differences in the Congo. And this country has pledged its full support to that plan.

Today, I want to call on you and all other Americans to back your country's support of the United Nations on this important issue. I know you share our hope and our desire that reason will prevail over ruin in the Congo. And there really is no alternative to Congolese unification except chaos and civil war.

If the United Nations is unable to achieve unity in the Congo, there is a strong, possibility that country will be plunged into a destructive civil war as the rest of the Congo seeks to reintegrate Katanga by whatever means available or necessary. These conditions, in turn, would breed external subversion and loss of true independence.

This is the principal reason why the United States is so concerned with the Congo situation. This is why our policy continues to be to help establish a unified and stable Congo—a Congo on good terms with the West and able to resist extremist and Communist influence and penetration. This is why we continue to welcome all steps toward political reconciliation of the Congo.

Since the beginning of the crisis, both the United States and the United Nations have looked on reconciliation as one of their major tasks. This is why we look so favorably on the plan drawn up by Secretary General U Thant.

Once a peaceful reunification of the Congo is achieved, then all parties involved can turn to the really important job of helping the Congo build itself into a strong, viable

nation. The U.N. plan offers real promise for a settlement under which the United Nations can work itself out of the expensive job of peacekeeping and policing the country and into the constructive job of economic and technical assistance.

Once this transition is accomplished, we will have made a major contribution toward lasting peace and security, not only in Africa but throughout the world.

This is what we hope will be achieved through the United Nations Congo plan of reconciliation. And this is why we are giving our full support and best efforts toward making this plan succeeed.

We hope you will join us in support of this endeavor.

Appeasement in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, both Roscoe Drummond and David Lawrence, in the September 17 issue of the New York Herald Tribune, discuss the history of authoritarian grabs for power and the current dangers in President Kennedy's do-nothing policy on Cuba:

PEOPLE SHOULD BE INFORMED: WHAT ACTION WILL BE TAKEN AGAINST THE REDS IN CUBA?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—In pouring a massive volume of Soviet arms, including military men and missiles, into Cuba, Mr. Khrushchev is embarking on a policy of brinksmanship, the end result of which cannot possibly be foreseen.

One thing is clear. The planting of Soviet power in Cuba is creating a depth of uneasiness and anxiety among the American people which can hardly be overstated. It is evident in the country; it is evident in Congress; it is evident in private conversations.

Quite properly, President Kennedy has addressed himself to this uncertain and frustrated state of public opinion. At his latest press conference, he appealed to the American people to "keep both their nerve and their head."

Mr. Kennedy is hopeful that this new stage in the Cuban crisis will not become a lacerating partisan issue in the coming elections. I know of only one way it can be prevented. That is for the President to convince the American people that they will get an absolutely straight and frank account of the gravity of what is happening and that the administration will take measures equal to the danger.

It is my present conviction—which I put down for whatever it is worth—that the administration is not yet forthrightly stating to the country the gravity of the challenge we now face, nor ambracing an adequate course of action to counter and to liquidate that challenge.

For my taste there is too great a tendency to belittle the problem and to pretend that it is something we need only meet in the future, rather than something we have to begin to deal with now.

At the outset of his statement, designed to put the Cuban situation "in perspective," the President pointed out that "it is Mr. Castro" who is in trouble. This is accurate but, as I see it, exceedingly irrelevant. It is true that Castro's communism has failed so totally and has turned most of the Cuban people so implacably against the regime, that Castro has only two choices before him. One choice was to turn Cuba over to the Cubans and submit himself to a popular election. The other was to turn Cuba over to the Kremlin and remain as its figurehead.

Castro chose the Russians, and what confronts the United States today is not a deteriorating Castro dictatorship but a powerfully armed Soviet satellite which the Kremlin can now use in its own way at its own will for its own purposes, and if Mr. Castro gets in the way that will be just too bad for Mr. Castro; he will be a dead deviationist.

Castro's troubles don't ease our troubles one iota, now that Castro's Cuba has become Khrushchev's Cuba.

Spokesmen for the administration continue to suggest that the Monroe Doctrine will be applicable and will surely be invoked if Soviet arms in Cuba become big enough to be "offensive" and are turned against other American nations. The truth is that the Monroe Doctrine has already been breached by the very takeover of Cuba by a foreign power. On this point the influential Washington Post goes to the heart of the matter in saying: "The ships and arms that Khrushchev has sent to Cuba are as menacing as the fleet that Emperor Alexander gave to Spain to help her subdue her former American colonies in 1818. This country resisted Russia then, it must resist its penetration of the Western Hemisphere today."

President Kennedy rightly counsels against provocative talk and rash action. But the only thing which will counter both is adequate action by the administration to resist and in the end liquidate Soviet penetration of the Western Hemisphere. Thoughtful people will agree, I think, that unilateral military intervention is not the beginning of such a course—but the last resort if other steps fail.

Obviously the Soviets approve intervening to deprive a people of their freedom—as in Hungary—but oppose others intervening to restore freedom.

Mr. Khrushohev threatens war if we do anything to lift the Khrushchev-Castro dictatorship from the backs of the Cuban people. I think the American people are not going to scare very easily.

TODAY IN WORLD AFFAIRS: COMMUNIST GRAB IN CUBA: THE 1930'S ALL OVER AGAIN?

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Is it the 1930's all over again? Fear of war led then to inaction by the West—and this brought on the big war itself. Will history repeat?

The parallel with events from 1935 to 1938 is startling. Then, as now, a dictator—Mussolini—grabbed Ethiopia. Just as Khrushchev today has grabbed Cuba. The West protested feebly in 1935, and the League of Nations voted 50 to 1 for an economic blockade in November of that year. But the United States was indifferent, and the commercial interests of the world succeeded in causing an abandonment of the blockade after 8 months of spasmodic effort.

Then, as now, in respect to Cuba, a blockade was characterized as useless unless all nations participated wholeheartedly.

Then, as now, the pacifists and appeasers expressed in speeches and newspaper advertisements the fear that a blockade would bring on war and implied it was better to recognize the steps taken by Mussolini as "accomplished facts." The Chamberlains and the Baldwins led Britain into a mess, out of which war became inevitable.

CHURCHILL'S WORDS

The United States wobbled then, too. Let Winston Churchill tell the story. He writes it frankly and bluntly in his book, "The Gathering Storm," published in 1948. He refers pointedly to the economic blockade of Italy as a means of persuading Mussolini to lay off Ethiopia, previously called Abyssinia—a country which also was a member of the League—and declares:

"A large number of commodities, some of which were war materials, were prohibited from entering Italy, and an imposing schedule was drawn up. But oil, without which the campaign in Abyssinia could not have been maintained, continued to enter freely, because it was understood that to stop it meant war. Here the attitude of the United States, not a member of the League of Nations, and the world's main oil supplier, though benevolent, was uncertain. Moreover, to stop it to Italy involved also stopping it to Germany."

Mr. Churchill then criticizes the failure of Britain to back up her economic blockade with naval power, and adds: "The Italian armies in Abyssinia would have famished for supplies and ammunition. Germany could as yet give no effective help. If ever there was an opportunity of striking a decisive blow in a generous cause with the minimum of risk, it was here and now."

BLUFF SUCCEEDED

"The fact that the nerve of the British Government was not equal to the occasion can be excused only by their sincere love of peace. Actually it played a part in leading to an infinitely more terrible war. Mussolini's bluff succeeded, and an important spectator drew far-reaching conclusions from the fact. Hitler had long resolved on war for German aggrandisement. He now formed a view of Great Britain's degeneracy which was only to be changed too late for peace and too late for him."

What Mr. Churchill describes as the "irresoluteness" of those days finds its counterpart in what is happening today. Here is a brief extract from a summary by William L. Ryan of the Associated Press in Sunday morning newspapers this week:

"Moscow today just about owns Cuba—lock, stock, barrel, and beard. Inexorably, Soviet communism is closing its steel grip. Challenging the United States in the sensitive Caribbean and the Western Hemisphere, Moscow has given the world a lesson in imperialism. When the Russians colonize, they colonize for good * * * the Soviet takeover will be complete when Fidel Castro is shoved aside * * * this will be a slow and cautious process, but signs of party conflict are clear."

ALLIES INDIFFERENT

The United Press International reported last Saturday from Washington as follows: "The United States has been making quiet diplomatic efforts for more than 6 months to persuade allies in European countries and elsewhere to help isolate Communist Cuba.

"The Kennedy administration was receiving little encouragement today from Latin American and European allies in its attempt to tighten the diplomatic and economic squeeze on Cuba."

A London dispatch by the United Press International on the same day said: "Britain has politely but firmly discouraged any American ideas that it join the United States in an economic blockade of Cuba, it was reliably learned today. Other European member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization were reported also to have backed away from tentative soundings as to whether they would go along with the United States in any possible embargo against Cuba."

KENNEDY BACKS AWAY

Thus, as in the 1930's, the free world is in disunion, and the enemy dictators are taking advantage of such disension.

President Kennedy, meanwhile, has also backed away. He has disregarded the all-important principle in the Monroe Doctrine

which declares against European colonization or imposition of their system in the Western Hemisphere. He says the Doctrine means only resistance to an armed attack against the United States or against other countries in this hemisphere with the aid of a European power. This gives Khrushchev a free hand to infiltrate any country in America, take over the government there with a puppet ruler, and send in military supplies and forces without running the risk of any countering action by the United States.

For all practical purposes has the Monroe Doctrine now been buried, as Khrushchev in 1960 said it would be? Resolutions in Congress introduced last week by administration leaders, still mention the doctrine in their "whereases" but not in the text of the conclusions reached. Their theory evidently is that only if America is attacked should any action be taken.

Communist imperialism is thereby given the unchallenged opportunity to extend its system anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. If the United States will not fight when historic American policy is being violated 90 miles away from its shores, the dictatorship in Moscow may conclude that pacifism has won a big victory in the Americas and the West, and that there will be no resistance to Communist aggressions anywhere else in the world, including Berlin. It could be the 1930's all over again.

Urban Mass Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, one of President Kennedy's proposals earlier this year called for Federal assistance for improvements in mass transportation for urban areas. There is an increasing need for this legislation in many sections of the country, and, of course, I am particularly interested in and familiar with the problem affecting my own city of New York, and the many thousands of my own constituents in Queens County.

The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962 was favorably reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency on July 3 of this year, and since that time has been waiting for a rule from the House Rules Committee. The bill would provide $500 million in Federal assistance over a period of 3 years to State and local governments for the construction, acquisition, and improvement of mass transportation services, facilities, and equipment. The grants can cover up to two-thirds of the project costs, and the remaining one-third must be contributed in cash by the local community. The measure would be an expansion and continuation of the temporary program currently in effect under the provisions of the Housing Act passed by the Congress last year, which authorized $50 million for a loan program for facilities and equipment in an effort to meet mass transit needs.

It is true that the passage of this bill would mean much to New York City, but strong support for it has come from varied sources including large and small communities, public officials, private transportation companies, and others. For New York City, it could mean that millions of dollars of Federal money could be made available to help meet the urgent need for new and improved facilities in our metropolitan area, now served by the New York City Transit Authority. With the thousands upon thousands of New Yorkers residing on the fringes and in the suburbs—and I refer primarily to those residents of my district in Queens County—who must use public transportation to and from Manhattan and other parts of the New York City area, it would facilitate travel and would mean a tremendous savings in time, energy, and money.

An efficient and economical mass transit system is absolutely essential if we are to provide those who live in urban areas with adequate means of transportation. Our cities have been experiencing fantastic population explosions, and lack of adequate transit facilities has caused an increased use of private passenger automobiles, which in turn has resulted in traffic congestion and a transportation problem which is growing more serious year after year. I believe that it has been estimated that traffic congestion and traffic jams cost the country about $5 billion each year in time and wages lost, fuel consumption, vehicle depreciation, et cetera. We must take prompt action in effecting a solution to the problem. In my own area of Queens County, a Queens transit committee, composed of prominent civic and business leaders, has been formed for the purpose of pressing for transit improvements in Queens, which is the largest borough in New York City.

The mass transit bill is only 1 of some 22 bills which have been bottled up in the House Rules Committee during the 87th Congress awaiting action, even after the attempted reform of the committee last year. I believe that this more than demonstrates the need for further changes in the rules of the House to permit the orderly and prompt consideration of legislation, which otherwise would never reach the floor for debate. It is my understanding that an effort to bring the bill up under the Calendar Wednesday rule will be made in the House of Representatives tomorrow, and I shall certainly do whatever I can to force consideration of this legislation. I sincerely hope that it will be possible for the majority of my colleagues to support this move to bring this necessary and desirable bill before us.

Fire Island National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 11, the New York World-Telegram and Sun wrote an excellent editorial on the question of Fire Island and the importance of bringing a portion of the island into the national park system.

The New York World-Telegram and Sun has been progressive and ahead of the times on this subject, as on many others.

The article follows:

FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL PARK

In the few weeks since he announced it, Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of Manhattan, has drawn heavy popular support for his proposal to establish Fire Island as a national park.

This is LINDSAY's alternative to the Robert Moses plan to build a highway on Fire Island as a means of controlling erosion. The highway proposal is bitterly assailed by many, and probably most, residents of the island and nearby communities—and by visitors and prospective visitors throughout the metropolitan area.

Moses could be 100 percent right from the engineering standpoint, but his plan bats just about zero in emotional and esthetic appeal—or even sufferance.

Under the circumstances, a sensible alternative becomes a must. Representative LINDSAY seems to have it.

Congress' approval last year of the Cape Cod National Seashore bill was designed to protect the beaches and dunes against both natural erosion and commercial ruination. The same principle motivates support for Representative LINDSAY's Fire Island bill.

Congress should give that bill at least its preliminary blessing before this session adjourns.

Chester Bowles Found

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people were wondering what had happened to Chester Bowles. No one had heard of him since he spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on his African jaunt.

This is the same individual who was the disappointed nominee for Secretary of State and was shifted almost daily within the Department of State. He is one of the best friends Communist China has.

Sunday, in a speech at Pittsburgh, Mr. Bowles called all those who want to protect our American rights "hot blooded and hot headed extremists." This is the same Chester Bowles who advocated our surrender in Laos and who is dedicated to defeatism insofar as communism is concerned.

It is no wonder that in the September 18 editorial of the New York Herald Tribune it is aptly pointed out that Kennedy censorship of this subject is not the answer. Let there be free discussion.

The editorial follows:

TYING OUR HANDS ON CUBA

The Kennedy administration has still a good deal to learn about the conduct of foreign affairs.

Apparently regarding criticisms of its stand on Cuba as simply campaign material, the President and his associates are dealing with the question as if it were a domestic issue. That is to say, Mr. Kennedy, and more recently, Chester Bowles, have devoted more energy to castigating critics at home than to warning opponents abroad.

This is unnecessary, unwise and dangerous.

The President bears a very heavy responsibility. As a man, it is quite understandable that he should feel annoyed at those who jog his elbow while he is working, particularly if he believes the jogging will have a political effect. But as the President, he cannot permit this annoyance, above all in matters of foreign affairs, to show in his own utterances, or those of his subordinates in the administration.

There are concrete reasons why, in the case of Cuba, it is wrong for the administration to denounce those who call for action now as "extremists," who play "directly into the hands of our adversaries," to use Mr. Bowles' words.

Mr. Kennedy himself has admitted openly that the situation in Cuba, as a result of the Soviet intervention there, is potentially dangerous. He has set up certain criteria which would call for strong action by the United States. Where he differs from his critics, then, is only that they want strong measures now, while the President may want them later.

This is, to be sure, a very important difference. But it is not important enough to justify the terms that have been used by the President and Mr. Bowles. Those expressions may be taken by the American public as an indication that the Cuban question is not serious now, and probably never will be; in other words, the President may want the popular emotion and will to sustain vigorous steps some day—and find only apathy.

Even more dangerous is the virtual certainty that Messrs. Khrushchev and Castro will take the President's strictures on the extremists more seriously than his warnings against converting Cuba into an offensive Soviet base. That could create the very crisis the President is trying to avoid by his studied moderation toward the Soviets.

Very few will envy Mr. Kennedy his joint and often contradictory task of acting as head of a major political party and as President of all the United States. But part of that task is to let politicians and publicists fight out these issues, if they wish, as party matters, while he confines himself and those who speak for him to higher levels.

The President can and should affirm the policy he proposes to execute. He can, if he sees fit, state the case against any alternative course. But to beat those who argue the alternatives over the head does not channel the powerful currents of public opinion toward ends useful for the Nation and for peace. Rather, it wastes them in confusion and internal strife.

Tax Credit Needed for Cost of Health and Accident Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1962, I introduced a bill—H.R. 12693—to provide a 20-percent tax credit for premiums paid by the taxpayer for health and accident insurance. The 20-percent credit is the equivalent of allowing a full deduction for insurance costs for a taxpayer in the first tax bracket.

This bill is intended to serve a twofold purpose: First, it remedies an inequity in the provision of existing tax law providing for a medical deduction; second, it will encourage more persons to obtain accident and health insurance.

The medical expense deduction presently available is confined to expenses in excess of 3 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. This penalizes the taxpayer who insures himself and his family through accident and health insurance.

For example, taxpayer A, whose income consists of wages of $5,000 per year, purchases a medical insurance plan at a cost of $150 per year. Since $150 is not in excess of 3 percent of $5,000, he would not be allowed a medical deduction in any year for the cost of his medical plan. Taxpayer A continues the plan for 5 years at a total cost of $750. In none of the years was he able to deduct this as a medical expense. In the fifth year, he incurs $750 of medical expenses. This $750 of medical expenses is covered by his insurance. He gets no deduction because his medical expense was covered by insurance, although he has paid out a total of $750 over the 5 years for the coverage.

On the other hand, taxpayer B, who has the same $5,000 income as our first taxpayer, has no medical insurance. Taxpayer B deposits $150 a year in a savings account, on which he earns interest. In the fifth year, taxpayer B also incurs $750 of medical expenses. He uses the $750 which he has saved to pay his medical bill. The first $150—3 percent of his income—is not includible as a medical deduction. Taxpayer B subtracts this $150 from his $750 medical bill, and takes a medical deduction for the balance—$600.

Thus, while both taxpayer A and taxpayer B had identical annual incomes and medical costs, B gets the benefit of interest earned while his $750 was invested, plus a tax deduction of $600. From this simple illustration it is apparent that the present medical deduction favors the uninsured taxpayer, to the detriment of the insured taxpayer.

While I have taken taxpayers with an income of $5,000 for purposes of comparison, the effect is the same irrespective of the taxpayer's income. The taxpayers who carry medical insurance are penalized under the Federal tax laws because those taxpayers will not obtain any benefit from the medical deduction, while the taxpayers who do not carry medical insurance will have the benefit of a tax deduction if their medical expense in any year exceeds 3 percent of their income. Taxpayer A is, in effect, penalized for protecting the Government's revenues against the risk of a medical deduction.

In providing a tax credit for medical insurance for the taxpayer, the bill includes amounts paid by the individual for himself, his spouse, his parents, his spouse's parents, and his dependents. Thus, whether or not his, or his spouse's parents qualify as dependents within the meaning of our tax laws, the taxpayer would be permitted to claim the 20 percent credit. This will act as an incentive for children to adequately insure their parents against a major illness.

The effect of this will be to encourage individuals to provide for adequate medical protection: First, for themselves; second, for those dependent upon them; third, and for those who might later become dependent upon them, and, fourth, beyond this, it will encourage individuals to provide for adequate medical insurance in advance of their old age.

Some may find that if they waited until age 65 or over to take out medical insurance, the cost would be such that adequate coverage is not within their means. This credit would apply to the purchase of level-premium policies or paid-up policies during their younger years which would provide health insurance coverage for their later years.

In providing for a credit instead of a deduction, the bill would still permit the taxpayer to use the tax tables or to take advantage of the standard deduction. The standard deduction—which is reflected in the tax tables—is the equivalent of a deduction of 10 percent of the adjusted gross income. This use of the tables makes it unnecessary for the taxpayer to itemize all his personal deductions. It is in lieu of any other deductions permitted under our tax laws—such as charitable deductions, interest payments, personal taxes, and nonbusiness casualty losses. If medical insurance premiums are treated as an additional personal deduction, the 37 million taxpayers who today elect to use the standard deduction and the tax tables would either lose the benefit of the insurance deduction or the simplicity of the standard deduction and the use of the tax tables. They would have to account for each and every item of personal expense allowable as a deduction. This would materially complicate the filing of returns, particularly for those in the lower tax brackets.

On the other hand, with a 20-percent tax credit for medical insurance, the taxpayer who had an income of $5,000 would still be entitled to the $500 standard deduction. The tax credit provided by my bill would be taken in addition to—not in lieu of—the standard deduction. In other words, the medical insurance credit would be treated in the same manner as the 4-percent credit for dividends received and the $1,200 retirement income credit, both of which are taken in addition to the standard deduction.

In recent months, we have heard a lot about establishing a Government plan of so-called medical insurance for those age 65 and over through the social security system. The Kennedy administration's proposal, embodied in the King-Anderson bill, would be financed through an increase in the social security tax, under the control of the Federal Government.

The Kennedy administration's plan—which was voted down by the Senate—applied only to those age 65 and over.

Furthermore, it offered them only limited coverage. It did not cover doctors' or surgeons' fees, drugs prescribed outside the hospital, or dental care—to name a few. It was even limited in its in-hospital care in that the individual must pay the first $20 to $90 of hospital services—$10 per day for the first 9 days, with a $20 minimum. The Kennedy administration's plan at most would only cover 25 percent of the medical needs of our elderly. The remaining 75 percent of their medical needs would go unattended.

We must recognize that medical care is not solely a problem for those under the social security system, or those 65 years of age. A major illness can befall both young and old. Legislation which limits relief to a segment of the population is deficient. A young father may be just as hard pressed to meet the expense of illness in his family as would the retired person who himself became ill. The bill I have introduced provides tax relief for meeting the medical expenses of both through private insurance. It does not attempt to socialize medical insurance as the Kennedy administration would do.

This bill makes no attempt to regiment our elderly citizens into a Government-conceived, adopted and controlled system of compulsory health insurance. It does not require that the taxpayer's insurance conform to certain standards set by the Federal Government before favorable tax treatment can be obtained. Many of our elderly citizens are at present adequately providing for themselves through private plans of their own choosing, and prefer to continue to do so. This bill recognizes that it is the right of the individual—young and old—to select the type of insurance program which best meets his needs—and to select it in a free and competitive marketplace.

H.R. 12963 approaches the problem through the encouragement of private insurance—without Government interference and control. Unlike other concepts, it realizes that it is not only the role of the Government to encourage adequate health protection among those age 65 and over, but that our Nation is faced with a problem which transcends both age and economic standards. The bill would encourage individuals of all ages and income levels to provide health and accident insurance as a means of protecting themselves against catastrophic and prolonged illnesses.

The bill advances one of the needs recognized recently in the Republican Declaration of Principles and Policy, wherein it was stated:

> Effective tax relief for medical and hospital insurance should be given to all. We support government action to increase the coverage of voluntary insurance plans and to help older citizens having difficulty meeting the costs of adequate coverage.

We have made tremendous gains in public acceptance of health and accident insurance over the past decade. The problem is that medical expenses are so treated under existing law that the taxpayer, instead of being given an incentive to enroll himself or his family in a medical plan, is penalized for doing so. Recognition in the tax laws of the desirability of private health insurance is long overdue. The tax credit I propose, by correcting this inequity, would build on the gains we have made in the field of private health insurance.

Conversation Piece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following article by Marguerite Wright, women's editor, Capital Press, Salem, Oreg.:

CONVERSATION PIECE

(By Marguerite W. Wright)

For thousands of Oregon housewives (and hundreds of thousands more throughout the country) summer vacation time does not mean the traditional 2 weeks of family togetherness, with excited planning of trips to mountains or beaches.

It means 2 weeks of Army Reserve or National Guard summer camp training for the head of the house, and 2 weeks of waiting for daddy to come home for the family.

To the average civilian citizen, the significance of this simple fact is little known and little understood. Yet it is a fact that vitally affects the welfare and security of every American family, including yours and mine.

What the training of reservists and guardsmen means to all of us should be better understood by all Americans, not just from the standpoint of the families involved.

As the wife of an Army reservist with 16 years' experience, perhaps I can explain some of the factors in a widely misunderstood situation.

GRAND STRATEGY

The fact that this Nation may, at any time, become involved in war is, I think, generally accepted by the American public. This is why the taxpayers, through Congress, are willing to invest billions of dollars in defense, and that is why the opponents of nuclear weapons testing have had little response from the general public.

The majority of Americans do not seem to think they will be directly involved in all-out nuclear war (the holocaust of world war III) anytime in the near future, else they would not be so apathetic about building personal fallout shelters. But they do seem to take it more or less for granted that this Nation will, inevitably, as part of its role as a major world power and leader of the free world, be forced to take part in limited military conflicts, such as Berlin, Vietnam, Laos, etc.

The military strategy of the present administration in Washington is based on the principle of freedom of action, sometimes called the fundamental principle of the art of war. This, according to George Fielding Elliot, one of the Nation's best known military writers, "requires nonnuclear military forces with a continuing capability of producing reactions both adequate and timely."

President Kennedy said last year: "We need the capability of placing in any area at the appropriate time a force which, combined with those of our allies, is large enough to make clear our determination and ability to defend our rights at all costs—and to meet all levels of aggressor pressure with whatever levels of force are required."

In October 1961, under the presures of the Berlin crisis, 150,000 reservists and national guardsmen were mobilized. "For the first time in history, a President of the United States found it possible to rely on trained citizen reserves to support his foreign policy objectives." The swift, decisive buildup of American forces is generally rated as the prime factor in influencing Khrushchev in his slowdown on Berlin.

And the time had finally come when the United States would no longer need to throw untrained men into battle or delay decisive action until enough civilians got enough training to be able to move effectively.

THE GRIPERS

Of course, there were some gripers and snafus. The complaints of some individuals were widely publicized and perhaps sometimes politically inspired. Mobilized members of established units, however, reacted with the esprit de corps they had built up through years of training, especially at their summer encampments, and the mobilization as a whole has been rated by competent observers as the most successful mobilization of U.S. citizen forces that has ever taken place. The 32d Division from Wisconsin, just now demobilized at Fort Lewis, Wash., has been highly praised for its promptness in achieving combat readiness, after the unfavorable publicity brought upon it last year by a few misfits. Legitimate shortcomings brought out by the mobilization, mainly the snarling of redtape, constituted a valuable lesson, and can be corrected.

VITAL TRAINING

Meanwhile, the training goes on. This summer, thousands of men in the Reserves learned about new equipment and continued their education in all the factors that affected their readiness to take effective action should the need arise.

My husband's unit, the 364th Civil Affairs Headquarters B, for instance, concentrated their summer camp training on Laos, the big question mark country in southeast Asia. They conducted classes, for hundreds of soldiers, on the history, geography, population, and government of this area, which may or may not become a major point between the cold war antagonists, East and West, U.S.S.R. and the United States.

In preparation for summer camp, these men (including County Agent Wilbur Burkhart whose article appears on this page and Don Shaffer) spent countless hours in advance study. Between them, three Salem members of the unit (Oregon Supreme Court Justice A. T. Goodwin, Farley Morgan of the State police, and my husband Tom Wright, newspaperman) read almost every book and information reference on Laos the State library could provide. They sent for the latest information material available in Washington.

This type of background for citizen soldiers, which was largely lacking in previous wars and which is essential if men are to know why they are fighting, is being done all over the Nation by reservists who might be called to go anywhere in the world.

TENTING TONIGHT

But summer camp is not all classroom work. Reservists are required to maintain their ability to use the basic weapons of combat, pistols, rifles, etc. They take part in chemical warfare drills (gas masks out in the woods at night), etc. And they must be kept up-to-date in whatever their technical specialties may be, in a highly mechanized, technological type of armed force.

Their housing was in open tents, cold at night, hot in the daytime, with only such concessions to comfort as some of the men thought to bring from home themselves. They got a chance to remember, if they had

ever forgotten, how to wash out their own messkits again.

And they all agreed (at least the ones I talked to) that it had been a hard working but extremely valuable summer camp.

THE DIVIDEND

What all of this training—at weekly drills, weekend drills, and annual summer camps—adds up to is that now there are, dispersed in every community throughout this State and Nation, millions of Americans experienced in military discipline and training. Stockpiled in armories all over are the arms and other equipment they know how to use.

This is meaningful not only for the limited types of warfare we expect to face, but extremely urgent for the Nation's survival if full-scale nuclear war should break out.

Thus, if the worst should happen, every State now has combat-type units "capable of providing internal security, helping to handle masses of frightened, homeless people, and controlling sabotage and looting," Elliot points out in his recent book, "Reserve Forces and the Kennedy Strategy."

These men, with the training, experience, and discipline necessary for maintenance of public order, are less likely to panic in a disaster than people with no realistic background whatever. The survival of the Nation would depend very largely then upon the readiness of the citizen-soldier.

EXTRA DIVIDENDS

Another factor, which Elliot does not mention and which I have never seen brought out, is the fact that the wives and families of the well-prepared citizen-soldier also would be less likely to panic than civilian wives and families who have never had to face the realities of the military facts of life.

The wives and children of reservists and guardsmen can't afford the soft luxury of "going all to pieces" when the head of the house is called to duty, whether it is on a holiday weekend for which the family had other plans of its own, or whether it is an annual vacation, which the family never gets to spend together, or whether it is a far more serious matter of life and death.

Military dependents, even part-time military dependents, are expected to acquire some of the same self-discipline and sense of proportion that military men must have.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

Families of reservists and guardsmen learn early that "first things come first," and that the real requirements of the father's military duty come first of all. There isn't any real question or argument about it, even though there may be the usual amount of complaining and fidgeting allotted to wives anywhere.

For many women, who have never had to be alone, the departure of a husband for any length of time constitutes a major crisis: "What will I do if the washing machine breaks down or one of the kids gets sick?"

But the well-disciplined military wife, whose husband's interests and duties always gets precedence, has learned through the years how to cope with crises and inconvenience and uprooting, and is therefore more able to be self-sufficient and self-confident of her ability not to be thrown out of kilter by circumstances beyond her control. Not only that, but chances are that through sheer self-interest, she is better informed about national and world affairs than her unaware and apathetic civilian sisters. She is better prepared to face the worst.

This byproduct of training and experience of reservist families is, I submit, the extra dividend the Nation's taxpayers get when they pay for the maintenance of a large and efficient Armed Forces Reserve. It could, in a time of major national crisis, have a great deal to do with the survival of this country, too.

Part II: Cuba's Soviet Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the second article on Cuba, by Anthony Burton, as it appeared in the New York Daily News, follows:

INSIDE CUBA: THE GUN RULES IN CASTRO'S REDLAND—GAIETY IS ALL GONE—EVEN THE LOTTERY'S A FAKE

(By Anthony Burton)

(NOTE.—This is the second eyewitness report on Sovietized Cuba by News staffer Anthony Burton, the last reporter for a U.S. paper to get out of the island. He describes life there and how Premier Castro has won the support of Cuban youth.)

MIAMI, September 17.—The symbol of Cuba today is the gun.

From the moment you touch down in the heat of Havana's airport they are everywhere. Painted in heroic size on a hangar is a picture of Castro fluorishing a gun.

Young soldiers, boys and girls still in their teens, carry pistols in holsters and rifles in their hands. Every building of any importance in the city sprawled around glittering Havana Bay is guarded by the gun-toting youngsters.

Along the coast and ringed around Havana, antiaircraft guns poke their snouts toward the azure sky. At first, the guns seem ludicrous against the background of guitar and bongo drums which not even communism can take from the Cubans.

Then they become depressing, a sight to be avoided.

USED TO BE FUN BUT FUN'S GONE NOW

"Earlier, there was a gay atmosphere about the revolution," one Western diplomat said. "The militia girls wore low-necked shirts and the tightest pants they could wriggle into.

"It's not fun any more. Rigid discipline has been imposed everywhere. The grip of the regime grows stronger every day."

Nothing in Cuba is fun any more. Even the lottery has been stripped of its kick. Now, winners receive government certificates which cannot be cashed.

NO EGGS, NO BACON FOR CUBAN BREAKFAST

Socialist slogans are posted on walls, shelves are bare, bookstores sell only Communist literature, the cost of living soars, and there is nothing to buy when you have the money.

Breakfast in Havana's best hotels is fruit juice, toast, and sometimes coffee—no eggs, no bacon, no milk. And Conrad Hilton would weep if he could see the run-down condition of the Havana Hilton, now the Havana Libre.

The only enthusiasm for the revolution remains with the soldiers and with the youngsters, Castro's main propaganda target.

A young soldier guarding the Brazilian Embassy, where Cuban dissidents had taken refuge, saw my fair hair and called out with a wide smile, "Russian?"

BEST OF THE FOOD GOES TO YOUTHS

Told, "No, English," his smile faded. A pretty militia girl, her uniform unable to discipline her abundant curves, asked the same question. To the indoctrinated youngsters, the Russians are saviors come to help the island against the Yanqui imperialist aggressors.

Young students live in the plush homes abandoned by the wealthy and they get the best of what food there is.

When I left Cuba Sunday, hundreds of students were setting off into the hills to pick coffee. For them it was a great adventure and their young faces were eager with desire to help their country.

Castro knows well that youth will always respond to challenge and he makes use of it. The scene was touching, but the fact is that last year amateur sugar cutters almost ruined the next crop by cutting the cane too high from the ground.

Youthful enthusiasm was not quite equal to the back-breaking labor of cutting the cane just above the earth.

PEASANTS JUST WON'T WORK FOR SOCIALISM

The use of students in agriculture makes a mockery of Castro's claims that the peasants have never had it so good now that the evil landlords have been vanquished.

The truth is that the peasants will not work for socialism. Before the revolution they had a rough life of hard work for little money, but they ate well enough, they were clothed and they were left alone.

Now, even when they earn money, there is nothing to buy on their trips into town. In some areas, they are living on beans, corn and coffee. They have not had meat in 9 months.

They speak longingly of the good American steel in the machetes which are part of their strong right arms. Now they get machetes from China. The steel chips and the handles shatter.

Nobody could support the repressions of Batista, but they have been exchanged merely for another type, the repressions of hunger and something worse.

FORGET ANY HOPE OF AN UPRISING

One Western observer, just back from the interior, told me: "The campesinos (peasants) seem to have lost faith in the one thing they had—work. Now there is nothing for them.

"They are apathetic and intimidated by the soldiers. They are a gentle people and you can forget any hope of an uprising among them. They are dumbly accepting the situation."

In Havana, however, the atmosphere is militant. Now that Khrushchev has promised to defend his outpost in the Americas, the regime has become cocky.

"The Yanquis are suffering from insomnia but we sleep better every day," said Fidel's brother, Raul Castro.

THE NEW LEADERS GET STEAK AND WINE

Already, only 3½ years after Castro and his bearded bravos rode into Havana on a wave of wild cheers, the new class of privileged leaders has been formed.

Of the Cuban people, they alone can enter the exclusive club where they can choose from a menu that offers tender steak, duck, turkey, and good wines.

They wear well-cut suits—Castro and the publicized leaders, of course, still stick to their crumpled uniforms to show their solidarity with the people—and sit in air-conditioned offices.

When I suggested to one official that a Socialist government should share the troubles of its people, I was told that the question was offensive.

And the grip of the regime grows firmer every day. From my hotel room the day before I left I could see children being drilled on a roof below.

KHRUSHCHEV CONTROLS REGIME THROUGH FLOW OF AID

"Spontaneous" meetings were being held in offices, factories, and on street corners to thank Khrushchev for his threats on behalf of Cuba.

Russian economic aid, as well as military forces, flows in so that the Soviets in turn gain more and more power, able to turn on and off the tap of assistance if Castro steps out of line.

The surface picture in Havana, glossed by the Caribbean sun and the bright faces of the idealistic youngsters, might be interpreted as that of a united people bravely facing the imperialist menace.

Apart from the Russian buildup, there is one inescapable fact that destroys the picture.

Every day, Cubans of all types—workers, professional men, young and old—fill the daily refugee plane to Miami. Simple fishermen risk their lives to sail to Key West.

Private and Social Insurance—Complimentary or Competitive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following excellent explanatory statement on the current subject of health insurance:

PRIVATE AND SOCIAL INSURANCE—COMPLIMENTARY OR COMPETITIVE?

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

(NOTE.—Mr. Cohen's many years of activity in the field of social security have gained him national recognition as one of the leading experts on this subject. He interrupted his career in Government briefly to join the University of Michigan faculty, then returned to HEW as Assistant Secretary in 1961. Although his views often are contrary to those of the insurance industry, they merit thoughtful attention, generally reflect the philosophy of the administration.)

The Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program now provides protection for practically all employed people and their families. More than 9 out of 10 people who work are covered under the program. Already, 87 percent of the people becoming 65 are eligible for retirement benefits, and this figure will gradually rise to 95 percent or more.

Nine out of ten mothers and young children can count on monthly survivors benefits if the worker of the family dies. Almost 50 million of the Nation's workers are currently insured for extended disability benefits should they become disabled before age 65. Currently, more than $1 billion a month is being paid out to over 17 million people, aged and disabled people, and widows and orphans.

This, then, is where the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program stands today—in its 27th year of successful operation. And I use the word insurance purposely because it is descriptive and appropriate, and legally correct, although social insurance differs, in some respects, in operation and philosophy from private insurance.

Social insurance is similar to private insurance in that both provide for a prearranged method of pooling funds to assure the payment of specified benefits in the event of certain occurrences. Under private insurance, the conditions under which benefits will be paid and the amount the insured will pay for this protection are established by contract between the insurer and the insured.

In social insurance, both the payment of benefits and the payment of contributions are statutory rights and responsibilities established by legislation.

The end result, then, is the same for the individual whether the insured is protected by contract with private insurance or by legally enforceable statutory rights under social insurance. In either event, the insured may expect and plan on receiving his insurance benefits under certain specified conditions. Both contractual insurance and social insurance are underpinned by law and by constitutional requirements.

Our Federal social insurance program in the United States reflects our traditional concept of individual responsibility that security for each person should grow out of his own efforts. Protection is earned as the worker earns his living. Entitlement to cash benefits are based on and directly related to the worker's level of earnings. In a general way, the higher a person's earnings, the more he will contribute while earning, and the higher the cash benefits will be for him and/or his dependents when earnings are disrupted by old age, disability, or death.

Over and above the soundness of this approach from a financial standpoint is its psychological value to the insured person and his family. Since each person's protection under the program grows out of his own work, social insurance benefits are viewed as an earned right by the receiver.

In addition, since benefits will be paid as a matter of earned right, regardless of other nonwork income and the value of the receiver's assets, the insured is not discouraged from making additional financial arrangements on his own in anticipation of retirement, death, or disability.

An important principle followed consistently in the development of Federal social insurance has been to provide for sound longrun financing. Assets of the two social security trust funds stand at about $21.7 billion. All of the invested assets are in U.S. Government bonds and a small portion of the total is in cash.

No aspect of the OASDI program has received more careful consideration by Congress than its sound financing. No modification of the program ever has been enacted by the Congress without consideration of the longrun actuarial costs. In 1959, the Advisory Council on Social Security Financing, made up of distinguished economists, private insurance actuaries, bankers, and social insurance and financial experts, as well as representatives of management and labor, after an exhaustive study of the system, arrived at this conclusion:

"The Council finds that the present method of financing the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program is sound, practical, and appropriate for this program. It is our judgment, based on the best available cost estimates, that the contribution schedule enacted into law in the last session of Congress makes adequate provisions for financing the program on a sound actuarial basis."

Social and private insurance ar complementary, rather than competitive. When the Social Security Act became law in 1935, life insurance purchases were running around $12 billion yearly. Today life insurance purchases by U.S. companies are over $75 billion yearly, and life insurance in force has risen from $100 billion to over $600 billion.

Certainly, then, social insurance did not depress the private insurance market and may have actually increased the market by making people more aware of the risk to be faced in a highly industrial society such as ours, where a continuation of income to the family is a necessity for its survival.

The same will happen, we expect, when health insurance for the aged is added to social security.

Under President Kennedy's proposal, people over 65 who are eligible for either social security or railroad retirement benefits, as well as others 65 and over, would be eligible for the health insurance protection to be included under the social security program.

This extension of social security would provide for the payment of up to 90 days of hospitalization for a single illness, with the patient paying $10 a day for the first 9 days. It would provide for the payment of up to 180 days of specified nursing home care following discharge from a hospital. In addition, the program would provide payment of all costs over $20 for hospital outpatient diagnostic services, as well as payment for up to 240 home health care visits per year. An individual could elect to have hospital benefits made available to him through a private voluntary health insurance plan. The beneficiary would have the benefits paid by the private carrier. The private carrier would be reimbursed by the social security program.

The costs of this program for those already covered by social security or railroad retirement would be met by increasing the taxable earnings base for social security purposes from $4,800 to $5,200 and increasing social security contributions of employees and employers by one-fourth of 1 percent each, and by four-tenths of 1 percent for the self-employed.

People who are now 65 or over or who will reach 65 in the next year but who are not eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits would get the same health insurance protection. The cost of services provided older people not eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits would be met from the general revenue of the Federal Government.

This plan, of course, will not meet all the health insurance needs of our older people. It is, however, designed to meet the most pressing and most expensive medical needs of our aged. It would still leave a substantial area for private responsibility and initiative.

We believe that health insurance for the aged will have an effect on private health insurance—a beneficial effect.

Insurance against the basic risk of hospitalization in old age under the social security system would enable private insurance to take advantage of these opportunities:

1. Aged individuals under the social security system would be able to exercise an option to continue their private insurance protection.

2. Supplemental and more comprehensive protection could be provided through private health insurance for older people who can afford it.

3. Private insurance would be able to sell more and better insurance programs for younger people—and the more younger people with voluntary health insurance coverage the more likely they would be in a position to continue voluntary protection when they become aged.

Pay-as-you-earn health insurance during a person's working years—whether public or private—is a sound way around the stubborn factor of high costs of health care in the high-risk, low-income years.

The administration's program would make it possible for individuals and their employers to pay in small sums during the working years—when they can best afford it—to provide insurance protection against the high costs of basic health services—at a time when aged individuals most need this protection and can least afford to obtain it solely through their own resources.

This program, in short, is a conservative and businesslike approach to the problem

with which it deals. It is a fiscally sound approach. It stresses individual responsibility and the contributory nature of insurance protection. It relates costs and benefits in the same package. And it does this in a way which stresses the complementary relationship of private and social insurance.

Health insurance under social security—reinforced by private savings and private health insurance and supplemented where necessary by medical care through public assistance—would together form a strong line of defense against the high cost of illness in old age.

Gov. William P. Daniel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, we Texans are very proud of the service that has been rendered to his country by retiring Governor of Guam, William P. Daniel.

To the great regret of the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the people of Guam themselves, Governor Daniel presented his resignation over the weekend. His motive was characteristically unselfish.

The keystone of Governor Daniel's program for Guam was a high degree of local government. He thought this program would be enhanced by the appointment of a native Guamanian and he so advised the President.

Governor Daniel's administration has been characterized by the President himself as "one of the most successful in the history of Guam." Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall said that Governor Daniel inaugurated "a New Frontier program which has made Guam into a showcase of democracy."

And the members of the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Guam, which includes all the members of the Sixth Guam Legislature, said that his accomplishments went "to a degree beyond expectation within such a short term."

Fortunately for the United States, Governor Daniel has agreed to accept an appointment as consultant on territorial matters after his retirement. His experience will be invaluable.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the exchange of correspondence between Governor Daniel and the President, a statement by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, and a resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of the Democratic Party of Guam on September 8, 1962:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I appreciate the opportunity of service as Governor of Guam afforded by your appointment early in 1961. I have been very pleased with the assignment and the progress made during my administration as Governor. This progress is best evidenced by the unanimous resolutions recently adopted and forwarded to you by the legislature and the elected commissioners of Guam.

During my period of service, I have formed a real attachment to the people of Guam and the work that I have done has given me deep personal satisfaction. I have great faith in the future of Guam and I hope that I can always maintain the close friendships that I formed during my stay. However, the keystone of the program which I have advocated is more self-government for the people of Guam, including enactment of legislation by the Congress providing for the election of a Governor.

Upon careful thought, I have become convinced that the success of this legislation would be enhanced if a Guamanian was serving successfully as Governor while it is pending. Therefore, in order that you may have the opportunity to consider such an appointment, I hereby respectfully submit my resignation as Governor of Guam, effective January 20, 1963.

I sincerely thank you for the confidence you expressed in my appointment and for the opportunity of service which this afforded me.

Sincerely yours,

BILL DANIEL.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 14, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM P. DANIEL,
Governor of Guam,
Agana, Guam.

DEAR GOVERNOR DANIEL: It is with great regret that I accept your resignation as Governor of Guam. Your administration as Governor has been one of the most successful in the history of Guam, and it is evident that the people of the island hold you in a great deal of affection and esteem for the work you have performed in their behalf.

I understand and fully appreciate the reasons that led to your decision, and I hope to make an appointment which will attain the objective you have set forth. In the event your successor has not been qualified by next January 20, I hope you will agree to continue in office until there is a qualified successor.

You have performed an important mission with distinction, and I am pleased to learn from the Secretary of Interior that you have agreed to become a consultant to the Interior Department on Territorial Affairs upon your resignation. Your experience and your dedication are valuable to our country and should not be lost.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

GOV. BILL DANIEL OF GUAM RESIGNS TO OPEN WAY FOR APPOINTMENT OF GUAMANIAN

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall today announced that President Kennedy has notified him he has accepted the resignation, effective next January 20, of Gov. Bill Daniel of Guam, who is stepping aside to permit a Guamanian to take the top position in the territory.

The Governor has agreed to become a consultant to the Interior Department on Territorial Affairs after he leaves office, Secretary Udall said. The Interior Department administers the U.S. territories of Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and, under a United Nations trusteeship, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

A Presidential appointee confirmed by the U.S. Senate, Governor Daniel took office May 20, 1961.

In his letter of resignation, Governor Daniel wrote that "the keystone of the program which I have advocated is more self-government for the people of Guam, including enactment of legislation by the Congress providing for the election of a Governor. Upon careful thought, I have become convinced that the success of this legislation would be enhanced if a Guamanian was serving successfully as Governor while it is pending. Therefore, in order that you may have the opportunity to consider such an appointment, I hereby respectfully submit my resignation as Governor of Guam, effective January 20, 1963."

President Kennedy's letter accepting the resignation with regret said "I understand and fully apprecaite the reasons which led to your decision, and I hope to make an appointment which will attain the objective you have set forth." He added that he hoped Governor Daniel would continue in office past next Jaunary 20 in the event a successor has not been qualified by then.

Secretary Udall said:

"I deeply regret that Governor Daniel is leaving this important post. I understand and applaud his motives. But he will be missed because Guam has made important progress under his administration and the people of the island have expressed their affection for him and their high esteem for his services.

"Under Governor Daniel, restrictions which prevented free access to the island have been lifted—thereby opening the way for increased economic activity and for the establishment of a tourist industry. Important public works have been set in motion to enhance both the health standards of the people and the natural beauties of the island.

"Such great strides have been made that private industry is now engaged in establishing adequate tourist facilities. Highways have been improved, as well as schools and parks. Major agricultural programs have been launched and Guam is well on the way toward a prosperous economy.

"Governor Daniel inaugurated a New Frontier program which has made Guam into a showcase of democracy.

"I am very pleased that Governor Daniel has agreed to accept an appointment by the Interior Department as Consultant on Territorial Affairs, effective on the date of his resignation. His advice will be invaluable in helping to draft and enact legislation which will raise local self-government to even higher standards."

Guam, with a population of more than 41,000, is about 6,000 miles southwest of San Francisco and 1,500 miles southeast of Manila. It is the largest and most populous of the Mariana Islands. Its people are U.S. citizens, although they cannot vote in national elections and have no representation in Congress.

Governor Daniel's home in the States is the historic Plantation Ranch, Texas' oldest settlement.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF GUAM,
Agana, Guam.

I, the undersigned, chairman of the Democratic Party of Guam, do hereby certify that the attached resolution was duly adopted by the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Guam at its headquarters in Agana, Guam, on the 8th day of September 1962; that the same has been duly recorded in the minutes of said committee and remains in full force and effect.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of September 1962.

R. J. BORDALLO,
Chairman, Democratic Party of Guam.

Attested:

JOSE I. CRUZ,
Acting Secretary.

RESOLUTION BY THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF GUAM, AGANA, GUAM

Resolved, That the 52 members of the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Guam, consisting of all the members of

the Sixth Guam Legislature, all the Democratic commissioners of the various districts, and the Democratic Party precinct chairmen of all districts within Guam, do hereby respectfully bring to the attention of the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States; the Honorable John M. Bailey, chairman of the Democratic National Committee; and the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of Interior; the fact that the economic program of the present Democratic Governor of Guam, the Honorable Bill Daniel, has the whole-hearted support of the Democratic Party of Guam per se and the Sixth Guam Legislature, whose members are all Democrats duly elected by the people of the territory of Guam under the Organic Act of Guam.

Gov. Bill Daniel, upon assumption of the highest office within the territory of Guam as its Chief Executive sometime in May, 1961, has achieved and accomplished most worthy objectives to a degree beyond expectation within such a short term, and far in excess of his three preceding Republican predecessors, some of which accomplishments are as follows:

1. The general cleanup of the city of Agana after many years of unsightly jungle growth and debris;

2. His support for the revocation of Executive Order No. 8683 (naval entry clearance) by President Kennedy;

3. The highly needed return-to-the-soil program and the upbreeding of livestock, largely through the personal efforts of Gov. Bill Daniel;

4. Active effort and support in the development of the tourist industry for Guam, including the impending construction of a hotel for the accommodation of visitors to Guam;

5. The successful intervention and negotiation on behalf of the people of Guam for the return of unused Federal lands to the Government of Guam;

6. The development of park and beaches for public recreation;

7. The continued improvements of arterial highways and major trunk line;

8. The installation of street lights in the various districts and villages of the territory;

9. The implementation of the intent and letter of section 9(a) of the Organic Act of Guam, which section provides that preference be extended no persons of Guamanian ancestry in all positions of trust and confidence;

10. His courageous stand in cooperation with the Sixth Guam Legislature to increase taxes in the midst of declining revenues which permitted the continuation of the public programs and services now being enjoyed by the people of the territory, without which the curtailment of such services and facilities would have resulted, causing the people undue hardship.

Gov. Bill Daniel is the only civilian chief executive of Guam since the inception of the Organic Act of Guam who has been commended twice officially by the Guam Legislature which is in itself one of the most remarkable events in the political history of the territory of Guam.

Wherefore, the Democratic Party of Guam, by its executive committee, desires to express by this resolution its highest and deepest appreciation to the constituted authorities of the United States of America for the meritorious appointment of Bill Daniel as Governor of Guam, to whom complete support has been extended during his tenure of office, the party furthermore pledging to continue such support as his program advances so that the record of the present Democratic Governor shall remain one unparalleled in the history of the territory.

Do We Have the Guts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, historically, Americans have never been "pushed around." Today they are being pushed around with the consent and acquiescence of the Kennedy administration.

In the September 17 Washington Daily News, Henry J. Taylor gives us plenty of food for thought as to the results of the situation, and Virginia Brewett tells us how we are facing disaster and losing face in South America because we do not have the courage of our convictions.

The above-mentioned articles are as follows:

WE MUST FACE REALITY

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Khrushchev wants us to dwell on the horrors to the United States of atomic attack if we upset his Cuba position and forget the horrors to the Soviet Union. It is an ancient trick. The best—and only—counteroffensive to this is our own bravery. With it, praise God, there will be no war.

Deep in our national heart we live by our fine old American saying, "Don't tread on me." We must live by it now and have security, or soon we will not live at all. For if we are afraid to fight, you and I will do nothing but die in a war that need not be.

In Geneva and elsewhere I have experienced countless meetings officially with the Kremlin regime. For 4 years I encountered them all. You are lost in dealing with the Communists until you realize that great stupidity and great cunning can go together. We are merely rationing Khrushchev as, piece by piece, he eats Berlin. Similarly he eats Laos, eats Cuba, even eats the shoreline of the United States. It is too late for half measures in Cuba, and certainly too late for no measures.

The choice is no longer ours. Humanity cries out for peace and the assurance of peace. But we cannot avoid war if we refuse to risk it, as we did in the Berlin airlift, the Quemoy intervention by the 7th Fleet, the Lebanon landings. This much we know. In fact, forgetting this is what caused us our agony today in Cuba.

Al Capone used to say, "We don't want no trouble." Neither does Khrushchev. These Kremlin khans are not going to knock the world into radioactive rubble, including mother Russia. They have a better idea. They expect us to knock ourselves out by appeasing them. For aggressor nations choose their victims among the bluffers, not among those of sober strength; among the craven, not among those with stout hearts, great productivity and an absolute determination to fight if they are trod upon. This is the key to our security. We have no other.

The Russian expression for someone who has very little power is "short hands." Communists say, "Promises are words which inferior people exact from each other when they are not sure of their own strength." We must not be unsure of ourselves or have "short hands" in nearby Cuba.

We cannot do with words, we cannot do with dollars, what we fail to do with guts. A nation that doubts itself enlists in the ranks of the enemy and bears arms against itself, guaranteeing its own defeat by being the first to be convinced of it. Accordingly, Khrushchev told poet Robert Frost we would not fight. "Khrushchev thinks," said Mr. Frost, "we will sit on one hand and then the other." Well, if we will not fight in Cuba, where will we fight? And what will Khrushchev demand next?

On April 20, 1961, 3 days after the Bay of Pigs debacle, President Kennedy stated that "if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are the security of our Nation. Should that time ever come, we do not intend to be lectured on 'intervention' by those whose character was stamped for all time on the bloody streets of Budapest."

What we must face are present realities. In effect, Cuba has been invaded. A great U.S. naval base (Guantanamo) in the shade of the Panama Canal stands surrounded now by a solid ring of enemy artillery. It is my opinion that the U.S. Navy, Marines, and Air Force either enter Cuba to relieve this intolerable danger, with all that it implies, or the Soviet Union will hereafter control the entire Western Hemisphere, including the United States.

WE'RE FACING DISASTER IN SOUTH AMERICA

(By Virginia Prewett)

President Kennedy's announced determination to act against Castro only if Russia makes Cuba strong enough to attack the United States or Latin America militarily is inviting the anti-American mice out to play throughout the hemisphere.

As result, Latin America is rapidly slipping toward anti-U.S. neutralism or pro-Communist control without the firing of a single shot by Castro.

The Organization of American States, our hemisphere defense system, is being nibbled to death.

Haiti, with two Communist cabinet ministers, recently warned the OAS it's preparing charges against the Dominican Republic. Informants say Haiti will accuse it's Dominican neighbor of "plotting an invasion."

Haiti is thus generating counter-pressure for Moscow against the Dominican Republic since the Dominicans are pushing charges in the OAS that Cuba is inciting subversion in their country. The United States is trying to get the republic started in self-government after 30 years of Trujillo dictatorship.

Bolivia, which has a Communist vice president, recently bolted the OAS. The trumped-up excuse is a dispute with Chile over use of the River Lauca waters. This argument bumbling along for years, was only lately blown up as a reason for disrupting the OAS.

BRAZIL SLIPPING

Brazil, already "neutralist," is slipping deeper into the power of President Joao Goulart's anti-American associates. Sr. Goulart has maneuvered his supoprters into top army commands, but civil war is still a possibility.

Sr. Goulart's triumphal visit to the United States last April rescued his then tottering prestige and fostered his power drive.

Argentina, only 2 years ago a showcase of recovery with the cooperation of U.S. private and public capital, has been economically shattered by the upsurge of totalitarian Peronism aided by communism.

Peronism and communism are manipulating labor. Huge packing plants and textile factories are closed, with slowdowns in other industries. Millions of letters are undelivered in paralyzed post offices. Newspapers are reduced to skeletonized forms. The government is 2 months behind in paying civil servants.

DIVIDED

While the Peronist-Communist combination gathers momentum from Russia's strong

play in Cuba, antitotalitarian forces are divided, disoriented, virtually leaderless.

Central America's President Luis Somoza of Nicaragua has just warned that U.S. inaction against communism in Cuba may "force" Latin Americans into the Soviet bloc. This hints that President Somoza, who inherited a family dictatorship but is now being pressured to "democratize" his country, may soon start playing the Communists aaginst the United States.

President Kennedy's limited defense on Cuba is inviting our hemisphere opposition to boil furiously, while we are a noncontender.

Dedication of the New Harrison, N.J., High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there are few honors and privileges associated with the office of a Member of Congress that compare with participation in an important civic event in a community within the Member's congressional district. A week ago last Saturday, on the 8th, I was so privileged, as the town of Harrison, N.J. dedicated its new high school.

Fortunately, I had been able to procure and present to the high school a flag that had been flown over this building where we are now assembled. So, I was especially honored and pleased to be a part of the occasion, both solemn and happy, of the dedication of an institution charged with the challenging responsibility of training the leaders of tomorrow.

In addition to an address by the distinguished Governor of New Jersey, Richard J. Hughes, the event was marked by three short, but stirringly effective speeches by Miss Sandra Marie Maszak, a senior in the high school who represented the student body; by Martin F. Honan, superintendent of schools of Harrison; and by T. Gerard Manning, assistant superintendent of schools.

I would like at this time to read into the RECORD the texts of these three fine speeches:

REMARKS BY SANDRA MARIE MASZAK, MEMBER OF SENIOR CLASS, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW HARRISON HIGH SCHOOL, ON SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1962

Governor Hughes, officials of the town of Harrison, school officials and teachers, fellow schoolmates, distinguished guests, citizens of Harrison, and friends, our principal has honored me by asking me to say a few words at this proud assembly on behalf of the student body. I hold no office in school life, I represent nobody really, but I feel that the pride and the happiness that are mine today on this glad occasion are the same emotions that fill the hearts of all our students.

For some time, each class, as it entered the old high school, hoped that before its collective career was finished, a chance would arise to be housed in a beautiful, modern, new high school building. Fortune has indeed smiled on us. We are the darlings of Lady Luck, and have we been surprised! Never in our fondest imaginings had we hoped for such a "dream" high school. We have lived in it for the past few school days now, and there are no words to tell you of the deep pleasure that we have taken in it.

I know that I echo the thoughts of each and every one of our present students and the students of years to come when I tell you that we feel a deep-rooted and sincere gratitude toward the board of education and the other town officials who have made this day possible. It is a wonderful thing they have done for us, and for the entire town of Harrison, and I am confident that the keen desire to improve ourselves that comes to all of us who are privileged to live in such a delightful school atmosphere will result in increased learning and more dedicated citizenship.

Speaking for all my schoolmates, I again give all of you a fervent "thank you" for this magnificent structure, and I pledge you that we will repay your trust with a greater devotion to learning than we have ever felt before.

REMARKS BY MARTIN F. HONAN, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW HARRISON HIGH SCHOOL, ON SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1962

Right reverend and reverend clergy, Governor Hughes, Congressman Rodino, County Superintendent Chase, Mayor Rodgers, members of the board of education, municipal and school officials, distinguished guests, school personnel, my fellow Harrisonians, and all our friends from wherever I bid you a very sincere welcome to the dedication of our wonderful new Harrison High School.

What any community thinks of itself may best be judged, not by what the leaders say but what they do, for the younger generation. On this criterion, Harrison may justly be placed in a position at the top for the citizens of Harrison have certainly provided well for its youth by making available for their education, training and social development this magnificent building that we are dedicating here this day to the youth of our community.

This school and civic center was indeed a community undertaking. It had the encouragement and support of our mayor and council. The Board of Education devoted themselves wholeheartedly to its planning, construction, and equipment. The school officials, the teachers, the office staffs, the auxiliary personnel, all gave their utmost in their diverse responsibilities. The town workers in all departments as well as private citizens cooperated to the fullest. I would like to name names but there would be many, and it always happens that one or more deserving of special mention are inadverently omitted. To avoid this I would like to embrace all who helped in any way in a very sincere and heartfelt "thank you."

This, of course, is a joyous occasion for us all. However, this jubilation of ours is certainly more than tinged with a note of sadness. As you all are aware I am referring to the untimely death of our late and beloved board president, Mr. Robert B. Millea. I say untimely because all of us who worked with him and knew of his condition hoped and prayed that he would be spared for this day. Nothing I or any other speaker might say, could adequately describe his devoted efforts in making this school become a reality nor could his contribution to it be properly put into words. Truly, we could very well devote the entire program to a tribute to his tremendous part in making this day possible, but you who knew him will agree he would not want it to be that way. I will, however, ask you to honor his memory in the best possible way—by standing for a period of silent prayer for our departed board president and good friend, Mr. Robert B. Millea.

Thank you.

We are fortunate to have here with us our Congressman from the 10th Congressional District who has always shown great interest in the people of Harrison, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR. He has very graciously made available for our high school an American flag that has flown over the U.S. Capitol. This same flag will grace our flag staff. Congressman RODINO will present the flag to Mr. John M. O'Neill, principal of Harrison High School.

REMARKS BY T. GERARD MANNING, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW HARRISON HIGH SCHOOL, SEPTEMBER 8, 1962

In acknowledging his invitation to these dedication exercises a now prominent member of the class of 1937 of this high school wrote in part—"We wish all of you the best in your new building. It has been coming for many, many years and it is nice to know that the faculty, administration, and student body finally have an adequate workshop."

As you go through this building today I am quite sure you too will agree we finally have an adequate workshop for our secondary school program.

As to the many, many years this building has been coming permit me to delve for a few moments into the pages of history.

In the 57 years of its existence our high school was never housed in a building expressly designed for it. It was started by the board of education in October of 1905 with a class of seven students, three boys, four girls, who met for all their subjects in the office of the principal of the old Hamilton School. In May of the following year it was transferred from Hamilton to Lincoln School where it remained until 1912, when space was provided for its classes in Washington School. When the new elementary school on Hamilton Street was completed in 1921, the high school was assigned 7 of its 14 rooms. In 1934 the high school took over the entire building because of increased enrollment and the elementary classes were divided among Washington and Lincoln Schools.

It was during this period as enrollments increased that plans were formulated to build a new secondary plant. However, 28 years were to elapse before our dreams of a new facility were to become a reality.

And for these 28 years our secondary workshop, our school, was to prove inadequate to meet fully the needs of our growing secondary school population. Our pupil mortality during our peak enrollment years when we were forced to resort to double sessions was 100 to 125 pupils per year. Now you may wonder what brought about this sad situation.

One of the answers to this dropout problem can be found in the evaluation report of the Middle States Association, the accrediting agency for all secondary schools in our area. This report rated our curriculums as below standard and gave as the reason for such an inferior rating the lack of offerings in music and fine arts, and the physical sciences. At the same time the report recognized the impossibility of increasing these offerings because of building space. In fact the committee bluntly stated: "It can hardly do less than to recommend a new and more adequate plant for Harrison High School."

Today, thanks to the efforts of your mayor and councilmen, and the members of your board of education, you citizens of Harrison have that new and more adequate school. As you walk through it today you will note that space has been provided for the teaching of music and the fine arts. You will find

that the industrial arts program has been broadened to embrace both wood and metal work, as well as a separate room for the teaching of mechanical drawing. The library which was criticized by the committee as not large enough, will now comfortably accommodate more than the 10 percent of our school population as recommended by the National Library Bureau. The physical science laboratories are a far cry from their rooms in the old building with their limited floor space and equipment. The home economics department will now offer courses in clothing, food, and homeliving in three separate rooms.

The auditorium, I dare say, is second to none in this area in beauty and appointments. This spacious gymnasium, with its two teaching stations, will comfortably seat 1,000 spectators. Our pool beggars description. Nowhere in this State will you find a more beautiful one, and nowhere will you find one, which we hope, will provide more lasting pleasure and enjoyment for both young and old.

In short, the boy and girl of high school age in this community now has every modern educational facility at his or her disposal in this beautiful building. With a very superior staff of teachers and a superior instructional program, so designated by the Middle States Association, there is absolutely no reason why a conscientious student, once enrolled in this high school, should not complete the 4-year course. The old excuses of lack of facilities or curriculum offerings are no longer valid ones. We are firmly convinced that with the tools at our disposal we can help every student reach his or her fullest potential for a creative and useful life. We are convinced we have the teachers who are anxious and willing to give to every pupil a quality of education which will make possible his fullest development on the secondary level.

In closing permit me to stress this thought that today more than ever before, graduation from an accredited high school is an absolute minimum requirement for effective commercial or industrial careers and for a happier and more meaningful life in this complex social and economic society of ours.

Dictator Nkrumah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the bleeding hearts for President Nkrumah, of Ghana, are saying today. He has just been made the dictator of Ghana, for life.

More than ever, the American people should be thankful that they still have a Congress which may disagree with the President—although the latter would like us to be a rubber stamp for him.

The September 17 Washington News has an excellent editorial on what could happen here:

DEMOCRACY A LA GHANA

The news from Africa recalls a Huey Long story.

The legislature of Ghana, by unanimous vote, has approved a one-party system—the Convention Peoples Party of President Kwame Nkrumah, who has been invited to remain President for life.

The action was taken on the announced theory that democracy means one man, one vote, one parliament, one ruler. Hereafter elections in Ghana will be open and honest with each citizen free to vote his choice so long as his choice is Nkrumah.

Oh, yes, the Huey Long Story. He was asked, so the legend goes, whether we ever could have Fascism in America. "Certainly," he replied. "We would just call it democracy."

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Time for Realism on the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to appear today by invitation of the chairman, Mr. MONAGAN, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on Europe, on the burning public issue of the captive nations.

The purpose of my appearance was to raise eight basic questions related to the national security of the United States in the context of this vital but neglected area of our foreign policy. I raised these questions because I am convinced that Congress, in these trying times, must be more than the voice of the American people. Congress must, in my considered judgment, be the conscience of the American people in the development and execution of a foreign policy that accords with the great traditions of our country. Nothing more is needed to pull us out of the depths of our dilemma, but nothing less will suffice to meet the global challenge of imperial Russian communism.

Under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD my testimony:

TESTIMONY OF HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, CONGRESSMAN, 20TH DISTRICT, OHIO, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SEPTEMBER 19, 1962

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate receipt of your letter of July 25, 1962, inviting Members of the House to submit testimony concerning the captive nations.

I am delighted to have this opportunity to present my views on the issue of captive nations because I have long been an advocate of the rights of all nations and all peoples to self-government and national independence. Such views accord with the basic traditions of our country, with our political ideals, with our moral principles, and with our oft-stated intentions toward all the nations and people of the world.

I observe from your communication of July 25 that the subcommittee has taken testimony from persons having expert knowledge of conditions in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. It struck me as peculiar that testimony before this subcommittee would be limited to a select few of the captive nations held by force within the present day Russian Communist empire. It may be that geographical limitations placed upon the Subcommittee on Europe result in this condition. I trust this is the case, because any other reason could not survive the honest test of what constitutes a captive nations, expertly defined in Public Law 86-90, known as the Captive Nations Week Resolution.

Let me make this clear, Mr. Chairman, I stand for the freedom and national independence of all the nations and which this subcommittee has taken testimony. But let me make this equally clear—I stand without reservation for the rights of all the nations spelled out in Public Law 86-90 in their quest for freedom and national independence. Freedom is indivisible. The worldwide movement toward national independence is equally indivisible. I maintain that the unity of freedom's cause is vital to the survival of freedom anywhere in the world. I maintain with equal conviction that any effort, accidental or intentional, to divide the cause of freedom—expressed through the desires of all the captive nations to regain their national independence is divisive, dangerous in the extreme, self-defeating and a black mark upon the historic traditions of our Nation.

It will be a sad day for the peoples of Asia if, by these hearings, the impression is created that our Government is concerned only with those captive nations which fall within the purview of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. A casual examination of geography reveals that the 600 million or more people of mainland China are captives of the mythology of Marxism supported by the imperial power of Moscow. Such an examination will also reveal that the people of ancient Tibet are no less captives of this tyrannical scourge—as are the people of North Korea and North Vietnam.

It will be equally damaging to the cause of American leadership if, as a consequence of these hearings, word goes out that our Government is not interested in the aspirations or the future of the captive nations in the central Asian part of the modern day Russian empire. I have particular reference to such ancient nations as Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Cossackia, and Idel-Ural. All of these nations declared and won their national independence and complete separation from imperial Russia during the period 1917-21. Acts of Russian Communist aggression which robbed these nations of their newly won national independence must not be allowed to purge the honest judgment of history. Genuine scholars are thoroughly acquainted with the historic struggles of these nations against the imperial encroachments of Moscow. Those who are not inclined toward or do not have the time for genuine scholarship in regard to these nations, can find a quick summary of the history and aspirations of these nations in the reports of the House Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress. Eyewitness testimony taken under oath and supported by reliable documents establish the facts concerning the rights of these nations to be regarded as captive nations. Popular ignorance concerning the history of these nations is no excuse for our failure to give them equal consideration in any deliberations relating to the issue of freedom versus human slavery.

Turning to the captive nations of Europe, I raise the question as to why the Ukraine nation and the Byelorussian nation have not been considered within the immediate purview of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Foreign Affairs Committee as expressed in the letter of July 25, 1962, of Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN.

These two nations have long been considered a part of Europe by competent historians. As far back as the 13th century European cosmographers and cartographers have identified Ukraine as part of the European geographical area. Noted in this regard is the work of a Frenchman, Beauplan, whose maps and charts of Ukraine were published in 1651. I admit that the work of early cosmographers and cartographers may be difficult to include in hearings of this type, but I submit that any scholarly examination of the issue of the captive nations requires an understanding and appreciation in depth of geography.

The world atlas of the Encyclopaedia Brittannica divides the U.S.S.R., the contemporary land mass of the Russian Empire, into its European and Asian parts. Both the Ukrainian nation and the Byelorussian nation are listed as European parts of that Empire.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that it is a dangerous exercise in folly, if not political suicide, to disregard the long history and the contemporary aspirations of the people of Ukraine, a nation inhabited by some 42 million people, among the great European powers, and holding unbreakable attachments to the history and culture of Europe. The same may be said for the Byelorussian nation whose population today approximates 15 million people, but which has no less an attachment to the history and to the future of Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I now come to the reason which compels me to appear before this subcommittee. My purpose is best expressed in a series of questions which I present for the consideration of the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Those questions are as follows:

1. Does the committee believe that the only captive nations within the present-day Russian Empire worthy of our consideration and solicitude are those which, by an arbitrary decision, are considered a part of Europe? I trust this is not the case because no one but imperial Russia could be served by such a decision.

2. Does the committee, in its considered judgment, agree that captive nations, regardless of their geographical location, merit equal concern and solicitude by the Government of the United States? I trust this is the case, because any other approach to this vital issue will divide freedom's cause, support the propaganda of imperial Russia, spread despair among multitudes of captive people, and in the end, earn nothing but contempt for our purposes among the suffering masses of the non-European parts of the present-day Russian Empire. We must not permit these things to happen.

3. Has the Subcommittee on Europe been limited in its purview of this Eurasian problem in any manner which prohibits an honest and open examination of the captive non-Russian nations within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics? There is current public suspicion that these hearings seek to avoid an objective and deliberative examination of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union, either because of the feelings of the State Department expressed in the letter of Secretary Rusk to the chairman of the House Rules Committee in connection with the pending resolution—House Resolution 211—or because an open examination of the rights

of those captive nations would interfere with or impair delicate negotiations now under way with the leaders of the U.S.S.R.? I trust this is not the case, because any concealment or delay of freedom's cause, accidental or deliberate, can only increase the prospects of war over the long run.

4. Is the committee aware of the special interests in the Department of State which hold that there is nothing wrong with the Soviet Union that a change in Moscow from a Communist government to a non-Communist government would not cure? These special pleaders appear to be completely unaware that the Russian empire under the Czars, was a constant threat to the survival of Western civilization, as it is today under the commissars. Russian imperialism—whether red, black, or white—is out of tune with the rising tide of self-determination so well described by President Kennedy in his address before the United Nations. Moreover, any action, statement or omission on the part of our Government which tends to favor or support a Russian empire, under any name, brands us as ignorant reactionaries in the eyes of our proven allies behind the Russian curtain. I urge a thoroughgoing public investigation of what I have called the doctrine of Russia, the sacred cow, and its practitioners in our Department of State.

5. To what extent has the committee probed into the policy conflicts within the Department of State with regard to the political principle of self-determination and its application to the global problems of colonialism and imperialism? For example, a policy of Africa for the Africans heralds our support for the full application of self-determination for all of Africa. What prevents our announcing a policy of Russia for the Russians as an expression of our support for the aspirations of the people in the captive, non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union? We have invited the charge against our country of discrimination on a massive scale for failing to give universal application to the principle of self-determination. This policy conflict is underscored again by the opposing points of view expressed by Secretary Rusk and Ambassador Stevenson. At the United Nations Ambassador Stevenson properly charges the Russian Communists with colonial aggression for robbing Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and other once free nations of their national independence in the years immediately following World War I. Here in Washington Secretary Rusk lends his signature to a letter which holds in effect that these same captive nations never had their national independence, and worse, they are regarded by our Government as traditional parts of the Russian state. This confusion at the highest policy levels of our Government indicates someone needs a few basic lessons in history—and I do not mean Ambassador Stevenson.

6. To what extent is the committee interested in establishing the connection between the collapse of the Red army before the invading German armies during World War II and the aspirations for freedom and independence long held by the people of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, the Caucasus and others? It is time that we flushed up the truth on this chapter of history. What motivated in excess of 2 million Red army soldiers to lay down their arms in the thick of battle? Were these soldiers Russians or nonRussians? What proposition did these soldiers make to the German commanders and what prevented the German commanders' accepting the proposition? How did the civilian populations of Byelorussia, Ukraine, the Baltic States, and the Caucasus react to the German armies in the early months of conflict on the eastern front and what caused them to change their attitude as the war wore on? Answers to these questions have a vital bearing on the question of which is and which is not a captive nation. It would be a tragedy of immeasurable magnitude if we, in the conduct of the cold war, made the same ideological mistakes as those made by the fanatic Nazis in their conduct of a hot war. For the cold war with the Russians holds no less a danger for our country than a hot war.

7. Is the committee aware of the organized assault being made by Russian emigree organizations in the United States against Public Law 86–90 and the parallel which exists between their propaganda line and that of the Russian commissars on this issue? Is the committee aware of the enthusiastic support for Public Law 86–90 given by all the non-Russian emigree organizations in the United States? A worthy public service would be rendered by this committee if it probed fully into the similarity of position on this issue assumed by the Russian emigrees, the Russian commissars, and the State Department doctrine of Russia, the sacred cow. Such a probe conducted within the framework of what policy position best serves the security of the United States and what policy position best serves Russian imperial ambitions would be a most rewarding exercise.

8. Has the subcommittee sought testimony from responsible representatives of the American Committee for Liberation, which sponsors "Radio Liberation," a powerful radio signal beamed to the U.S.S.R.? I raise this question because I observe in the letter of Mr. MONAGAN of July 25, 1962, that testimony has been taken from the president of the Free Europe Committee. I urge that representatives of the American Committee for Liberation be brought before an appropriate committee of the Congress to testify as to its political aims and objectives with respect to the captive non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. Such a quest for information, if properly conducted, would be most revealing in terms of Public Law 86–90 and the basic question of the indivisibility of human freedom and national independence.

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the problem which engages the leadership of the House with regard to the establishment of a Select Committee of the House on the Captive Nations, as proposed in House Resolution 211. Strong public support favors action by the House to establish such a committee. The trend of the times underscores the need. I have favored the establishment of such a committee because I believe that the geographical limitations inherent in the present subcommittee structure of the House Foreign Affairs Committee would make it unduly cumbersome, if not impossible, to do justice to this vital issue. I submit that if the House does not establish a Select Committee on the Captive Nations, it is incumbent upon the House Foreign Affairs Committee to establish a subcommittee on the Captive Nations, which should not be limited by geographical considerations and which should concern itself with all the captive nations identified in Public Law 86–90.

My appearance before this subcommittee today, I hope, will contribute to a resolution of one of the most burning issues before the 87th Congress. If the House Foreign Affairs Committee is to be held responsible for a full, objective, scholarly, and purposeful examination of matters relating to the captive nations, it must take steps properly to assume this responsibility. Otherwise there is no other course open to Members of Congress who are informed on and concerned about the cause of the captive nations, as identified in Public Law 86–90, but to advocate the establishment of a select committee of the Congress on the captive nations.

I urge that this problem be resolved before the adjournment of the 87th Congress. The power of decision on this question rests within your committee. It is time that action was taken.

Woolgrowers Face Bright Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Mr. Robert T. Stevens, former Secretary of the Army and presently owner of the American Fork Ranch near Two Dot, Mont., spoke in Montana recently regarding amendments to strengthen the national security provisions of the present foreign trade bill. Mr. Stevens is also president of a 150-year-old textile manufacturing firm which uses Montana wool. And, I would add, my hometown, Stevensville, was named after one of Mr. Stevens' illustrious ancestors. He was Gen. Isaac J. Stevens, first Governor of the Northwest Territory, which included part of Montana.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Addison R. Bragg's article entitled "Woolgrowers Face Bright Future," containing Mr. Stevens' remarks and found in the August 31, 1962, issue of the Billings Gazette be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RANCHER DECLARES WOOLGROWERS FACE BRIGHT FUTURE

(By Addison R. Bragg)

A Montana cattle rancher spoke Wednesday with feeling and concern for the future of Montana's woolgrowing industry—and with good reason.

Robert T. Stevens, owner of the American Fork Ranch near Two Dot, is also president of a 150-year-old textile manufacturing firm which uses Montana wool.

"We have a high regard for wool from here," Stevens said, "and we buy a lot of it."

But, said the former Secretary of the Army, many wool producers seem discouraged by the fact that nearly half of the wool-textile manufacturing industry has disappeared since the end of World War II.

"It's my opinion," said Stevens, "the bottom has been hit in wool consumption—in the next few years there's no place to go but up."

USE MORE NOW

For example, said Stevens, his firm, one of the seven oldest members of the New York Stock Exchange, uses more domestic wool today than ever before in its history.

Fighting synthetics, he declared, isn't the answer.

Giving up, he implied, isn't either.

"Woolgrowers shouldn't get mad at blends," Stevens said. "Anything that provides an outlet for domestic wool is good for the industry—and blends are doing just that."

Stevens drove to Billings with Ralph Cordiner, top executive of General Electric, who caught a plane here after visiting Stevens.

"He's got a place he calls a ranch in Florida," Stevens grinned. "I told him to come up here and I'd show him what a ranch really looks like."

The tall grey-haired man who probably became best known to the public audiences during the celebrated Army-McCarthy hearings is no stranger to Montana.

BOUGHT RANCH

He came out here 13 years ago and got into the cattle business with the purchase

of Wallis Huidekooper's American Ranch. Every year since then he and Mrs. Stevens have tried to spend "at least a month" in Montana.

"And it's no secret," he volunteered, "that, when I retire, I'll be spending a lot more time out here."

Even though the Plainfield, N.J., executive, who lives today only 5 miles from where he was born, is a summertime Montanan, he's far from being a carpetbagger.

The town of Stevensville was named after Gen. Isaac I. Stevens, first Governor of the Northwest Territory, which included part of Montana, and an ancestor of Stevens'.

It's probably due to his military background—which includes service as an officer in both World Wars as well as the cabinet post he held during the Korean war—that Stevens finds it difficult to talk about his industry without talking about national security.

SEES WOOL LACK

In case of another war, he said flatly, the domestic wool industry could not possibly supply military and civilian requirements.

"Think of this country," he said, "having to buy army blankets and uniforms from Japanese and German mills—yet this is essentially the position in which we're in today."

Stevens added that he doubted if the American public was aware of this fact.

"I'm not opposed to foreign trade," Stevens said, "but the fact remains that this country today is one of the least protected nations in the world."

Competition with the European Common Market, said Stevens, is one thing. "But competition with wages paid in the Middle and Far East is an entirely different thing," he added. Pointing out that the Common Market nations themselves have imposed "stringent restriction" on imports from Japan, Stevens said he felt this makes the United States even more of a target for Japanese goods.

The whole question, Stevens said, boils down to: Are we taking as good care of our mobilization as we should?

American plants abroad, said Stevens, don't help American workers—and they would, he added, be of little use to this country in the event of a war. Further slashing of tariffs overseas, he said, will only hasten the existing trend for American industry to supply American markets from abroad.

"I don't think the administration or the Congress wants this," Stevens said, "but what is being done to prevent it?"

NEED SAFEGUARDS

Amendments to strengthen the national security provisions of the present foreign trade bill, Stevens declared, are "desperately needed."

"Some people think of a future war in terms of a few hours or a few days but our Department of Defense is planning for all types of wars of any duration—wars which we must be able to win, long or short."

If the United States is ever called upon a third time as "the arsenal of democracy," Stevens said, it must not erode vital industries in the meantime.

"This," he said, "is what's happening in the machine tool, as well as in the textile and other industries."

The ex-Government official, who served under both Democratic and Republican administrations, said he was distressed at present laws which permit representatives of foreign governments to speak before the Office of Emergency Planning on matters concerning national security.

"Can't we agree," he asked, "that in matters concerning our security, the American Government is fully capable of making decisions without foreign interference?"

New Frontier Quiz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in the September 18 Washington Daily News, Mr. Richard Starnes gave us the feeling of the American people about our Kennedy administration policy of appeasement:

IF YOU WERE PRESIDENT

(By Richard Starnes)

Every American boy runs the risk of some day becoming President, but how many are really prepared for that exalted task by training and character?

The following quiz prepared with the assistance of that noted phrenologist, V. K. Meachley, is designed to find out:

You are President, and some volunteers begin to land in a peaceful Central American republic long friendly to the United States. These volunteers say "da" instead of "si" and wear droshky drivers' caps, but are otherwise indistinguishable from authentic Cubans. As President, you immediately:

(A) Make a speech declaring that the invaders are armed only with defensive weapons, but that we are watching the situation closely; (B) release a report disclosing that the youth of America is soft and urging schools to institute a program of pushups; (C) send a regiment of marines to clean out the invaders, and warn the Soviet Union that if she interferes you will send two regiments of marines to deal with the Red army.

You are President, and you are on record as saying the United States will take a most serious view of further Communist encroachments into a flyblown southeast Asian kingdom which, unfortunately, is vital to U.S. interests in the area. Communist aggression against the kingdom continues, of course, until our tame native Army is thoroughly defeated. As President, you—

(A) Take a very serious view of the situation, but do nothing else; (B) announce that we will be first on the moon (if Russia is already first on the moon, announce that we will be first on Venus); (C) decide that a moral commitment is a moral commitment, give the Communists a week to get out, and this time mean it.

You are President, and the United States is one of four powers occupying the wartime capital of a defeated enemy. The occupation agreement guarantees free access to all parts of the city, but the Soviet Union builds a wall effectively sealing off its area. When you protest, you get a telegram from the Kremlin telling you to go climb a tree. As President, you:

(A) Find a tree you can climb; (B) make a speech saying we will never fear to negotiate, and then sit down and negotiate like mad; (C) send a bulldozer and a squad of GI's to push down the wall, and warn Russia that there are more bulldozers and troops where the first ones came from.

Scoring the test: If you selected the (A) response to each question, you can't miss going to the White House, perhaps even ahead of Teddy. If you picked (B) in reply to all the questions, you have a great deal of talent for the job and may make it if you can swim the width of a swimming pool while fully clothed.

If you selected (C) in answer to any question, you are automatically disqualified. What do you think you're going to be, President of a first-rate nation?

Trade Expansion Act of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 has been passed by the Senate. I believe that the importance to the future economic progress and the free world leadership role of the United States residing in the final implementation of this bill cannot be overestimated.

It must be pointed out that whatever may be the boldness of vision embodied by the trade legislation, it could become obstructed by actions and policies designed to avoid the implications of trade expansion—and which would disadvantage consumers. It is an almost immutable law of economics that restrictions and controls meant to affect only one small sector of the economy often translate themselves into shockwaves which strike down unexpected targets and, sometimes, even boomerang on the very elements they were designed to help.

It is for this reason that I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a letter which I have received from a constituent, a small businessman, who is a member of an important segment of the textile apparel industry of the United States—who is entitled to have the data and the views presented in his letter receive our attention. I invite particularly the attention of our distinguished colleagues on the Special Senate Subcommittee To Study the Problems of the Textile Industry—the subcommittee which has been engaged in such exhaustive work for the benefit of our domestic industry—to this letter. The continued health and expansion of the U.S. textile-apparel industry and of our whole economy demands that we take the broadest possible view of the consequences of our actions, and be willing to examine varying points of view with expressions of dissent as important as assent.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter of August 24, addressed to me by Mr. M. I. Cushing, as well as the August 29 article by Frank C. Porter and the August 30 editorial in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the letter, article, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(NOTE.—The following is the complete text of the August 24, 1962, statement of M. I. Cushing, president, Pierre Imports, Inc., in New York to the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS, U.S. Senate.)

Unnerved by its lack of legislative success, the administration appears ready to go to any length to save the Trade Expansion Act. Operation "sellout" is underway once again.

The price for getting the bill through the House of Representatives earlier this summer was unprecedented—massive tax relief for the domestic cotton textile operators, plus a special international cartel agreement to protect them from oversea competition. Now the same men, this time wearing their caps as wool fabric producers, are out to

block Senate action on the vital trade act. Their minimum price for allowing the Nation to move ahead with an up-to-date trade bill is another "international agreement," this time restricting world trade in woolen textiles.

The pressure, as you know, has been turned on full blast in Washington. The nabobs of the domestic textile industry gathered at the Capitol several days ago openly threatening the trade bill unless "taken care of." An August 6 report by Secretary of Commerce Hodges referring to the progress of the (textile) industry was angrily dismissed as misleading.

The textile chiefs knew what they wanted. Presidential Assistant Myer Feldman was finally compelled to extend further assurances to the corporate executives and their lobbyists; the administration is giving considerable attention to an international restriction of wool fabric trade, he said, and it will not tolerate any level of wool textile imports that might threaten market disruption.

And just within the last few days, the State Department has had to request a meeting of the International Wool Study Group to discuss present and future problems. Perhaps this is only a maneuver, a means of temporarily appeasing the protectionist forces, while retaining future freedom of action. But whatever the administration's possible inner reservations, the truth is that a definite step has been taken toward the sort of world wool fabrics cartel that the big textile producers of this country demand. It is not yet inescapable, but it surely looms as more and more probable.

What substance is there to the hue and cry? Has the American market actually been disrupted by imports of wool apparel fabrics?

Every indicator points in the exact opposite direction: The domestic industry is, right now, in the midst of a vigorous upsurge, while imports of wool apparel fabrics lag.

The Wool Bureau reports that mill consumption of apparel wool will this year top 300 million pounds. That is a jump of more than 14 percent above last year's 263 million pounds and is 23 percent higher than the figure for 1960.

The August 23 Daily News Record characterizes domestic worsted plants as being sold up and notes that they are even requiring extended delivery dates on U.S. military orders.

Meantime, the import share of total U.S. consumption is down. Projecting figures released by Secretary of Commerce Hodges earlier this month, 1962 imports of woolen products may run about 51 million pounds. Adding that to the estimated 300 million pounds of domestic production (and that figure may well prove too low) would set aggregate U.S. consumption at 351 million pounds. Imports would, therefore, constitute 14.5 percent of the total. That figure compares with an import share of 14.9 percent in 1961, 18.6 percent in 1960, and 15 percent in 1959.

In the key field of woolens and worsteds, imports suffered badly in 1961, plunging to 18.8 million pounds, down 36 percent from the preceding year. The figures for the first 6 months of this year still show market weakness, 10.4 million pounds against 10.5 million pounds for the comparable period of 1961. Only the last few weeks have given any signs of renewed market stability.

No matter how you slice it, that just doesn't spell market disruption.

The lobbyists' howling cannot dim the recent progress of the domestic industry. Data from the Survey of Current Business reveal, for instance, that the wholesale price of wool products had by this June climbed 3.4 percent over the low point of last year. In the allied apparel field the gain was only about one-half of 1 percent.

Unfilled orders had also soared, according to Commerce Department reports, from 46 million linear yards at the low point of 1961 to 85 million yards. That is a gain of more than 84 percent. And the figures on average weekly wool fabric production jumped about 50 percent between the low of 1961 and the latest 1962 figure.

Per worker productivity in the domestic wool fabric industry gained more than 8 percent between 1961 and 1962.

Accordingly, woolen mill labor has benefited. Average weekly earnings advanced $7.27 between the first quarter of this year and the same period of 1961.

Earnings of the big, all-fibers companies that now dominate the field are even more exuberant. Recent headlines from the Daily News Record make the situation very clear:

June 8: "J. P. Stevens Sales Set Record, Net Up in Half."

July 25: "Burlington Sales, Net Up in 3 and 9 Months—Profit Rises 36.9 percent for Third Fiscal Quarter and 74 Percent for First Three Periods."

August 7: "Lowenstein Net Up 88 Percent in Second Quarter, Sales 14 Percent to Peak."

The record of the privately held Deering-Milliken complex is believed to be equally good.

Such import competition in wool as these companies have experienced has had to surmount an amazing variety of obstacles. In fact, I doubt if there are many manufacturers that have been more rigidly protected than woolens and worsteds.

You are well acquainted with the recent history of our world trade in this item.

In the last quarter of 1956, the Eisenhower administration established a tariff-quota system of protection for wool apparel fabrics. It permitted imports equal to 5 percent of domestic production to enter the country at the ad valorem duty of 25 percent (a specific duty, 37½ cents per pound, was also charged). When the 5-percent cutoff point was reached, the duty jumped 80 percent.

The premium, obviously, was in beating the cutoff date. The crush became worse each year. In its last year of operation, 1960, the cutoff came on March 4. The business year was just 63 days long.

Finally recognizing the destructiveness of this system, the administration abandoned the tariff-quota. But care was taken to avoid disquieting the domestic wool fabrics producers.

Ad valorem tariffs on medium- to high-priced fabrics were, in 1961, hiked 52 percent from the former base rate of 25 percent up to 38 percent. Moreover, the specific duty of 37½ cents per pound was continued.

At the other end of the scale, the duty on the cheapest imports (principally from Italy) rocketed to 50 percent, plus 37½ cents per pound. The total, effective rate of the impost in this case came to a stupifying 111 percent.

These astronomic tariffs can be usefully compared with the average rate on U.S. dutiable imports—12 percent. In that light, I say, it takes real gall to demand even more protection.

The greatly increased tariffs of 1961 had their intended effect. Imports from the three major oversea sources of supply (each a key ally of the United States) plummeted.

Imports of Japanese woolens and worsteds were off nearly 9 percent, from $24.9 million in 1960 to $22.7 million last year. British imports dropped off from $26.9 million in 1960 to $22.3 million last year, a loss of 17 percent. Imports from Italy fell 44 percent, from $19.9 million in 1960 to $11.2 million in 1961.

These few facts suggest, I believe, what a full review of the problem would certainly prove: The domestic industry does not merit further protection, there is no reason to restrict the importation of wool apparel fabrics further—whether by means of an international agreement or otherwise.

The consequences of further harassment are clear. Both American importers and the American apparel industry would suffer.

Let me express the self-interest of myself and my employees. This firm employs 20 persons and maintains an annual payroll well in excess of $175,000. We were significantly injured by the inanities of the tariff-quota period, suffered a marked downturn thanks to the tariff rise of last year and would lose even more as a result of further protective action at the behest of the Deering-Millikens, Burlingtons, and Stevens.

What is more, I deeply believe that international agreements and all other protective devices strike hard at our area economy. As you pointed out to the Senate Finance Committee earlier this month, "one-fourth of the personal income generated in the port of New York and its metropolitan area results from foreign trade." In view of this foreign trade orientation of our regional economy it seems evident that we cannot countenance further damage to imports—particularly in a sector as locally important as textiles.

And on the basis of my 38 years of experience and leadership in every sector of the textile-apparel field, let me add that tougher restraints upon wool apparel fabric imports would be harmful to the American clothing industry. Its economic well-being depends to a high degree upon imports.

The fact is that imports are not necessarily competitive with domestic production, all the protectionist propaganda notwithstanding. On the contrary, imports very often are a necessary supplement to domestic output—and thus essential to the immediate consumer of wool fabrics, the clothing manufacturers. To make my point, allow me to borrow from a letter that I sent to you on March 7, 1960:

"Why * * * don't the apparel manufacturers exclusively rely on U.S.-made textiles? The answer is simple enough: the domestic woolen textile producers are unable to supply the high quality needs of the U.S. clothing market. A good part of the Nation's woolen textile imports, accordingly, are made up of high-priced fabrics upon which great amounts of craftsmanship and artistic inventiveness have been lavished. The bulk of U.S. production, on the other hand, is in staple fabrics.

"Let me cite one recent shipment from Japan as an example. The fabrics included gabardine 272, 2-ply, both ways; tropical 266, 2-ply, both ways; and iridescents 260 and 266, 2-ply, both ways. These varieties are simply not made here in the United States in the same quality. And yet these are the sorts of textiles upon which clothing manufacturers must depend for their lines of suits in the $100–$125 bracket.

"The mass production techniques of U.S. woolen textile manufacturers also have the effect of stimulating imports. Very few U.S. producers are able to manufacture, or can afford to sell, in lots of one or two pieces (each piece is approximately 75 yards in length). It is upon such quantities, however, that the custom tailor relies. Imports, therefore, are again indispensable."

I argue, therefore, that there is abundant reason that no further barriers to wool apparel fabrics imports be erected.

Nevertheless, the administration is clearly on the brink of taking this step. One more blow against free world commerce, it appears, is to be delivered in the name of the administration's free trade bill.

It is apparent, however, that this move is being made at the sole initiative of the executive branch. I urge that the legislative

branch, equally invested by the Constitution, at least consider the matter.

To be sure, the Special Senate Subcommittee To Study the Problems of Textile Industry (the Pastore subcommittee) has in the past busied itself with allied questions. But it has been the undisguised advocate of the protectionist interests within the textile-apparel industry. Its chairman has gone so far as to admonish witnesses who did not, despite expectations, echo the anti-import line.

What is needed, instead, is a fully objective study. The domestic wool manufacturing interests have been notably reluctant to submit their case to the Tariff Commission, the body established by law to grant tariff relief. Apparently the industry has thought that the facts of the case made it necessary to play politics instead.

Inasmuch as the protectionists' strategy to avoid the Tariff Commission has kept that body from reviewing this question, I believe the best possible panel before which it could be taken would be the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Eocnomic Committee. You have played a leading role on that committee, just as you have gained distinction as a friend of the textile industry. I have for those reasons written to you.

I propose that the subcommittee hold hearings and investigate this matter in its entirety. The facts on woolen and worsted imports must be exposed to national consideration. In addition, attention could also be given to the questions of imported wool yarns, wool knitted apparel, wool tops, etc.

The great value of such a subcommittee investigation is that it would restrain the administration from a precipitate, politically motivated action and would provide an opportunity for the representatives of the people to consider the question.

At the urging of colleagues in the textile-apparel industry, I shall, with your permission, make this recommendation available to the press in the next few days. Meantime, my colleagues and I would welcome hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

M. I. CUSHING,
President.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 29, 1962]

WHITE HOUSE SAID TO BOW TO WOOL MANUFACTURERS

(By Frank C. Porter)

Reported White House plans to extend limitations on cotton textile imports to cover wool products as well have brought angry charges against the administration of a new sellout to domestic textile interests.

Importers charge that a 1-year freeze on cotton cloth imports at existing levels was engineered earlier as part of the price for saying the President's foreign trade bill from congressional protectionists. The bill passed the House and now awaits Senate action.

"Now the same men, this time wearing their caps as wool fabrics producers, are out to block Senate action" on the bill, M. I. Cushing wrote Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, yesterday. "Their minimum price for allowing the Nation to move ahead with an up-to-date trade bill is another 'international agreement,' this time restricting world trade in woolen textiles," Cushing said.

Cushing is president of Pierre Imports, Inc., of New York City. He proposed that the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, of which JAVITS is a member, investigate the wool situation.

Recently the State Department requested a meeting of the International Wool Study Group "to discuss present and future problems."

Earlier this month Myer Feldman, deputy special counsel to President Kennedy, wrote the National Association of Wool Manufacturers that "we intend to implement" the administration's policy of limiting textile imports to prevent market disruption "with regard to all textiles." He also noted that the Interagency Textile Administrative Committee has been expanded to cover all textiles.

Trades sources have reported that the administration will seek to seat American woolen manufacturing representatives as delegates at the Wool Study Group parley, expected to be held this November in London. At deliberations of a similar cotton study group which preceded an international agreement to limit cotton imports last February, domestic cotton textile interests were permitted as observers only.

Although its provisions are being carried out under a 1-year stopgap authority expiring in October, the cotton agreement has not yet been ratified by all 18 signatories. Several nations say they will refuse to ratify it if the United States puts into effect an 8½-cent additional "equalization" tariff on cotton textile imports. The proposal is bottled up in the Tariff Commission, where some critics predict it will languish until after the Trade Bill is enacted.

In his letter to JAVITS, Cushing ridiculed claims of disruption in the wool market. He cited burgeoning sales and profits of textile firms, a drop in wool imports from 18.6 percent of domestic consumption in 1960 to an estimated 14.5 percent this year, a substantial rise in domestic prices for wool products, a big jump in unfilled orders and a $7.27 increase in weekly earnings of wool mill labor since last year.

In a letter to President Kennedy earlier this month, William J. Barnhard, Washington attorney representing a number of importers, blasted Feldman's "abject surrender to the political pressures of the textile lobby."

"The giveaway to the cotton textile industry," Barnhard wrote, "has encouraged the same sort of pressure on wool textiles, lumber, oil, fruits and nuts and a variety of other products * * * It has, in short, stimulated and encouraged protectionism at a time when, as you well know and have often stated, the urgent need is for trade expansion."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 30, 1962]

SELF-DEFEATING TACTICS

In its efforts to secure the passage of the Trade Expansion Act the administration appears to have ignored a lesson which every victim of blackmail has learned through painful experience. Once paid off, blackmailers refuse to stay bought.

In order to appease the strongly protectionist elements in the cotton textile industry a long term Cotton Textile Agreement was negotiated at Geneva this year which, when fully implemented, would oblige its signatories to place quotas on cotton exports to the United States when requested to do so. But this concession failed to satisfy the domestic cotton interests, and they are now busily lobbying for an additional 8½-cent equalization tariff on cotton-textile imports.

Having been burned by the cotton interests, the administration is taking still another step along the primrose path of appeasement. Myer Feldman, deputy special counsel to the President, informed the National Association of Wool Manufacturers that: "Limitation of textile imports to prevent market disruption is an essential element of administration policy. We intend to implement this policy with regard to all textiles, and particularly to prevent market disruption such as would result from an increase over current levels of exports * * *. The functions of the Interagency Textile Committee have just been expanded to cover all textiles."

This implied commitment to extend the protectionist quota system to woolens comes at a time, when that industry is experiencing rising sales and high profits.

The willingness of the administration to buy off the protectionist opposition with piecemeal concessions is causing growing suspicion abroad and alienating the supporters of the Trade Expansion Act at home. According to the terms of the original cotton agreement, negotiated at Geneva in 1961, the base period of imports is specified as a guaranteed minimum. But the program appears to be administered in such a way as to establish that base level as a maximum above which "market disruption" is automatically presumed. Cotton imports are now cut off without attempts to determine public damage, and as a result a suit has been filed which challenges the constitutionality of the cotton quota agreements.

The administration has made remarkable progress in breaking down traditional protectionist sentiment and garnering nationwide support for the Trade Act which now has an excellent chance of passing the Senate. When passed, the act will empower the President to enter into negotiations for the lowering of international tariff barriers, but his chances of success will be severely limited if his hands are tied by the concessions which are now being made to the enemies of freer world trade.

Communist Ships Carry U.S. Aid Cargo After Delivering Russian Goods to Cuba

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

COMMUNIST SHIPS CARRY U.S. AID CARGO AFTER DELIVERING RUSSIAN GOODS TO CUBA

The American Maritime Association has called upon the President to withdraw the approval of the Department of Agriculture in the chartering of the M.V. *Drzic*, a Yugoslavian vessel, scheduled to load Public Law 480 cargo at Houston for delivery to the United Arab Republic on or about September 28, 1962. The letter dated September 17, followed a September 12 letter by the association to the President which showed that the Yugoslavian vessel has been carrying cargo to Cuba, then coming to the United States to carry American aid cargo to the United Arab Republic. The association has also informed the President of similar charter fixtures, approved by the Department of Agriculture, in which foreign-flag vessels alternately carried cargo for the U.S.S.R. or other Communist countries, and the United States. On June 21, 1962, the association transmitted this information to the Department of State. Replying for the Secretary of State, Mr. G. Griffith Johnson, Assistant Secretary, said that after consultation with agencies most concerned with aid movements, the Department of State did not consider that any "meaningful facilitation" by the U.S. Government to Communist trade was involved in the carriage by such foreign-flag vessels of the U.S. Government-generated cargoes. The American Maritime Association feels that this abuse of admin-

istrative practice in the chartering of Public Law 480 cargo results in American foreign aid dollars being used to subsidize Communist shipping. In addition to this, the use of NATO ships and so-called flags of convenience ships in transporting Communist cargo releases Russian ships and permits them to concentrate on more strategic objectives.

The use of American dollars to subsidize Communist shipping lessens popular support for the foreign-aid program at a time when that support is most needed.

The September 12 letter to the President also noted that on April 2, 1962, the American Maritime Association submitted to the President's Petroleum Study Committee of the Office of Emergency Planning, a list of the foreign-flag vessels which alternately carried oil for the United States and for the Soviet Union. Thus far no action has been taken by that Committee.

Foreign Atmosphere in American Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 19, 1962]

EXCLUSIVELY YOURS: FOREIGN ATMOSPHERE IN AMERICAN TOWN

(By Betty Beale)

If you want to vacation in a foreign city, don't go to Rome, Paris, or London. Go to Santa Fe, N. Mex.

I bet you if Jacqueline Kennedy and little Caroline, who have been swamped in Italy, had gone to Santa Fe, those Indians squatting behind their silver work in the colonnaded front of the old Spanish governors' palace facing the square—wouldn't have moved a muscle.

They haven't changed their style of clothing or their hairdos or, in some cases, their pueblo way of living, in over 300 years, so why should they change their facial expressions?

Because it is so different they say that Santa Fe is the fourth city and the only small town on the list of preferred places to see requested by foreign visitors here under State Department sponsorship.

Small wonder. In New York, Chicago, or San Francisco, Europeans run into the same clothes, same customs, same jazz, and even the same language that are engulfing their own countries.

But in Santa Fe a man may be dressed like Wyatt Earp or in a Navaho velvet blouse with a $160 silver belt round his hips. Not everybody even speaks English there where the courts of law were conducted in Spanish as late as the 1930's.

NO PHOTOGRAPHS

And Mrs. Kennedy would really envy the way some of these Indians handle camera fiends. At the corn dance put on by the nearby Santo Domingo Indians a couple of weeks ago, a woman tourist from a Midwestern State plainly ignored the signs warning visitors not to photograph the dance, which is a religious one. She went ahead and took pictures anyhow and was suddenly flanked by two braves who informed her they would have to confiscate her film.

She protested, saying she also had pictures of Aunt Minnie on the same roll. Unimpressed they took the camera and exposed the film, with the woman crying out all the while in indignation, "You can't do that. I'm an American." Those within earshot are still rolling in the aisles over that one.

And Americans who point with pride at having attended the outdoor operas in Rome staged in the ruins of the ancient Baths of Caracalla, would be flabbergasted by the dramatic beauty of Santa Fe's outdoor opera right in their own country—started singlehandedly 6 years ago by the then 31-year-old Conductor John Crosby.

SUPERB OPERA SETTING

Here on top of a hill, altitude over 7,000 feet, sky overhead brilliantly starlit, air so starkly clear the lights of Los Alamos about 30 miles away look like nearby electric bulbs—Igor Stravinsky has been watching or conducting one of his operas after another. Exquisitely graceful Vera Zorina, who spends the day sunning by the pool at Bishop's Lodge, danced the leading role in his "Persephone" last weekend, and also acted the title role in the downright gripping performance of "Joan of Arc at the Stake." The latter was written by former French Ambassador to the United States, Paul Claudel, with music by Arthur Honegger.

What's more, nearly every opera given out there is presented in English, and I must say it's kinda nice to know for a change what all the shoutin' is about.

Other biggest source of interest in Santa Fe right now is the news that it is about to get the first secular liberal arts college in the whole Southwest. Scholastically tough St. John's College, of Annapolis, Md. (that has two male students to every one female, girls), is going to build its western twin right here on the slopes of Twin Mountains, and will be ready to open in 1964, says President Richard D. Weigle.

NEW COLLEGE GOING UP

Santa Fe was chosen over 36 other places that were pleading for the college because of its beauty, its champagne climate, its cultural bent, the eagerness of the atomic brains at Los Alamos to cooperate, and because noted southwestern Architect John Meem donated 214 acres and tossed $400,000 into the kitty as well, which, as they say, ain't hay.

Glimpsed on the active social circuit in the adobe city: Mrs. John Dempsey tossing a cocktail to-do for Mrs. Millard Tydings, who was also feted by Gen. and Mrs. Patrick Hurley. Composer Virgil Thomson whipping into the latter's party. Pulitzer Prize-winning authors Paul Horgan and Oliver La Farge at Laura Harvey's vernissage greeting young Peter Hurd, Jr., son of the noted artist and himself an expert on Jacobean music. Oliver saying he has to write another book because he's running out of cash.

Part Indian himself, Mr. La Farge told about his recent trip to Pierre, S. Dak., where he and his wife went into a bar and were soon surrounded by some French Indians who recognized him as one of the same. "There I was," said the author of "Laughing Boy," "having to polish up my French to talk to a group of Indians in Pierre, S. Dak., with names like Rene de Montigny."

Mrs. John Murchison, daughter-in-law of billionaire Clint Murchison and wife of the young Dallas financier who won control of the Allegheny Co. last year, lunching at her favorite Mexican food restaurant in the tiny town of Gallisteo with her sister, Mrs. Stewart Hunt, wife of the nephew of Texas billionaire H. L. Hunt. Yours truly and the Ben Briggs, of Dallas, going to little Cerillos, N. Mex., where the oldtime Western Tiffany Saloon, that looks like a movie set with its boardwalk and columns on the outside and is often used for same, is still going strong at night.

BILLBOARD PARTIES

Santa Fe socialites grinning to themselves and professing complete ignorance as to who's been sawing down the billboards of late on all roads to their lovely city except the one to Albuquerque. The State can't seem to get an antibillboard law through, so Santa Fe's most distinguished citizens have taken the law into their own hands. They take turns having parties at each other's houses, arriving with saws and hatchets, then under cover of darkness, they sally forth and topple over any road advertisements that mar the scenery. Nobody in the city calls it vandalism because only in this way can the charm of the countryside be preserved.

If you ask me, the State ought to award each billboard toppler the distinguished service medal.

Kenosha Realizes Dream: A Port City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the St. Lawrence Seaway—transformed from a dream into a reality—has opened new doors of opportunity not only for my home State of Wisconsin, but for all of the Great Lakes States and the Nation.

Through the deepened and improved waterway flows an expanded volume of traffic that brings new economic life into America.

True, there are also problems; for example, this less expensive water route provides opportunity for foreign produced goods—often produced at less cost—to come into America. Of these, some are noncompetitive—not being available in this country; others, however, do compete with domestic industries.

On balance, however, the overall impact of the increased flow of trade has been of benefit to my home State of Wisconsin and to the country.

With the prospect of a deep-sea route to markets around the globe, ports on the Great Lakes undertook improved programs for participation in expanded flow of trade and commerce.

For many, this has meant immeasurable progress.

As a sponsor of the seaway law, this has been particularly gratifying.

Realistically, we recognize, however, that progress is not created for a great agricultural and industrial complex like the Great Lakes by the wave of a magic wand; rather, this must be done through the foresight, dedication, and hard work of each community and port throughout the Great Lakes.

Today, I would like to refer further to one such port which—awakening to its potentials—put its community shoulder to the job and created one of the great ports of the Great Lakes: that is, Kenosha, Wis.

In 1955 the port had suffered from a decline in use of the harbor, decaying

facilities, and little prospect of a bright future.

Thanks to community foresight and strong leadership, however, the community awakened to its potentials—undertook the needed effort—and by hard work aimed toward high goals, has created within the span of about 7 years one of the outstanding ports of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have an additional article by Mary-Anne Thompson, entitled "Kenosha Realizes Dream: A Port City," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kenosha (Wis.) News, Sept. 12, 1962]

KENOSHA REALIZES DREAM: A PORT CITY

(By Mary-Anne Smoler Thompson)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The years 1955 through 1959 were the crucial ones in the making of the Kenosha Harbor. These were the years in which far-sighted Kenoshans went all out to make the port of Kenosha a reality. This article, about those crucial years, is the last in a series of three about the growth and development of the Kenosha Harbor.)

A record of declining use of the harbor, a knowledge of its decaying facilities and no concrete indication that its use would ever again increase lay before Kenoshans in 1955. The harbor seemed virtually useless.

Still, it was at this time that some citizens with high hopes for the city's natural advantage began to push for harbor development. They managed to persuade the city to spend $250,000 on the harbor and to work on State and National levels for the promotion of the harbor—just in case there was any future Great Lakes traffic to be had.

In January 1957, when Kenosha appealed to the Army Corps of Engineers to recommend Federal aid for the harbor here, citizens could proudly present a record of city progressiveness for Federal inspection.

That record of 18 months of community-wide efforts to reestablish Kenosha as a major Great Lakes port was an impressive one. It included the following items of progress and many others.

Backing of a bill which officially closed Pike Creek to navigation, opening the door to an eventual rail link to harbor facilities on the Haas Coal Co. property.

Sponsorship of a bill which added 52d Street to the State trunk highway system, linking the harbor area to American Motors, the site of the proposed municipal airport and Highway 41.

Approval of a preliminary survey of port potential by professional harbor consultants. The preliminary survey, completed in December 1955, showed that Kenosha was in a position to regain its role as a major part city.

Ordering of a full survey of the harbor's potential by the consultants.

Off season soundings of the local harbor taken by Army Engineers to gather data in view of the promise of renewed activity in the port of Kenosha.

Passing by the harbor commission of a unanimous resolution reopening the 1,000-foot city dock on Simmons Island for commercial use after it had lain idle for 10 years.

Agreement of American Motors Export Division to do its share to promote the local harbor by transferring its shipping from the Milwaukee Harbor to Kenosha, after 10 years of shipping through Milwaukee.

Loading of American Motors cars plus a significant load of cars from the Studebaker plant in Indiana, driven here in preference to Chicago or Milwaukee, aboard the Swedish motorship *Rigoletto*.

Finally, the city council took two giant steps toward a booming port of Kenosha at the end of 1956 and beginning of 1957. First it passed the 1957 budget which provided for the construction of an $80,000 warehouse to serve the municipal dock. Then, as 1957 was beginning, it voted to purchase the Haas property, doubling city-owned harbor frontage. This purchase, alone, cost the city $198,000.

With this move, the last mentioned in its 1957 progress report, the city moved into the Great Lakes shipping picture. It had acquired a new dock and had succeeded in letting out leases on the waterfront property which were expected to bring the city at least $200,000 profit along with other indirect benefits.

The city had taken the initial chance by purchasing the property and now could sit back and earn money as the renters sent money into Kenosha coffers to cover the cost of the dock, with a profit besides.

Three of the leases were granted to the Endee Co., current operators of the harbor, which, like the city, trusted that the harbor would pay off in spite of the fact that the St. Lawrence Seaway was not finished and Kenosha shipping was minimal when the long-term leases were signed.

By 1958, the harbor was on its way. The warehouse approved in 1956 was completed in October 1958. A week before it was to have its formal opening, a Swedish ship loaded with automobiles docked. The warehouse was filled with English-built Fords and the ceremonies had to be held outside.

From that point on, the road for the local harbor extended straight upward. Tonnage soared, the number of ships using the port went up, and Kenosha's reputation as a forward-looking city was never better.

The year 1959, marking the official opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, was a year of firsts for Kenosha, the port. The harbor had its first big year. It became the Midwest's automobile port, unloading 2,285 foreign-made automobiles. It replaced Green Bay as the State's second-ranking port. It handled more defense and military cargo than any other Great Lakes port, save Detroit.

The Kenosha Harbor became an official Federal port of entry in 1959 and gained State and National recognition when the Ford Motor Co. announced its plans for utilizing the port as the Midwest port of entry for English-made Fords.

Since 1959 the city has continued to improve its harbor, finally being able to see in terms of hard cash what a well-developed harbor can do for a city. Steel sheeting projects, improvements in recreational boating facilities and dredging work have made local headlines recently and certainly the harbor will continue to need work to maintain and enhance its position as a major Great Lakes port.

But Kenoshans can revel in the truth of a statement made in 1959 by a Racine columnist who said about local harbor action: "Kenoshans weren't sleeping at the switch and they didn't fail to take advantage of their opportunities. Way back in 1954, they became awake to their possibilities." And now citizens' awareness is paying off in the port of Kenosha.

Inquiry Into Political Morality and Lobbies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two excellent articles by my colleague, Mr. MCCARTHY, which appeared this summer in the New York Times magazine.

The first one is entitled "An Inquiry Into Political Morality"; and the second is entitled "A Senator Looks at the Lobbies."

I know that all who are interested in government and in the legislative process will find these articles of great interest and value.

I wish to commend my colleague for the fine quality of these two articles.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times magazine, July 1, 1962]

AN INQUIRY INTO POLITICAL MORALITY: A SENATOR EXAMINES THE REASONS FOR THE TOO FREQUENT LAPSES IN PUBLIC ETHICS AND SUGGESTS WHERE RESPONSIBILITY LIES FOR CREATING AND ENFORCING HIGHER STANDARDS

(By EUGENE J. MCCARTHY)

(NOTE.—EUGENE J. MCCARTHY is a former professor of economics and sociology who took office as Senator, Democrat, from Minnesota in 1959. He wrote "Frontiers of American Democracy.")

WASHINGTON.—The morality of men who hold public office—a matter being brought forcibly to public attention in the case involving Billie Sol Estes—has been a subject of concern throughout the history of the United States.

An essay, attributed to Alexander Hamilton, in the "Federalist Papers" in 1788 states: "The aim of every political constitution is, or ought to be, first to obtain for rulers men who possess most wisdom to discern, and most virtue to pursue, the common good of society; and in the next place to take the most effectual precautions for keeping them virtuous."

One hundred and fifty years later, Peter Odegard, in an article on corruption written for the "Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences," observed that among the great modern nations the United States had had the least enviable record with regard to the morality of its public officials.

Fourteen years later, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, in commenting on the investigations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, said: "As our study of the RFC progressed, we were confronted more and more with problems of ethical conduct." He asked these questions: "How do we deal with those who under the guise of friendship accept favors which offend the spirit of the law, but do not violate the letter? What of the men outside Government who suborn those inside it? Who is more at fault, the bribed or the bribers?" How, he asked, do we deal with the disturbing problem that "among so many influential people, morality has become identical with legality."

The findings of congressional and executive investigations, reports of State and local governments—official and unofficial—indicate that the moral and ethical standards of public officials have not improved much since 1951. Congressional committees are now looking into not only the Estes case but also scandals in the national highway-construction program, price fixing, and excessive profit taking on Government contracts, even on those vitally related to national defense.

It is not important to determine whether present conditions are better or worse than those of the past; what is, is bad enough. It is important that two questions be asked and answered, if possible.

First, what are the causes of the present state of morality or lack of morality; and,

second, what can be done to bring about a change for the better?

The explanation of the present state of public or political morality or immorality is not to be found in simple one-cause statements such as in a recent Senate report "that corruption is the inevitable result when one party or one faction remains too long in power." Neither is it to be found in sweeping generalizations regarding the inevitable corruption of democratic government; nor can it be explained away in terms of technique, codes and procedures of government. We must look for more fundamental causes.

There are, I think, at least three distinguishable ones: first, the general level of morality prevailing in the United States; second, the level of morality in business and in the legal profession, as well as in those other professions that directly bear on government and politics, and, third, the lack of a strong tradition of political responsibility and of the honor of public office in the United States.

Let us look first at the general level of morality in the United States. Americans by and large are concerned about the ethical aspects of politics and business. There is widespread protest against clear cases of bribery and graft and outright theft. "Throw the rascals out" is a popular campaign slogan. On the other hand, it is a matter of common knowledge, sustained by reports and statistical records, that the level is not so high as we would like it to be. Why?

Ideas do have consequences. There is less respect today for old-fashioned morality and for the hard-and-fast principles of honesty that were formerly enforced by religious conviction. Today there is rather wide acceptance among philosophies of the relativism of morality. We should not be surprised, therefore, to find some government officials and business men making up rules which, although convenient to their own purposes, are not based upon traditional or reasoned standards of right and wrong, truth or falsehood.

The level of strength of the virtue prevailing among citizens will inevitably be reflected in the conduct of officials—since they are drawn from the body of citizens and are formed and influenced by the moral standards which are generally accepted and observed.

The conduct of public officials is likely to be affected particularly by the standards of conduct prevailing in business and in the professions that touch most directly upon government. It is significant that, in many cases in which public officials accused of wrongdoings have attempted to defend themselves, they have argued that their actions were fully within the bounds of accepted practice in the business or professional world from which they had come.

Disclosures of dishonesty and misrepresentation in the fixing of radio and television programs a few years ago turned the spotlight of publicity on those associated with the communications and entertainment industry. These findings, however, have significant bearing upon other fields of business and professional activity and especially upon politics, in which the temptation to oversimplify and misrepresent is always strong.

In our society falsification is universally condemned, yet the practice in greater or lesser degree is widespread and to some extent condoned. The problem is complicated. Carl Sandburg, in "The People, Yes," asks the searching question: "What kind of a liar are you?"

"People lie because they don't remember clear what they say.

"People lie because they can't help making a story better than it was the way it happened.

"People tell white lies so as to be decent to others.

"People lie in a pinch, hating to do it, but lying on because it might be worse.

"And people lie just to be liars for crooked gain.

"What sort of a liar are you?

"Which of these liars are you?"

Carl Snyder, in his book, "Capitalism the Creator," observes that despite our prejudices we must acknowledge that avarice and greed have been the great forces in the building of America. This is too harsh a judgment, but certainly it is true that the opportunist and the sharp dealer are not unknown in the business world.

They may not sit at the head of the table, but often the high-pressure artist, the dealer in influence, the public-relations man skilled in expanding doubt or contracting truth as the case demands, and the disciples of Hermes, sit at the right hand.

The term, "free enterprise," which has a good and defensible meaning, has been abused. For many it has been the excuse for sweeping rejection of social justice and responsibility, for the rejection of traditional conceptions of right and wrong. "Legality" for many has become the watchword; they see little wrong in avoiding legal obligations, as indicated in the Internal Revenue Service estimate that something over $25 billion of taxable income goes unreported in the United States each year.

John Cassidy, who argued the question of political morality with Mr. Dooley at the turn of the century, insisted that he "niver knew a pollytician to go wrong ontil he's been contaminated by contact with a businessman."

This oversimplifies, but it does point to the fact that there is in nearly every case of corruption a double responsibility or a shared responsibility.

In the long run, the indirect and more subtle influence resulting from the transfer of an exploitative and self-seeking philosophy can be more destructive of morality in public office than the direct influence of bribery.

The third general cause bearing on morality in public service in the United States is the lack of any strong tradition of the responsibilities and special obligations—and the honor—of public office.

In the beginning of our national existence, we cut ourselves away from the aristocratic traditions of the Old World and adopted an egalitarian political philosophy. Every citizen was given a share of the political power which, in the old order, had been restricted to the aristocracy.

In transferring political rights to each citizen we failed to transfer a corresponding sense of responsibility which the old traditions and institutions had imposed and institutions had imposed upon the nobility. We failed to develop new institutions or a new tradition attaching obligations and responsibility to position and to office directly, as a substitute for a system that fixed such responsibility through birth or class.

Montesquieu declared that that honor was the basis of monarchy and virtue the basis of democracy. History has demonstrated that honor without virtue is an insufficient basis for monarchy, so history is demonstrating that virtue is also inadequate unless sustained by honor.

What can be done to bring about an improvement in public morality in the United States?

First, there must be a broad effort to transform the whole social and cultural environment—that is, to transform it by eliminating whatever pushes man toward evil or leads him into error, and whatever establishes or sustains conditions which encourage man to easy response in action that is morally objectionable and wrong.

Government has a clear responsibility in this field, but it a residual and sustaining responsibility; the primary and principal responsibility rests on all persons and on all institutions that affect moral judgment and actions, primarily those whose work is religious and educational.

Second, ethical standards in business and in the professions must be raised primarily for the sake of businessmen, but also because of the effects such improved standards will have on public morality and morality in public service.

We have come to accept that only a few fields of activity are truly professional—for instance, medicine and the law—and that all others are, somehow, nonprofessional or unprofessional. It is essential that other groups be indentified, like professions, with special public responsibilities, and consequently be expected to develop self-discipline and individual codes of ethics—a true sense of profession.

I cite as examples physical scientists in some fields, certified public accountants, public-relations personnel and others acting as consultants and advisers on matters touching directly on the social and public good.

Third, we must take immediate action to develop in the United States a code of ethics for men in public office, for those with responsibilities for making laws, interpreting laws and administering the affairs of Government, and to lay the foundations upon which we can build a tradition reflecting the high honor and responsibility of Government service.

The responsibility rests first with the Congress and the President, who have the authority to set standards for Government service. In a more general way it is a responsibility of the colleges and universities. They should be willing not only to fill the demand but also to create a supply of men who view Government as a professional career and who are liberally educated and professionally trained for such service.

Lindsay Warren, as Controller General of the United States, testified in 1951 before a special subcommittee to study ethical standards in Government:

"For a long time I thought that no code of ethics or morals would insure a high standard of conduct of the Government's business. I have felt that moral integrity is something innate, the result of a person's conscience, upbringing, and education and not something controllable by regulation, no matter how rigid. * * * Without good administration the best written codes will fail.

"However, the things I have seen in my 25 years in Washington, especially the shocking disclosures of the war and postwar period, have made me more receptive to an official moral code. In the first place, I no longer feel that we can rely on the moral training of all those who come into or deal with the Government."

We must not expect perfection. It will not be possible to eliminate all abuses through changes in rules and procedures. But there is a continuing need for reexamination of the methods and processes through which the great powers of Government are exercised, and a need, also, for penalties and punishments which are adjusted to the new and varied ways in which public officials today may violate public trust.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times magazine, Aug. 19, 1962]

A Senator Looks at the Lobbies: Groups That Have Stakes in Pending Legislation Clamor To Be Heard in Congress—This It Is Argued, Is Their Right, and There Are Safeguards Against Their Abusing It

(By Eugene J. McCarthy)

(Note.—Eugene J. McCarthy has served as a Senator, Democrat, from Minnesota

since 1959. He wrote "Frontiers of American Democracy.")

WASHINGTON.—The word "lobbying" has a derogatory ring. This is not surprising, for good or bad lobbying occurs in the processes of democracy at the point of rough transition where interests conflict and judicial processes fall short. Lobbying is a test—sometimes a raw test—of the judgment and integrity of political officeholders, both elected and appointed.

Who are the lobbyists? What do they do in order to affect the course of Government? How effective are they? Is lobbying a threat to democracy? Do Government officials need more protection from lobbyists? What can or should be done about lobbying? It is important that these questions be asked and that an attempt be made to answer them.

This has been a most active year for lobbyists in Washington. They were drawn especially by the tax bill, the Trade Expansion Act, the medical insurance program and by the Sugar Act.

The activities of lobbyists on the Sugar Act, which involves foreign countries, have moved the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to make a special study of lobbying—or, as the committee described it, of "nondiplomatic activities of representatives of foreign governments or their agents in promoting the interests of those governments." Investigation or inquiry into the operation of lobbyists in other fields has been suggested by some Members of Congress.

By statute, the lobbyist today is any person who solicits money or anything of value to be used principally to secure or influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

Lobbying has a long history. The word "lobby" appeared first in the English language about the middle of the 16th century. It was derived from the medieval Latin word "lobium," a monastic walk or cloister.

Three hundred years later the word was in politics. It was used both to identify a hall or corridor in the British House of Commons and as a collective noun applied to all those who frequented these lobbies. It covered those who sought to influence men in office as well as newspapermen and others looking for news and gossip.

Today the word "lobbyist" is used both in its narrow legal sense and, more broadly, as a description of all attempts to influence not only the legislators, but also any agency or officer of Government. Registered lobbyists in Washington number approximately 1,100, but the number of persons and agencies involved in efforts to influence the Government is much greater.

Some lobbyists represent big interests and well organized groups. The chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers have registered lobbyists along with the AFL–CIO; so do the American Petroleum Institute, the Association of American Railroads, and nearly all major industrial and financial interests. The so-called little people and the unorganized or less organized also have lobbyists. For example, the American Committee for Flags of Necessity, the Hualapai Tribe of Hualapai Reservation, and the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation are among those groups or organizations represented by lobbyists.

Some lobbyists are well paid; some get little more than expense money. Some operate directly on Government officials, others primarily by indirection through appeals to constituents or voters. Some are professional, others amateur. Some lobbyists represent only one position or program, while others are available as free lancers on an issue-by-issue or client-by-client basis.

Some lobbyists are quite open—they seek their own gain, the protection of an economic advantage, or the elimination or reduction of advantages held by their competitors. These cry more often for equity than they do for justice. Others speak for the arts, for morality, for aid to the sick and for the oppressed among the family of man.

What do lobbyists do in order to affect Government decisions?

The methods used by the lobbyists are almost as varied as their causes. Some appeal on a purely personal basis, as friend to friend. Some undoubtedly use monetary or material appeals, but there is little evidence of direct payoff in lobbying activities affecting the Congress. In some 14 years of membership in the Congress, I know of no case in which a Member was moved to support or to oppose a position in response to any kind of direct financial or material reward. The indirect influence of campaign contributions is more difficult to assess but it is, I believe, more important.

The most common method of lobbying is that of simply appearing before a committee of Congress or speaking to individual Members in an attempt to bring them to understand one's position or to influence them to support that position.

How effective are the lobbyists?

Some are wholly ineffective but take credit for what happens without, in fact, having in any way influenced events.

Among the regular lobbies, the postal employees' organizations are usually very active and, whenever postal pay legislation is before Congress, they are listed at or near the top in terms of total expenditures. In order to raise wages or to change working conditions significantly, the spokesmen for the postal workers of the country must influence either the Congress or the administration—or both—for Government employee unions are not recognized and dealt with in the same way as other labor unions are by private employers. There is little doubt that the existence of this Washington lobby has influenced the Congress and successive administrations to raise salaries and to improve working conditons not only for postal employees, but for all Government workers.

The major farm organizations in the country maintain regular lobbies in Washington. The American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Farmers Union usually take opposite sides on farm legislation. The apparent success of the two organizations parallels closely the success of the two major political parties. The Farmers Union position is favored when the Democrats are in power, and the Farm Bureau position when the Republicans are in power.

One of the most interesting and continuing lobbying efforts of recent years has been that in support of a bill which is known as H.R. 10. This bill proposes to change existing income tax laws to allow members of professions and other self-employed persons a limited income tax credit on money invested in private pension or retirement programs. Starting almost from scratch, the supporters of this legislation have secured the approval of the House of Representatives and of the Senate Finance Commitee. Victory in this case—if it comes—must be credited in great measure to the efforts of a lobby registered as the American Thrift Assembly, a kind of holding company or organizing lobby, which was supported in testimony by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Farm Bureau, the American Medical Association, and others.

In this session of Congress, lobbies have been most active in four major areas: taxes, trade and tariffs, medical aid for the aged and extension of the Sugar Act. Undoubtedly the lobbyists did have or will have some effect on action in each of these areas.

Any significant change in tax laws attracts the attention of those who may be affected. The changes being considered this year were significant and controversial and the lobbying effort extensive.

Industries likely to be affected by trade and tariff policies are always well represented in Washington. Whenever an issue even remotely bearing upon trade is brought up for consideration, the representatives of these industries seek permission to testify. The hearings on the President's new tariff and trade program have attracted them in great numbers. Members of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, which ordinarily hold trade and tariff hearings, are generally familiar with the testimony of these witnesses. They have been described as somewhat like professional soldiers who regularly go to battle, seldom win wars and suffer few casualties.

One of the most active Washington lobbies this year, and through the years, is that of the American Medical Association—better known in Washington for what it is against than for what it is for. The spokesmen for the AMA have effectively opposed the inclusion of doctors in the social security retirement program. They were strongly opposed to amending the social security law to provide for the payment of social security pensions to people who are permanently or totally disabled after they pass the age of 50. And in the present session of Congress, the AMA lobby led the opposition to the establishment of a medical insurance program for the aged as a part of the social security program. Action in this congressional session has been a real test of the power of the AMA lobby.

Lobbying activities with reference to the Sugar Act revision this year involved lobbyists in greater numbers than ever in the past, and the lobbying activities were more intensive. At least 22 lobbyists testified before congressional committees in behalf of the countries they represented. The list of lobbyists included former members of both the Eisenhower and Truman administrations, Washington lawyers, and public relations men. Their agreements with their principals varied from flat fees to contingency agreements, depending upon the action taken by Congress.

The massive lobbying activity this year arose from the fact that the administration recommended that the Cuban sugar quota of some 3 million tons, withdraw from Cuba because of Castro, be purchased in the world market at something like 2.8 cents a pound rather than on a quota basis from designated countries at traditional premium prices. At the premium price the supplying country would receive approximately $54 a ton more than it would receive at world prices. The administration's counterproposal was an open, almost demanding invitation to every sugar producing country interested in getting a share of the premium market to seek representation. Most of them did.

We now come to the basic question: Is lobbying a threat to democracy?

The effects of lobbying can be good or bad, helpful or harmful to democracy, depending upon two things: the purposes or objectives of the lobbying effort, and the methods or devices by which the lobby seeks to accomplish its objectives.

There are some who take the extreme view that lobbies are by their very nature power blocs and therefore inconsistent with democratic government; that since lobbies represent special or limited interests, their objectives are of necessity not directed to the general welfare and, therefore, they should be abolished.

There are some who see nothing wrong with lobbies except when they represent economic interests.

There are some who hold that the dangers in lobbying arise from secrecy and behind-the-scenes operations and from the amount of money that may be spent by lobbyists.

There are regular demands that more publicity be given to lobbying activities, that lobbying be more closely regulated, and that the amount of money which can be spent by a lobbyist or lobbying groups be limited and fully reported.

Positively, the activity of lobbyists is often very helpful. Lobbyists can help maintain a balance between Congress and the executive branch of the Government. The executive branch has a prepared case, usually sustained by expert witnesses. The Congress can offer in opposition the knowledge and experience of its own Members and that of the committee staff or congressional assistants. Often this is an unfair contest. The expert testimony of lobbyists or witnesses from outside may help to bring the contest closer to balance.

Congress, of course, does not depend entirely upon lobbyists for its information. It is the usual practice to call upon governmental experts and also on independent experts drawn from groups directly affected by the legislation under consideration or from related fields and from the academic profession.

For example, in special hearings on unemployment in 1959, invitations to testify were sent to these organizations; the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Coal Policy Conference, the AFL–CIO, the United Mine Workers, the National Small Businessmen's Association, the Railway Labor Executives Association and others. Representatives of the United States Departments of Labor, Commerce, and Defense were called. Leading labor economists were asked to submit papers, to testify, and to meet with the members of the committee. Hearings were also held in the field. These hearings were open to the testimony of anyone who wished to speak on the subject.

Apart from laws and regulations, there are some built-in protections against the power and influence of lobbyists. One safeguard is that usually there are organized lobbies on both sides of contriversial issues; protectionists on the one hand versus free-traders on the other; the AFL–CIO opposed by the National Association of Manufacturers; growers' associations against those seeking to improve working conditions of migratory farm workers; antivivisectionists against those who favor medical experimentation with animals.

Sometimes the opposition is not direct but involves competition for a larger share of a quota or a subsidy, or for greater participation in advantageous tax concessions.

Political party positions and programs, too, tend to eliminate large areas of political action from the influence of lobbyists. The political compaign in the United States is a rather severe testing. Most of the important national issues are raised during political campaigns, and most men who are elected to office have made firm commitments on most issues.

The President of the United States is called to account and judged by the people every 4 years; Members of the U.S. Senate must run for reelection every 6 years, Members of the House of Representatives every 2 years.

The activities of Members of Congress are watched closely by colleagues, particularly by those of the opposite party. They are watched by newspapermen whose reputations in many cases are based upon their ability to ferret out and report any action and conduct unbecoming Government officials.

In addition, of course, everyone who holds office must assume that there are at least two or three people—perhaps in his own party and certainly in the opposition party—who are quite willing to replace him and consequently are likely to give more than ordinary attention to his conduct in public office.

What can or should be done about lobbying?

Members of Congress cannot be fully protected from lobbyists by regulation. They cannot be expected to keep a checklist of registered lobbyists or demand proof of registration or defense of nonregistration before responding to a request for conversation or for a conference. Yet, Members of Congress and other Government officials can be given some protection by law.

The present lobby registration act should be fully enforced, and financial reporting should be checked carefully. Fees contingent on successful lobbying should be outlawed. Care should be taken to remove from direct legislative determination those questions which should be settled by other branches of Government: by the President, by special commissions, by departments and agencies of Government or by international agreement.

Much of the agitation over the Sugar Act could have been prevented if the administration, acting directly or possibly in cooperation with the Organization of American States or the signatories to the International Sugar Agreement, had determined the way in which the Cuban sugar quota was to be allocated. These would have been some congressional protest, since in a broad way Congress has determined sugar allocations since the Sugar Act was passed in 1934. But the protest would have been limited and the compromises so minor that extensive lobbying activities, brought on when the whole question of reallocation was left open by the administration, would have been discouraged.

Better salaries for Government officials and sounder methods of financing campaigns would also lessen the likelihood of undue financial influence on public officials by lobbyists and others.

There is always the risk that public officials may be unduly subject to outside influence. But it is hard to imagine a meeting of a national legislature today that could or should be insulated from public pressure or demand. The practice of some primitive tribes, in which the wise men or elders withdrew from society periodically to consider laws and practices, is not likely to be revived.

The whole concept that lobbying opposes the majority, that it seeks to manipulate and subvert the majority will and the public interest, is unrealistic. Lobbyists seldom manufacture a problem. They call attention to an existing problem and try to guide the course of events. Action in Washington sometimes supports the judgment of J. B. S. Hardman, the philosopher and intellectual mentor of industrial trade unionism in America: "Majorities never rule, they merely give credentials to contending minorities."

Although lobbying does not usually involve a physical assembly—such as the 1932 veterans' bonus march on Washington or current picketing of the White House—it does involve organization, a bringing together of citizens seeking a common objective. Thus, the act of lobbying is basically an exercise of the right to petition the Government—a right set forth in the Constitution. Lobbying also involves, in a way, the exercise of the right of assembly.

In a democratic society there must be a point at which influences, both good and bad, are brought to bear upon government. The point at which these influences meet finally is in the elected and appointed officials of the country. They are supposed to be men skilled and experienced in politics and possessing the character to withstand improper pressures and improper demands.

Until a clear case can be made against the lobbyist, his voice should be heard in Washington. But his voice must be identified and, insofar as possible, restricted to that influence which is justified by the facts and the conclusions to be drawn from those facts.

THE BIG ONES

As reported, according to law, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate, the 10 biggest spending lobbies in Washington in 1961 were:

American Medical Association	$163,405
AFL–CIO	139,919
American Farm Bureau Federation	111,364
American Legion	103,566
U.S. Savings & Loan League	101,801
National Committee for Insurance Taxation	90,058
National Farmers Union	88,273
National Housing Conference	88,141
American Trucking Associations, Inc	84,986
International Brotherhood of Teamsters	81,918

Wrecking Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following statement, with which I agree, extracted from an editorial published in this morning's New York Times:

WRECKING FOREIGN AID

The House Appropriations Committee has gutted a large part of the economic aid program, cast what is in effect a vote of nonconfidence in the Agency for International Development, and revived the old prohibition against aid to Poland and Yugoslavia. If the committee had set out deliberately to undercut the prestige of the United States among its friends and allies, and to destroy confidence in the foreign aid program, it could hardly have done a more effective job than has been done, or one more pleasing to the Soviet Union.

The most damaging single recommendation is the cut in the development loan program's funds from the requested $1,250 million to $775 million. This is clearly an attempt to repudiate this long-term program for which Congress only last year gave an annual authorization of up to $1,600 million. In the words used by an administration official last week, final passage of the committee's recommendation would be "a colossal breach of faith by the United States with the underdeveloped half of the free world." The $75 million cut in the $600 million requested for the Alliance for Progress strikes similarly at the confidence the nations of Latin America may have in the promises of the U.S. Government.

Since the quality and impact of the aid program must depend in large measure upon the supervision given allocation and expenditure of funds, the 15 percent cut for the AID also is alarming. This slap at the agency comes after a period in which AID's workload has increased very substantially, yet the appropriation request would require reduction of the staff. This is not the way to build morale or improve performance.

It is in the revival of the Polish-Yugoslav issue that the spirit of the committee's recommendations is most apparent. This question has already been discussed and debated at incredible length, and decided in a

sensible fashion which gives President Kennedy the flexibility he needs. Now the House Appropriations Committee seeks to upset this satisfactory arrangement.

The Foreign Aid Program for Fiscal Year 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House, by Hon. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, September 19, 1962.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am gravely concerned by the drastic cut of over $1,100 million which the Appropriations Committee has recommended in the appropriation requested by the President to conduct the foreign aid program for fiscal year 1963.

That program has a central and major role in our foreign policy whose objectives are to protect the security and promote the welfare of our country. I know that you and your colleagues of both parties in the House are as deeply devoted to the achievement of these high objectives as I am. I feel impelled, therefore, to bring to your attention my deep conviction that those objectives will be greatly endangered if this cut is allowed to stand.

You are as familiar as I am with the worldwide struggle for freedom in which the United States and other nations of the free world have been engaged against the aggressive power of totalitarian communism and of the indispensible role which our foreign aid program has had in preserving freedom in the world. It quite literally saved Europe from chaos and the spread of communism and made possible its regrowth as a strong partner in collective security. It rescued Greece and Turkey from Soviet domination, maintained stability in Iran, preserved the Philippines from Communist insurrection and made possible the continued existence of the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China. It has provided the military assistance vital to creating the free world shield of NATO. It has made possible the economic survival of Israel and the development of India and Pakistan where a fifth of the world's people are showing that progress can be made in freedom—in contrast to the failure and human misery of communism in China.

The great struggle for freedom still continues. Dangers in the Far East are still present. The importance of progress in South Asia is still as great. NATO remains essential to our safety. The Communist effort to penetrate and control the many new nations of Africa goes on. Communism has actually succeeded in establishing a beachhead in our own hemisphere, in Cuba. It is attempting to infiltrate and destroy the freedom of our Latin American neighbors, with whom we are joined in an Alliance for Progress.

Our aid program is a principal and vital instrument of our foreign policy for maintaining the integrity and freedom of the nations of these regions and for helping them in their own efforts toward economic and social progress. Its significance to our own security and welfare is fully recognized by the legislation enacted by the Congress last year and renewed this year.

It is important to realize that the appropriations requested by the President for fiscal year 1963 are intended to carry out the policy authorized by the legislation and initiated last year. The appropriations requested for fiscal year 1963, $4,754.8 million, including funds for the Alliance for Progress, are in fact only 1 percent more than the appropriations actually made and available last year, including the funds for the Alliance for Progress. They are only 3 percent more than was appropriated for fiscal year 1961 (leaving aside the Alliance, which did not then exist).

It is obvious that a drastic cut of the nature recommended by the Appropriations Committee would compel an equally drastic change in and weakening of the policy now carried out by the President pursuant to the legislation itself. I do not believe that any such change in policy is desired or intended by the Congress.

Although the reductions as a whole and in several categories will impair our ability as a nation to pursue the central objectives of our foreign policy, I would like to emphasize the effects of two reductions in particular: those in development lending and in supporting assistance.

Development lending was enacted by the Congress last year as the keystone of our aid program. The new aid agency was to move as rapidly as possible from grants for short-term purposes under the supporting assistance category to dollar-repayable loans for long-term development under the development lending category. Last year the Congress appropriated $1,112.5 million for development lending for fiscal year 1962 and authorized $1,500 million for fiscal year 1963. The President has now asked $1,250 million for fiscal year 1963 under this authorization. The increase over last year is intended to carry forward the policy of transferring aid from grants to dollar-repayable loans. The Appropriations Committee has recommended $775 million—a cut of 38 percent. (The provision of funds for the Alliance for Progress does not reduce this cut. Funds of a comparable amount were provided for the Alliance last year by a separate act.) This cut would obviously make it impossible for the President to carry out the policy established by the Congress of shifting the emphasis from grants to loans. It would reverse that policy.

In fact, the action of the committee would make it impossible to extend any significant new loans beyond those already committed in the past. Let me emphasize that underscored statement. You will recall that last year the Congress provided statutory authority to the President to make long-term commitments, subject to appropriations. Commitments made under this authority, with others already made and explicitly recognized last year, will call for loan funds in fiscal year 1963 amounting to $700 million. The committee recommendation would leave only $75 million for additional lending to such important countries as Greece, Israel, Turkey, the Republic of China and the Republic of Korea.

Such a reversal of established congressional policy would paralyze U.S. leadership in this tremendous task of development and progress in the most dangerously critical areas of the world.

I would urge on you and all Members of the Congress the sober necessity of providing the funds needed to continue that leadership.

Supporting assistance is needed, as you know, primarily to help sustain the economies of nations heavily burdened by military programs which they maintain as part of our agreed free world defense effort. These nations are on the very edge of Communist power, living quite literally under the continuing threat of infiltration, subversion or attack. Supporting assistance also goes to a few nations which provide us with bases or other special facilities—and to others whose internal stability is endangered by serious economic problems and whose collapse could set in train consequences potentially dangerous and highly expensive to our own Nation.

It is our policy to end supporting assistance to any country as soon as its circumstances and our national interest allow it in each case. But until that time comes, it is a dangerous economy to fail to do what needs to be done. The $415 million the President has requested under the authorizing legislation is already well below the $481.5 million for which he asked authorization. The further cut to $350 million recommended by the committee will make it impossible for us to act—or to act adequately—where we should in our own national interest.

The sum requested by the President for development grants, $300 million, is substantially identical with the sum appropriated last year. These funds are needed for basic education, technical training, and the preparation of the public administration officials, particularly in those nations which most recently attained their independence. They are directed toward developing the human resources which are so fundamental to the firm establishment of these new nations and their growth in freedom. The committee cut of $75 million—or 25 percent—would seriously impair our ability to provide fundamental help at a most critical time.

The contingency fund provides the essential margin of safety in our conduct of a highly complex aid program in support of our worldwide foreign policy. The demands on this fund which have arisen since the legislation was originally submitted have already been heavy. The President's request of $300 million is well below the $400 million authorization originally requested. The further cut of $75 million recommended by the committee narrows the margin dangerously below the level of safety.

I warmly welcome the action of the full Appropriations Committee in partially restoring the military assistance funds cut so heavily by the subcommittee. Nevertheless, the $1,500 million which the President has requested—and which is below both the appropriation for last year and the authorization for this year—is in fact needed.

The reduction in the Alliance for Progress, though less severe than the cuts I have discussed, does not support our call to the governments and peoples of this hemisphere to mobilize to defend the freedoms of our own continents.

The sharp reduction in the sum requested for administration of the program can have costly effects far greater than the apparent saving. In our aid program, not only are we engaged in the expenditures of very significant sums, but the wisdom with which we use them can have effects on the future of our Nation far beyond the immediate value of the funds involved. The administrative funds requested are needed to employ the most capable personnel to man the most effective organization we can devise. We cannot do this with the reduced funds recommended.

Finally, I understand the effect of section 109 of the appropriation bill, as recommended, would be to undo the work of the Congress only a few weeks ago in the foreign aid authorizing legislation to give the President authority, under certain circumstances carefully spelled out in the law, to provide aid to such nations as Yugoslavia and Poland. This matter has been extensively discussed in the Congress and I shall not, therefore, repeat the reasons why it is of the highest importance that the authority provided by the Congress in the authorizing legislation be continued.

Our aid program has always been a great national effort. Over the past 14 years, it has always been bipartisan in nature, springing from the needs of our country, not the ambitions of either party. It has been strongly supported by successive Presidents and by both parties. I trust and am confident that support will continue.

I am sending a substantially identical letter to Mr. HALLECK.

Sincerely,

DEAN RUSK.

Virgin Islands National Park, St. John, V.I.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 2429) to revise the boundaries of the Virgin Islands National Park, St. John, V.I., and for other purposes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, a couple of weeks ago when this bill came before the House under suspension of the rules I protested the condemnation features that were in the bill. I thought that the people of the Island of St. John should have the right to decide themselves whether or not they wished to dispose of their property and dispose of their homes, so I opposed the bill and it failed to get the necessary two-thirds vote at that time. It now has been brought to the floor under a regular rule.

I think as a result of that failure of passage quite a few things happened. Mr. Laurance Rockefeller had announced his opposition to the condemnation features. Governor Paiewonsky subsequently announced his opposition to the condemnation part of the bill. I can assure you that I got a great many letters from the people of the Virgin Islands, particularly from the Island of St. John, in opposition to the condemnation features.

I also want to compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUTHERFORD] for his diligence in going down there to get the views of the people who were basically concerned, and coming back with the proper solution. I think the House should also know that Senator Moorhead of the Virgin Islands, who lives in St. John, visited me in my office the other day, as I am sure he did other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and expressed his view that if the condemnation features were eliminated the bill would meet with the approval of the residents of that island. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUTHERFORD] has informed me that he is going to offer this amendment, which will eliminate the condemnation features. Therefore, I will support the bill.

I do not know whether another 3,000 acres on the Island of St. John will be acquired or not. I frankly think that 6,000 acres, which amounts to half of the island, is adequate. I would like to see private development, homes built by many people who would like to live there. But whether these other acres are acquired or not is up to the judgment of those people who own the properties. They can decide for themselves whether or not they want to sell. They will not be subjected to condemnation proceedings. They can do it of their own volition. This is the kind of legislation that I think the House should approve.

Bird's Eye View of New York Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, for the edification of the country, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD this report from the September 18 issue of the New York Herald Tribune on the actual happenings at the recent New York State Democratic Convention:

A DEMOCRATIC RIOT: NOTHING EVER LIKE IT
(By James F. Clarity)

SYRACUSE.—The bands were blaring and the delegates were still having a happily raucous blast on the floor of the Onondaga County War Memorial Auditorium at 11:30 Monday night.

It was something to tell the neighbors about when you got back home to Cortland, or Elmira or Rego Park, a spectacle to make the faithful Democratic hearts beat fearlessly and hopefully against the enemy Rockefeller.

A few seconds later about 200 angry people from Queens began a demonstration that turned the convention into a riot of screaming, cursing and fist shaking unique in the history of State conventions.

The Queens people thought their favorite son, District Attorney Frank D. O'Connor, was being cheated out of the nomination for Governor by Mayor Wagner and other party chiefs.

They shouted down speaker after speaker who tried to make speeches heard from the auditorium stage. They stood up at the front of the hall, near the stage, and waved O'Connor placards as if by sheer motion they could dissuade the party fathers from their decision to make Robert M. Morgenthau the candidate.

Mayor Erastus Corning II, a tall, tanned, imperious man who is mayor of Albany and the convention's permanent chairman, beat on a small wooden block repeatedly with his gavel. He was totally ignored by the O'Connor zealots.

Mayor Wagner sat in the back row of chairs on the stage and smoked filter-tipped cigarettes, his face as expressionless as stone.

The demonstrators shouted: "Down with bossism. Down with Morgenthau. Who's running this, DeSapio?"

James A. Farley sat on the stage and glowered. Mr. Farley, the party's grand old man, who attended a convention for the first time in 1918, said later: "It was terrible. Corning was inept. He should have gavelled them out of order and had the hall cleared for an hour. Rayburn did it once. Why didn't they stop the damn bands from playing after 10 or 15 minutes? I've never seen anything like it in my entire political life."

Another party veteran, Representative CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, of the Bronx, was asked for his opinion.

Mr. BUCKLEY, whose delivery of his delegation to the Morgenthau camp was the turning point of the preconvention maneuvering, said: "I didn't hear any noise in my section."

What did he think of the noise elsewhere? "I didn't hear a thing," Mr. BUCKLEY said.

Gradually, the anti-Morgenthau force swelled to include supporters of Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON and Howard J. Samuels. The drums continued to thump throughout the hall.

The first rollcall of counties began shortly after 1 a.m. There was shouting and ranting as each non-O'Connor was announced. The Brooklyn delegation went almost solidly for Mr. Morgenthau, but one delegate called for polling of the entire delegation by individuals. According to the State election law, individual polling can only be done on the request of a delegate for his particular assembly district delegation. One Brooklyn district was polled individually and Mr. O'Connor gained one vote.

At 2 a.m., the auditorium was filled with one huge cacophonous roar as the first ballot ended with Mr. Morgenthau seven votes shy of the necessary majority.

The O'Connor people acted, simply, as if they were insane. They had their opponent on his back with a swordpoint at his jugular—they thought.

Nassau County Chairman John F. English, an O'Connor supporter, grabbed a microphone on the floor and demanded a vote be taken on a motion to adjourn until 10 a.m.

Mr. Corning, after a hurried conference with party officials on the stage, called for a voice vote.

There was an undeniable roar in favor of adjournment, which, presumably would give the O'Connor forces more time to talk to irresolute Morgenthau delegates, if there were any.

A lesser roar was voiced against the motion. Mr. Corning ruled the motion defeated. The screams of the O'Connor enthusiasts reached a new pitch of uncontrolled outrage. Their faces were red and savage.

Mr. English jumped over a 3-foot high wooden barrier, bounded through the press section, climbed onto the stage, and appeared on the verge of punching Mr. Corning. He shoved his right fist within inches of Mr. Corning's face and shricked, "You're going to give us a delegate poll."

State Chairman William H. McKeon, who weighs 120 pounds, stood to the side of Mr. Corning and said, "All right, all right. Just get down off here." Mr. English pointed a finger at Mr. McKeon and repeated his demand.

Syracuse policemen jumped to the stage to prevent delegates from climbing up, but none tried.

The polling of the delegates was conducted and, ironically, it resulted in a defeat of the adjournment motion when some 50 Queens delegates who supported Mr. O'Connor on the first nominating ballot switched their votes.

It was these same 50 who swung the nomination to Mr. Morgenthau on the second nominating ballot, which followed.

By 4 a.m. it was all over.

Beaten and exhausted, the O'Connor people filed sullenly out of the auditorium, and the great attempt to buck city hall had failed.

Mr. Morgenthau left his room on the sixth floor of the Hotel Syracuse and made

a brief statement in a banquet room, expressing his desire to have the party united against Governor Rockefeller for the campaign.

Still, there was no celebrating at the Friends for Morgenthau headquarters in the hotel. There was no liquor. There were no sandwiches. There wasn't much left but the disturbing thought that, after all, underdogs hardly ever win anything.

Fairleigh Dickinson Comes of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, in the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News of September 16, 1962, there appeared a very interesting article by Staff Correspondent Richard Johnston, with respect to Fairleigh Dickinson University which has now reached the age of 21 years. I doubt if any educational institution in the world has progressed from a 2-year junior college with 59 students to a university comprising 6 schools and 39 buildings, on 3 campuses, with 16,000 students, in so short a time.

This modern miracle is largely the product of the inspiration, the leadership, and the hard work of Dr. Peter Sammartino, Fairleigh Dickinson's president, and his many enthusiastic coworkers both in and out of the university.

In order that all who read the RECORD may have the opportunity of learning more about the miracle of Fairleigh Dickinson, I include this interesting article about this great university, as follows:

FAIRLEIGH DICKINSON OF AGE

Fairleigh Dickinson University, having reached the age of majority, is now ready to settle down and mature.

"We won't be getting any bigger," says Dr. Peter Sammartino, president and motivating force behind the school's phenomenal growth since it was founded in 1942. "Now all we want to do is develop and improve what we have."

To facilitate the university's improvement, Dr. Sammartino will announce this week the appointment of Dr. Clarence R. Decker, university vice president, to devote his time exclusively to creative and experimental educational activities.

LOOKING TO FUTURE

In addition, a committee of the future, made up of members of the faculty and educational trustees, will be organized to develop the university park in the Teaneck campus for a research center; develop a research program at the graduate and undergraduate level; develop contacts with international educators to improve the school's summer institutes in Italy, Mexico, England, and southeast Asia; develop similar educational activities in the Middle East and Africa; increase the services of all kinds of placement services, extracurricular services and services for foreign students; increase facilities at the international house opened last week in Teaneck, and establish a college for outstanding students.

Fairleigh Dickinson, which started in 1942 as a 2-year junior college with 1 building on an 8-acre campus, 59 students, 8 teachers, and $60,000 in cash, today has 6 schools in 39 buildings on 3 campuses (Teaneck and Madison-Florham Park are the others), 16,000 students, 784 teachers, a $6-million endowment fund, and properties valued at $24 million.

SIX MAGAZINES

In addition to the great strides the university has taken in the fields of arts and sciences, it now publishes six nationally and internationally distributed magazines.

It has schools in liberal arts, science, and engineering, dentistry, education, business administration, and a graduate school.

In 1948 the school became a full 4-year college, acquiring Bergen Junior College, Teaneck, in 1954 and the luxurious Twombly Estate in Florham Park in 1957. "The Florham Park campus is probably the most luxurious campus in the country and it is the only time in the history of higher education that a college has established three campuses in less than 20 years," said Dr. Sammartino.

Sitting at a modern version of a desk in his tastefully decorated, paneled office in the Old Castle Building, Mr. Sammartino recalled the humble beginnings of the school that had developed in his imagination for more than 10 years before it was founded.

VERSATILITY REQUIRED

"Right where we're sitting was a cafeteria when the school was first opened," he said, "and when no one was eating we used it for a classroom." He taught psychology and modern political history then. "That was between the many other chores I had," he smiled, "like stoking the furnace."

His wife, Sylvia, now the dean of admissions, then "did everything else that had to be done * * * like registering students, handling the social functions, and doing the office work.

"What a job it was reading the place for our first term," Dr. Sammartino recalled. "The new teachers, even some students, came to work with us in dungarees. We cleaned and painted and made most of the repairs ourselves.

"The castle, built as a summer home for a New York book company executive in 1888, later became a private club for men known as the Union Club. It hadn't been occupied since the depression," he said.

ADMIRED CASTLE

The idea for a college here first took form in the mind of Dr. Sammartino in the early 1930's when he was courting his wife who then lived at 220 Montross Avenue here.

"I used to pass the castle and think about what a wonderful school it would make," he said. At that time he was an associate in New College, Teachers College, Columbia University. He received his masters degree and doctorate at New York University and studied at the University of Paris.

"Over the years I became acquainted with many high school principals in this area through Dr. Guy L. Hilleboe, then superintendent of schools here," said Dr. Sammartino. "Being educators, we frequently discussed the need for a college in this area.

"Then one day the idea just seemed to take form and we started."

Louis J. Scaramelli, Dr. Sammartino's father-in-law, was a member of the board of directors of the Rutherford National Bank, now the National Community Bank. Col. Fairleigh S. Dickinson was the chairman of the bank's board of directors.

Scaramelli approached Dickinson with the idea for the college and solicited his financial support. "Colonel Dickinson said he would match any amount Scaramelli put up," Dr. Sammartino said, "and he matched the money both of us put up."

Dr. Sammartino and Scaramelli then called a meeting of 16 high school principals in the area along with the assistant commissioner in charge of higher education, formed a board of educational directors and voted to form a junior college.

The next step was the purchase of the Old Castle Building, on which the bank held a $25,000 mortgage. When they purchased it, Dickinson reimbursed them for the money.

They then hired six instructors and opened the first class for 59 girls and 1 boy in September 1942.

Quincy Lights Its Bridge Without Tax Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this session I called the attention of this House to the Quincy, Ill., good neighbor policy found so successful in solving one community problem. Today I call attention to another story of the accomplishments possible when good citizens get together to solve their own problems in their own way without interference of government.

A few months ago a group in Quincy, Ill., felt that the bridge over the Mississippi River ought to be better lighted than it was. One way to solve this problem would have been to ask the city council to vote tax dollars for this purpose, or to turn to the State, or since the bridge crosses a navigable stream, to ask Congress to appropriate money for the needed lights.

Many people in west-central Illinois are hardy and self-reliant. They believe a man ought to do those things for himself which he can do best and call government in only when the problem is too big for him or for his neighbors. Lighting a bridge over the Mississippi is not too big a chore to be solved locally in west-central Illinois.

I am including with these remarks, Mr. Speaker, an editorial of the air which was carried over radio station WTAD and TV channel 7, KHGA in Quincy, and under unanimous consent take pride in inserting in the RECORD this editorial so that the Nation can be reassured that the spirit which made this country great still flourishes in the 20th Congressional District of Illinois:

The city of Quincy has passed a milestone during the past week. On Friday morning Mayor Wes Olson's office announced that the bridgelighting campaign had gone over the top by some $500. This means that Quincy, through it's own efforts entirely, will have beautiful lights on it's bridge.

This was a unique effort. It was a united effort—in which Quincyans pulled together to reach their goal. The fine leadership, so necessary for such a campaign, was furnished by Mayor Olson. But the real solid effort came from the people of Quincy themselves. It was a grassroots effort to solve a problem which had become almost impossible for the bureaucracy of two States to solve.

All of us who live in Quincy can be very proud of this effort. And, when the lights are up and lighting the way across the bridge, each of us can rejoice in the fact that we had a part in this fine community effort. We can also rejoice in the fact that taxpayers will not have to pay 1 penny of this expense.

An effort of this kind should surely make Quincy well qualified to become an all-American city. Because this was a cross section of the community, working together. This was in the fine American tradition of doing something for yourself—and was in very sharp contrast to the accepted practice these days of running to our Government for everything we want and need.

America was built and settled by pioneers who wanted no help from anybody. They were rugged individualists who worked for what they got. That their system works is apparent to any American—or anyone else who takes the trouble to travel across our great country.

Now, many years later, we have proved that this system works once again—and right here in Quincy.

Mayor Olson gives the credit for this achievement to all Quincyans—and all those who gave him such splendid cooperation. It is well to remember, however, that this was Mr. Olson's own idea—and that he worked extremely hard to push the campaign to a successful conclusion himself.

Quincyans will work hard and they will work together. We have always known this. In the past sometimes they have worked in opposite directions. But, now they have the leadership so necessary to make their work effective.

With this kind of spirit—and cooperation—and leadership—there is literally nothing that Quincy cannot do. No task should appear too formidable to us from this point on.

Administration of the Davis-Bacon Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to a letter from Mr. J. B. Lowe, of Dallas, Tex., inserted in the RECORD of September 14, 1962, by my colleague, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE. In his letter, Mr. Lowe makes some fallacious assertions about practices of the Department of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Act. In clarification of those assertions, I submit the following:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1962.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I read with interest the letter of Mr. J. B. Lowe, of Dallas, Tex., which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1962. Unfortunately, Mr. Lowe made a few erroneous statements concerning administration of the Davis-Bacon Act by the Department of Labor.

The Special Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, has recently concluded extensive hearings on the Davis-Bacon Act and its administration. I would like to apprise you of the actual practices of the Department in contradiction to Mr. Lowe's statements.

Mr. Lowe's letter indicates that only union rates have been considered by the Labor Department in determining prevailing wages. This is not correct. The Department considers whatever rate is prevailing in a given area, whether it be union or nonunion.

Another fallacy in Mr. Lowe's letter is his assumption that residential construction rates would determine construction rates for nonresidential projects. This is incorrect. Under the Davis-Bacon Act the Secretary of Labor is required to determine prevailing wages from projects of a character similar to the contract work.

The Special Subcommittee on Labor has heard various criticisms of the Davis-Bacon Act and its administration. Such criticism, if constructive, is very helpful. The instant leter, however, raises some criticisms that, to me, seem unfounded. I am sure you would want to be informed of what the subcommittee has learned to be Labor Department practice under this important act.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES ROOSEVELT, *Chairman.*

Buffalo, N.Y., Host to Polish Union of America's 25th Quadrennial Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the week of August 19, 1962, the city of Buffalo, N.Y., was host to the Polish Union of America on the occasion of their 25th quadrennial convention.

The highlight of the convention was a banquet held on Sunday, August 19, at the Hotel Statler-Hilton in Buffalo, under the careful guidance of Mr. Alfred F. Wolinski and Mr. John Krysinski, the reception chairman.

The toastmaster for the evening was the Honorable Chester C. Gorski, president of the city council of Buffalo.

The invocation was given by the Right Reverend Monsignor Peter J. Adamski, P.A.

Greetings were extended to the delegates and guests by Mr. Walter J. Lohr, president of the Polish Union of America.

His message follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, as president of the Polish Union of America, it gives me more than usual pleasure, to extend a hearty welcome to His Excellency Bishop Leo R. Smith, our honorary chaplain of the Polish Union of America, whose friendship, is one of the most precious possessions one can hope to enjoy, always interested in the good of our organization and the welfare of its members. I also want to extend our welcome to the right reverend, the very reverend monsignories, the reverend clergy, to Congressman Thaddeus Dulski, to Senator Walter Mahoney, to Mayor John Ogarek, mayor of the city of Lackawanna, to Mr. Frank Luchowski, representative of mayor Chester Kowal, mayor of the city of good neighbors, Buffalo, who unfortunately cannot be with us, for reasons known to all of us, to Mr. Stanley Turkiewicz, president of one of the largest Polish Roman Catholic organizations in America, to the representatives of our brother and sister organizations, to the delegates and members of our organization and to all our friends, who have honored us by their presence here tonight, the opening of the 25th quadrennial convention.

I also want to thank Mr. John Krysinski, our national vice president who has labored most earnestly and most cheerfully, to make this banquet a success.

Ladies and gentlemen, anyone who lives fully and makes a contribution to the community in which he lives, is a success.

This motto, can be applied to the fullest extent, to the Polish Union of America, a fraternal as well as a beneficial, organization of American citizens of Polish extraction.

Its worth reflects the wisdom of the founders of the Polish Union of America, the late John Pitass, pastor of St. Stanislaus Parish, Buffalo, N.Y., and the late Reverend Dominik Majer, of St. Paul, Minn., who built, this organization on the enduring foundation, and religious principles, to support its purposes and religious practices, on the part of its membership, to insure its perpetuity.

Through their guiding genius, the stupendous undertaking, was launched as the Polish Union of America.

The Polish Union of America, was a product of historic necessity, it helped to preserve, what is best in the Polish background and tradition, of its members and incorporate it, into the American way of life, of which they are an integral part.

The members of the Polish Union of America contributed, to American industry, commerce, education, religious and charity. It may not be widely known, but cannot be ignored and minimized.

America to some of us, may be an adopted land, but to most of us, born here, is a home of the free and mighty, in the championship of freedom, to all peace-loving countries of the world.

While some of us despair about the future of the Polish American status, and point out, that the Polish language is spoken less and less, that the Polish American press is losing support and our fraternal organizations are not gaining enough new members, and generally claim, that our Polonia is doomed, I say, have faith

Work and work hard, because Polonia is not wasting away, falling apart and sliding into an abyss, but on the contrary, it is living a healthy normal life, based on strong and enduring principles, principles which have guided the life of the Polish American community in its religious, family, social, intellectual, economic, cultural, political and fraternal manifestations.

It is based, on positive established principles, so well embodied in the Polish Union of America, for the past 72 years, in this motto: "Unity is Strength."

Again I repeat, let us have faith, and upkeep, what our forefathers built, and as long as we have organizations, such as the Polish Union of America and others, we will succeed and benefit. As I said at the very outset of my address of welcome, anyone who lives fully and makes a contribution, to the community in which he lives, is a success, and the Polish Union of America is a success.

In conclusion, it is our hope, that you will enjoy the program arranged by the committee, but perhaps, more than that, we hope that all our thinking will be provoked, so that we will renew our efforts to promote fraternalism in its purest form.

Fraternalism, has a definite mission. Fraternalism, is a patriotic and democratic institution, founded on the principles of democracy.

It has always been a strong and beneficial influence in our Nation's history and is sorely needed today, when we are beset on every side, by other concepts of life—isms, which would destroy our Government, of, by, and for the people.

The Honorable Walter J. Mahoney, New York State senator, delivered the following address:

In a few days, September 1, we will mark the 23d anniversary of the infamous day when Poland was invaded by Hitler's Nazi hordes and World War II began. The gallant defense by Poland will go down in history as one of the most heroic chapters in the never-ending fight for freedom. Today, that fight is still going on against an equally vicious tyranny, the forces of atheistic communism. The Polish people are still in the forefront, and they deserve our prayers and encouragement. I am confident that one day they will throw off the chains of dictatorship.

The great contribution the Polish Union makes in providing insurance for its membership is well known outside your community. This is, of course, vitally important. But you are to be congratulated also for the lesser known social-service aspects of your organization. In these days when the concept of family life is under attack from all sides, and when people more and more are being encouraged to depend on government for the things which might better and more properly be done by themselves and their neighbors, this is indeed a heartening thing.

America's greatness has been its ability to draw upon the cultures of all of the many peoples who have come to her shores, preserving the best of each while uniting all under a common devotion to their adopted land. We must strive to retain the interest of our young people in their respective heritages, so that while we all fuse in the great melting pot, we do not lose sight of the great contributions each national group has made.

Senator Mahoney brought the following message from the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, August 17, 1962.

Mr. WALTER J. LOHR,
President, Polish Union of America,
Buffalo, N.Y.

DEAR MR. LOHR: The 24th quadrennial convention of the Polish Union of America affords me the welcome opportunity of sending my cordial greetings to all present at the preconvention dinner.

The Polish Union, thanks to able leadership, has done a remarkably good job. It has maintained the ideals of ancient Polish traditions. It has preserved among the Americans of Polish origin respect for Polish history and Polish customs. It has contributed to the happiness and welfare of its members. It has encouraged fidelity to Poland's passionate belief in man's right to his own soul and his own integrity. God did not make the Poles to be slaves.

Among the finest of our citizens are those of Polish origin. Your great generals, Pulaski and Kosciusko, helped us win our freedom, and those who came after have defended, expanded, and enhanced it. You helped to build our railroads. You helped clear and till our fields; you helped man our factories; your thriftiness helped finance our economic growth; you have made distinguished contributions in the arts and professions; and when the call to arms has been sounded, Americans of Polish origin have customarily responded in numbers far beyond your proportion in our population.

You have been freedom fighters, not only when freedom was threatened by tyrants but also in the day-to-day struggle to keep it viable and strong.

My best wishes for a happy convention.

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

Greetings were extended by the Honorable Chester Kowal, mayor of Buffalo, who was represented by Mr. Frank Luchowski.

Choral selections were offered by the Kalina Singing Society No. 221 P.S.A., under the direction of Mr. Peter Gorecki.

Greetings were also extended from the Polish Clergy Association by the Reverend Joseph Stelmach, president.

It was a pleasure for me to address the delegates and guests and my text follows:

It is an honor and a great personal pleasure to address this great convention of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America.

As I am sure you are all aware, the Polish contribution to American life extends back to the time of the earliest voyages of exploration. Poles have participated in every American conflict. They made notable contributions to the American Revolutionary effort. At the time of the Civil War there were some 30,000 Poles in the United States. Of this number, 4,000 fought in the Union Army and 1,000 in the Army of the Confederate States. When President Lincoln made his appeal for volunteers, typical of those who responded was General Kryzanowski who distinguished himself at the battles of Cross Keys, Bull Run, Chancellorsville, and Gettysburg. He was appointed the first Governor of Alaska, served in Panama, and died in 1887. In 1938 his remains were transferred to the Arlington National Cemetery. Polish-Americans have fought in the Spanish War, both World Wars, and the Korean war. Their heroism is one of the great parts of the tradition of the Polish people in America. But an important part of that same tradition is the history of the organization met in convention here today, the great patriotic, religious, fraternal, Polish Roman Catholic Union of America.

The founding, growth, and tradition of service of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America grew naturally out of the history of the Polish people in the United States. In 1870 there were some 50,000 Poles and 10 Polish parishes in America; in 1875 there were 200,000 Poles and 50 parishes. By 1889 there were 800,000 Poles in 132 churches led by 126 priests. At that time Wisconsin had the largest number of Polish settlements, and Chicago had the largest Polish population. Today there are more than 1,000 churches with Polish parishioners. Most Polish Americans live in the regions of the Great Lakes, lower New England, New York, and Pennsylvania. Chicago, with a population of over a half million Poles is the second largest Polish city in the world; Warsaw is the first.

The first Polish mutual aid society established in the United States was that of St. Stanislaus Kostka, in Chicago, in 1864. In time, Polish parishes were established which became the centers of social and cultural activities. The tendency toward concentration grew stronger. At the turn of the century, for example, two Polish parishes alone were larger than many dioceses. In 1899, St. Stanislaus Kostka parish of Chicago had a membership of over 50,000 parishioners, and the Buffalo parish of St. Stanislaus Bishop and Martyr numbered 30,000 parishioners. The parish church in America took on the form of a Poland in miniature. With the establishment of the parish, new institutions, especially the parochial school came into being. The purpose of the parochial school was not only to impart Christian education but to acquaint the child with its Polish heritage.

Since the Polish parishes were the centers of all community activities, an informal federation of parish leaders joined Father Gieryk to promote unity among the American Poles. The first convention met in Detroit; the name "Polish Roman Catholic Union" was adopted.

Thus, the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America became a fraternal organization which not only insures its members, but also gives help and assistance to them in commercial and educational endeavors. It helps its handicapped and unfortunate members in the spirit of brotherhood.

From the beginning, the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America has contributed to the founding, building, and expansion of the Polish-American school system. Various schools throughout the United States have been recipients of this aid. They include St. Stanislaus Kostka College in Chicago, and St. John Cantious College in Erie, Pa. Every convention of the Polish Roman Catholic Union in America has shown a strong interest in education.

The union, by using funds from assessed dues, also laid the foundation for the Polish Seminary at Orchard Lake, Detroit, Mich., the oldest Polish institution of higher learning in the United States.

The fifth convention of the union devoted itself to the problem of Polish orphans. The plans then made were realized in 1885 with the establishment of an orphanage in Chicago under the direction of the Sisters of the Holy Family of Nazareth. In 1891 the union helped establish in New York City the Polish Emigration House of Saint Joseph, a social agency for the protection of Polish immigrants. In 1894 it helped build a Polish-American pavilion at the Polish National Exposition in Lwow, Poland. In 1901 and again in 1903, at Pittsburgh, the union took a leading part in the second and third Polish Catholic Congresses which strove for Polish representation in the American Catholic hierarchy. In 1904 the union contributed to the Chicago monument to Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the American Revolutionary War hero.

In 1918 the union established its juvenile department whose primary purposes were to insure the future growth of the organization and the training in character of Polish youth born in the United States. In 1935 the sports department was formed; in 1937 the youth department replaced the sports department.

In 1908 the library was established; today it is a nationally know institution having the largest collection of Polonica in English. The union has published a series of books dealing with the history of Polish-Americans. These annals are the organ of the archives and museum of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America. In 1897 the union established Narod Polski as the official organ of the organization. Issued on the first and third Mondays of every month, it is free to members.

This great tradition of service and achievement deserves commemoration here today, and I am well aware that all in attendance at this convention intend that the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America will add new and further triumphs to its splendid record.

The convention was honored by receiving a message from the President of the United States, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, which was read at the opening meeting on Monday, August 20.

The President's message follows:

It is a pleasure to send warm greetings to the members of the Polish Union of America on the occasion of your 25th quadrennial convention. I am delighted to convey these words through Congressman DULSKI.

As Americans of Polish descent, you may be proud of the contributions made by Generals Pulaski and Kosciuszko, so many others of your countrymen, and you of this generation to the American way of life and to the ideals of freedom and democracy throughout the world.

With every good wish for a successful convention and for continuing progress in the important work you are doing.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The principal speaker was Dr. Stephen A. Graczyk, K.S.G., medical director, Care of the Aged, Catholic Charities, diocese of Buffalo, who gave a very interesting address on medical care, a topic on which he is well qualified to speak. Dr. Graczyk is an authority on this subject, because of his vast experience and the many positions he holds.

The concluding speaker was his excellency, the Most Reverend Leo R. Smith, D.D., who lifted us spiritually by stressing our obligations to God and our country.

Dick Reeves: Master of Gullah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when raconteur Harold (Dick) Reeves, district manager of the social security office, retired recently at Charleston, S.C., an excellent tribute to his faithful service was published in the Oasis, an HEW magazine.

Dick Reeves' talents are many, but aside from his topnotch reputation as district manager, he is probably best known for his efforts to preserve the distinctive Gullah dialect in the low country of South Carolina.

This colorful dialect is spoken in the coastal islands by the descendants of members of a West African tribe. And throughout the low country, Dick Reeves is known as a master of Gullah.

His knowledge of this language has taken him on lecture trips throughout at least 10 Southern States, and he frequently is called upon to speak at social and civic gatherings.

I know of no one else who has worked so unceasingly to help preserve this lingual phase of our history.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert this article in tribute to an outstanding South Carolinian:

RACONTEUR REEVES RETIRES

On May 26, 1937, a Charleston, S.C., newspaper, the News & Courier, feared the worst when it contemplated the sort of employees a new Social Security Office was likely to attract. "Any gent who has friends," the editorial declared, "may be given an office at $3,000 or $5,000, and he will be especially eligible if he be prominent and influential in a State or a congressional district. Later, he may acquire some knowledge of the insurance business, but, unlike clerks in private insurance companies (managed by economic royalists), will never be expected to work more than 35 hours a week exclusive of time devoted to the 'public interest' whose name can be found in the Congressional Directory."

Had the paper checked its facts more thoroughly, it would have learned that Harold "Dick" Reeves, the then recent appointee to the post of district manager at Charleston, had actually left a vice presidency and partnership in an insurance business to seek employment with the Social Security Board at $2,600 a year. Since then, not only the manager, but many of his staff as well, have often put in uncompensated hours of overtime to insure that potential beneficiaries learned what their rights were.

Now Dick Reeves has retired: June 30 was his last day at work. And last March, when he had completed 25 years at the same job, the same newspaper which had been so critical appraised those years as follows: "Here in the low country, social security has been administered with the competence and rectitude characteristic of Dick Reeves. He has leavened a Federal welfare operation with humor and comprehension of the problems of ordinary people. It is a pleasure to note Mr. Reeves' fine performance of a public task. * * * Well done."

Dick Reeves is a native of Charleston, "America's most historic city." Married to Roberta Lanier Taylor, father of two children, he received his education in Virginia and at the University of South Carolina. Upon retirement, he has plans to keep busy and, among other things, he will devote much time to the preservation of the distinctive Gullah dialect. Gullah is spoken in the South Carolina and Georgia coastal islands by the descendants of members of a West African tribe, brought to this continent as slaves in the 17th and 18th centuries. Dick is a master of Gullah. His weekly 15-minute social security radio program was devoted to a recitation of Aesop's Fables, first in Charleston-style English, then in Gullah—both sandwiched between the public-service BOASI announcements. But he omitted the moral of each tale. The announcer would request the listener to write in and tell what he thought the moral was. In return, Dick would send his version, along with some Bureau literature.

Dick Reeves has lectured in 10 Southern States, winning the applause of many, including at least one President of the United States. He is a member of the American Dialect Society, S.C. Dialect Society, and the Society for the Preservation of Spirituals. He is secretary to the Charleston Society of the Cincinnati, and is a lay reader for his church. Some of his stories in the Gullah dialect have been recorded and distributed nationally by BOASI; some can be heard through the facilities of the Folklore Section of the Library of Congress and various museums.

The BOASI Office of Information hopes to be able to include numbers sung by the Society for the Preservation of Spirituals with commentary by Dick Reeves, in its well-known series "The World of Folk Music."

"Gradually," as another Charleston paper—the Evening Post—summed it up recently, "through personal calls, buttonholing citizens on the street, public appearances, and many miles of travel, Dick Reeves has eliminated much of the hostility toward the OASI program, and many who once opposed his efforts, now are receiving benefits."

Dick's great modesty is touching. He sincerely believes that "there is really not much to be said" about him. And here is the "petition" that he offers to the Bureau employees with whom he has been associated over the years:

"Give me a sense of humor when I hear
Men speak a language other than my own;
And tolerance when things I once held dear
Are thrown aside like garments long outgrown.
The world moves on—the changing years unfold—
Please hold my hand when I am growing old."

A Time for Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, seldom is a State fortunate enough to have a man with the wisdom and stature as Dr. Perry E. Gresham, president, Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va. It has been my privilege to know Dr. Gresham for a long number of years professionally, socially, and politically. Under his guidance, Bethany College has grown tremendously and the people of the First Congressional District have come to love and admire this man, Gresham.

At a time in the history of our State when all dedicated West Virginians are anxiously trying to solve our difficulties on our own. Dr. Gresham has come forth with an article entitled, "A Time for Leadership," which is a ringing challenge to all West Virginians. Under unanimous consent I insert this article to be included with my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I accept Dr. Gresham's challenge:

LOOK TO THE WEALTH OF WEST VIRGINIA: A TIME FOR LEADERSHIP

(By Dr. Perry E. Gresham, president, Bethany College)

Leadership is the present crying need in West Virginia.

Without the hands and minds of men, timber remains uncut, ores unmined, fields unsown. No terrain, however veined with minerals or carpeted with loam, has wealth until men work it and develop it, and shape their dreams and lives out of it.

In our people, we have a wealth still greater than our natural bounty. Their diligence and simple virtues built us a mighty heritage. And these things still count: we have the human resource to face the altered challenges that face us now.

But a modern, complex society makes different demands of that human resource, our youth, than the difficult but simpler, individual obstacles that dared our pioneers. Now is a time for leadership—for the man who can join the many of us against vast undertakings, the man with broad-ranging knowledge of the world's tools of progress, deeply understanding of history's lessons.

Youth is the wealth the future rests with. Like a mineral wealth, it must be developed. And the unearthing, refining, shaping, tempering, and polishing of our youth is a task, desperately important, as difficult and costly as the development of any natural resource.

Producing leaders is a use of education. Yet the schools can do only what the people want them to do—too often as little as possible, as cheaply as possible. We have not everywhere been interested enough in learning; our schools are uneven in quality, our teachers unevenly prepared. Too many of our youngsters drop out of high school. Not enough go on to college—and, of those who do, far too many go out of West Virginia, leaving her bereft of the leadership they might have given.

There are bright spots. In public education we have those who are knocking themselves out to give us better schools. Some civic and community leaders and public servants have enormous dedication to school improvement. And some enlightened indus-

tries are now doing things to keep our young people in West Virginia, providing employment for them, spurring their pursuit of graduate studies, encouraging them to return afterward if their studies have taken them out of the State.

We have upward trends in gifts to private institutions, and in appropriations to State colleges; improved attitudes toward education on the citizen's part; expansion in facilities and curriculums; more schools accredited. Marshall is now a State university; West Virginia University has its remarkable new medical facility. Yes, there are bright spots.

But is it enough?

History tells us on every page what just one man of leadership can do—to change a people's philosophy from one of looking back to one of progress, to open a multitude's eyes to vistas of great new economic opportunity, to melt regional barriers and spark massive marches upon shared goals. How sadly remiss we are if we allow but one potential leader to drop out of high school and forgo such a destiny.

Ignorance has gone out of style. Pride in backwardness today is deadly. We cannot starve our schools, then wonder why they are not producing leaders. We must see; we must care; we must increase our support.

We must persuade our young people that there is every opportunity here for accomplishment and dignity, that their gumption and ideas will meet with welcome and encouragement. We must find ways to interest our bright youngsters in higher learning, and ways of pointing them toward the rewarding achievements that await anyone who will help guide West Virginia across the threshold of her hundredth year and into greatness.

Let those who can lead stand forward.

Safeguarding Our Future Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it has been vividly brought to my attention by a New York constituent who wrote me a letter that our children are returning to school and we must again be watchful for them as they are crossing streets on their way to school and playing on their way home in the afternoons. I think my constituent, Mr. Arthur Murray Aibinder, has made a very fine and constructive observation about the importance of each child to our Nation, and therefore ask unanimous consent to have the text of his letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 4, 1962.

Hon. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: School resumes. At this time I feel it is appropriate to respectfully appeal to you to convey the following safety message to your colleagues in the Senate. Together, each of you could spread the following safety precaution to your constituents:

School resumes, little Billy is anxious to see his schoolmates and tell them about his summer trip to Washington. He even met his Senator. Motorists are urged to drive carefully as this freckle-faced kid crosses the street. He might grow up to be President of the United States.

I am very grateful for your consideration of the above.

Thank you so very much, Senator JAVITS.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR MURRAY AIBINDER.

The Way of the Aggressor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in the last month, because of two recesses, many of us have "felt the pulse" of our people in the various congressional districts, and realize that, as usual, they are ahead of us in matters pertaining to the national security. At a Joint Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committee briefing last Wednesday, the Secretary of State, and others, were clearly, but not so succinctly, told that they want no more indecision, vacillation, evasion, lack of policy and/or "fiddling while Rome burns." I have said to the House in a recent talk on the floor that we have dealt from a policy of fear for too long. The accompanying editorial from the National Observer, dated Monday, September 17, 1962, summarizes the fears of our Nation at this time. Two resolutions pending before this body will enhance action instead of words and use of power before it becomes mutually annihilatory. The article summarizes how we got that way, the question of whether or not we will erase the obstacles while there is still time depends upon the will of the people, and is a function of command. We must recede from an appearance of vacillation, and we must forego appeasement.

I strongly urge, not only reading of this summary and editorial, but it's reflective study by all Members of this body:

THE WAY OF THE AGGRESSOR

In many a week for many a year the cold war has dominated the news. Last week, that war seemed to be heating up perceptibly. Many Americans wondered how, at the least, some kind of showdown over Cuba could be long avoided—if, that is, the U.S. Government planned to do anything at all about the Khrushchev-Castro combine.

The Soviet Union, having put Cuba under military occupation without opposition from the United States, proceeded to blast the United States with yet another lengthy and vicious tirade. The gist of it: Don't dare invade poor little Cuba or you will be unleashing what could be a worldwide nuclear war.

While few experts believe the Soviets actually would fight for an island so remote from them and so near us, this assessment hardly gets the United States off the hook. Its own strategic interests are directly involved if the Soviets turn Cuba into a military base for offense against other Latin nations or, in any eventual East-West war, against the U.S. mainland. That the Soviets have even gone this far, pouring masses of weapons and troops into Cuba, makes a pretty sorry spectacle of the U.S. role as defender of the Americas.

President Kennedy at his news conference declared that if ever the security of the United States or its hemispheric allies become directly threatened by Cuba, "then this country will do whatever must be done." Perhaps he is right that the time has not yet come, or perhaps there are compelling reasons, unknown to the public, for not taking a strong stand at this time.

The question today nonetheless is: If the current Soviet provocation in Cuba is not enough to move the United States to action, what if anything will?

The United States, to be sure, was making responses of a sort last week to the provocations in Cuba, Berlin, and all along the cold war front. On Cuba, Secretary of State Rusk slated an informal meeting later this month with other members of the Organization of American States—though what good it would do, on the basis of that assembly's past performance, is hard to imagine.

More broadly, the Senate gave quick approval to the President's request for standby authority to call up 150,000 Reserves. Almost everyone, and notably General Eisenhower, said we must support the President. But many people, including us, can see in the request little more than a gesture, and a somewhat baffling one at that.

President Kennedy did call up Reserves last year as a partial reaction to what he regarded as a grave intensification of the long-standing Berlin crisis. Rarely has there been a bigger military-administration foul-up, in peacetime anyway, with the Reserves' recriminations still ringing in the Pentagon's red ears. Worse, the flailing of Reserve arms seems not to have fazed Khrushchev in the least; the Berlin wall stands, and Khrushchev goes grimly on concocting new provocations in the world's No. 1 problem city.

Now, with those Reserves scarcely sent home, the question is: Will authority to call up more Reserves impress the Kremlin any more than last year's action—anywhere in the cold war cockpit?

Another kind of response last week, designed to demonstrate America's determination to Moscow and enlist American public support for the administration, was Mr. Kennedy's soaring speech on space. In Houston he said the United States must forge full speed ahead to the moon and first place in space over Russia so that those reaches of infinity will be an area of peace and never a "terrifying theater of war."

"We have vowed," the President declared, that the peoples of the world shall not see space "governed by a hostile flag of conquest, but by a banner of freedom and peace. We have vowed that we shall not see space filled with weapons of mass destruction, but with instruments of knowledge and understanding."

Though there may be good reasons for urgent exploration of space, some of the President's logic is a little hard to follow. How can we be first in space all over, in the sense of barring the Soviets from it, when they are already in it? Even if we beat them with a man on the moon, how does that preclude them from using space as a terrifying theater of war? Meantime, back on earth, they are pressing and pressing, gaining and gaining, not with spacecraft but with guns and tanks, and we are giving little by little.

The questions about the scope and unprecedented pace of our space program are not so easily answered. They are, we think, deeper than the President's inspirational language suggests.

In the midst of all this, last week also offered a footnote to the history of the cold

war. In London, at the age of 61, died Dr. Robert Soblen, naturalized American citizen but convicted Soviet spy, the victim of his own overdose of drugs in a final effort to escape serving a life sentence in the United States.

Soblen's death was not only the climax of a spy thriller international goose chase that held the headlines for weeks. It should also be a reminder of the Soviet espionage apparatus in this country; Soblen was busily transmitting our intelligence secrets even during World War II when Russia was our ally.

The damage that apparatus has done needs no elaboration. But we should also remember the climate in which it thrived: The attitude, in Government and elsewhere, that Red Russia (under Stalin, yet) was really a democracy like ours, and that if only we would be understanding the Soviets would cooperate with us in building a peaceful postwar world.

Out of this tragic illusion came our disastrous agreement with Stalin that made possible communism's conquests in Europe and in Asia. Out of it came the cold war. Out of it came Korea. Out of it came the confrontation of Soviet armor 90 miles from Florida.

Looking at that dismal past does not, perhaps, tell us what to do about Cuba. But it does tell us one thing: Whether with Hitler or Stalin, Khrushchev or Castro, whether in cold war or hot, an appearance of vacillation and weakness and excessive reluctance to employ the power we so fortunately possess—that appearance will never stop the aggressor.

Patrol Dog Teams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the high incidence of crime in housing projects and outlying areas requires the enforcement agencies to use every means available to prevent crime and to apprehend criminals. The District of Columbia has recognized that an effective deterrent to crime is the use of police-dog teams. I have communicated with the New York City Police Department and urged that department to use police dogs in their police work. The New York City Police Department has indicated that it is taking the matter under advisement.

My interest in the matter has caused me to inquire into the use of police-dog teams, and I find that dogs are used in police work in the following cities, counties, and States:

Cities using dogs in police work: Birmingham, Ala.; Sacramento, Calif.; Bridgeport, Hartford, and Milford, Conn.; Norwalk, Conn.—program about to start; Miami, Fla.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Lexington, Ky.; New Orleans, La.; Baltimore, Cumberland, Ocean City, and Mount Rainer, Md.; Brentwood, Kansas City, Overland, and St. Louis, Mo.; Clifton, Elizabeth, and Trenton, N.J.; Santa Fe, N. Mex.; Rochester, N.Y.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Tulsa, Okla.; Lancaster, and Reading, Pa.; Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Alexandria, Newport News, and Richmond, Va.; and Washington, D.C.

Counties using dogs in police work: Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md.; and St. Louis County, Mo.

States using dogs in police work: Delaware, Maryland, Michigan, and Virginia.

Our citizens have a right to be protected and we have a right to call upon our enforcement agencies to use whatever means available to decrease the rising incidence of crime.

Wasted Years of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of all Members of Congress, through insertion in the RECORD, a very excellent statement on the lack of youth employment, which appeared last summer in the editorial columns of the Seattle Times. These observations on the economic and social consequences of this problem provided strong support for H.R. 7536, the Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961. I deeply regret that the House of Representatives has not had the opportunity for debate on the measure, which I feel would have resulted in its passage with subsequent benefits to our Nation and its young people.

The editorial statement follows:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, July 16, 1961]

WASTED YEARS OF YOUTH

The Nation is climbing steadily, if not spectacularly, out of economic recession. But despite swelling employment and wage totals, the blight of unemployment increased sharply last month.

One reason is obvious. Millions of young people, just out of school, are looking for work.

This problem is going to get worse, no matter what the general trend of the economy. According to Labor Secretary Goldberg, some 450,000 young people were unemployed last fall, and by 1965, an additional 800,000 youth will be seeking jobs.

The outlook for young persons, says Goldberg, is "extremely dark unless constructive plans and programs are developed to assist them."

We need not belabor here the social evils that could grow out of a situation in which more than a million active, energetic, restless young Americans have no useful means of occuying their time.

Suffice it to say on this point that spokesmen at the National Conference of Juvenile Court Judges, meeting last month in San Francisco, described the growing numbers of unemployed in the 16-to-22 age bracket as an "army of youngsters roaming around at loose ends, creating a tremendous delinquency potential."

This is a situation that demands something more immediate than longterm studies, nor can it be remedied—as noted above—exclusively by the expected longterm growth in the economy.

Many of the youth now "roaming around at loose ends" cannot qualify for colleges or the armed services—nor is it the purpose of either of those institutions to take people off the labor market.

Last month, President Kennedy proposed a threefold attack on the problem. One part of the Kennedy program would provide on-the-job training on a private basis for young men and women between 16 and 22 over a 3-year period. Another would provide federally aided job opportunties in public service and on local public works projects. A third would set up a youth conservation corps somewhat on the model of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's.

The CCC experiment today is generally regarded as one of the most successful of the New Deal innovations. Some of the Western States, including Washington, still are benefiting, in terms of physical assets, from the conservation work of the CCC. The benefits in human terms are incalculable.

The Kennedy CCC proposal is a modest pilot project that would affect, at the beginning, only 6,000 young men. Senator HUMPHREY has introduced legislation which would authorize a first-year corps of 50,000 young men.

It is not our purpose here to urge passage of either of these measures in detail. HUMPHREY may be putting too much emphasis upon a CCC solution to youthful unemployment; Mr. Kennedy perhaps too little.

The point is that both these gentlemen are clearly right in emphasizing the urgency of the problem—the need for Congress to take effective steps this summer.

On a longer-range basis, and in regard to youth of a younger age, Congress might well explore the possibility, suggested last week by Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, that child-labor laws be eased to allow today's children a "valuable" taste of useful, gainful employment.

Neither Ribicoff nor anyone else on record is advocating a return to sweatshop conditions. Nor do the Secretary's remarks constitute advocacy of children usurping adult jobs.

But there is no doubt that some laws to prevent exploitation of children may have, in Ribicoff's words, become too strict for the public good.

This is a difficult, delicate problem, but one worthy of close congressional scrutiny.

However, the problem demanding more immediate attention is that of the unemployed older, out-of-school youth—the problem that is the target of the Kennedy and HUMPHREY programs.

Our State can take satisfaction in the small beginnings this month of a youth conservation corps program in Washington. Forty young men are at work developing State park facilities at Lake Easton as a pilot project.

Unemployment is tragic at any age. But in the case of youth, the long-range effects—the acquiring of habits of aimlessness and shiftlessness that could persist a lifetime—could be especially detrimental.

Action on this problem should not be a matter of partisan politics or something to be put off until an election year.

It's Time for Foreign Aid to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, because of the tremendous concern on the part of every American about our future relations with Cuba and the threat to our

security which results from the establishment of a Communist base so near our shores, I insert, under unanimous consent, an editorial which appeared in the Union City, N.J., Hudson Dispatch, on September 13, 1962, in the Appendix.

This forceful editorial sets forth, in language that anyone can understand, the urgent need for the United States to demand that its allies do not aggravate the present Cuban situation by allowing the shipment of arms to Cuba in their ships to continue.

The editorial follows:

IT'S TIME FOR FOREIGN AID TO UNITED STATES

An insupportable anomaly in the Communist buildup of military supplies in Castro's Cuba which cries for elimination is the spectacle of a number of our NATO Allies permitting their commercial ships to carry cargoes of Soviet goods to the Red island bastion which is becoming an ever-greater threat to the United States and our Latin American allies.

NATO, which gets the largest part of its manpower as well as its financial support from the United States, was set up for the purpose of keeping the free world free, yet our partners in this allied defense organization are ignoring a vital phase of their overall commitments in that direction by providing more than half the shipping carrying arms and strategic materials to the Red-bloc satellite.

The United States has the means and unquestionably should act to bring about a speedy cessation to the practice of allowing Russia to charter private vessels of our allies to haul food, consumer goods, and arms, including missiles, to the Communist puppet regime only 90 miles off our shores. Even before Soviet Premier Khrushchev had the supreme gall to threaten this country with nuclear war over Cuba, American appeals to NATO Allies to discourage this aid to the Moscow stooge in Havana were voiced.

The United States brought up the Cuban question at North Atlantic Treaty Organization Council meetings in Paris last month. On August 31, when Washington revealed that the appeals had met with a limited but generally satisfactory response, it was stated that further insistence on the part of this country was certain.

Following President Kennedy's remark at his first September news conference that NATO countries should consider what steps they could take to prevent usage of their ships for Russia's Cuban trade and arms buildup, our request were officially repeated.

Since mid-July through the end of the week of the current month, our State Department reveals that about 60 ships have left Soviet bloc ports for Cuba. Of these, 25 were said to be Soviet-owned while most of the rest were chartered from free world countries.

American officials are continuing talks with European countries on whether their trade with Cuba hampers the U.S. policy of trying to isolate the Castro regime economically and whether goods embargoed to Cuba by the United States might have been transhipped through Europe.

Countries approached on the charter question included Greece, Norway, Britain, and West Germany. These are said to be the NATO nations whose vessels most frequently are chartered by Russia. Yesterday, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, assistant Democratic leader in the upper Chamber, speaking against the backdrop of Soviet threats over Cuba, urged that stronger pressure be applied on our allies to halt military and strategic shipments to the Communist outpost in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. HUMPHREY was joined by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican of New York, in urging some plain talking with U.S. allies. The Empire State Senator said he had been urging such a course for some time. We, too, join in this call for action that will get results. All the billions we have spent on foreign aid certainly entitle us to this kind of foreign aid.

Part III: Cuba's Soviet Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the third article on Cuba, an eyewitness report by Anthony Burton, appears in the September 19 issue of the New York Daily News:

CASTRO'S CUBA IS BEING SOLD DOWN THE VOLGA

(By Anthony Burton)

(NOTE.—This is the third and final eyewitness report on Sovietized Cuba by News Staffer Anthony Burton, the last reporter for a U.S. newspaper to get out of the island. He describes Castro's secret police at work and Soviet penetration.)

MIAMI, September 18.—At first when you discover that agents are shadowing you in a police state like Cuba the reaction is one of amusement, even flattery, that you should be considered so important.

Then, gradually, you find a tautness overtaking you, a tugging at nerve ends. You can't help looking over your shoulder.

It was a taxidriver who first tipped me off that the Castro government was taking more than a friendly interest in my visit to the Sovietized island.

"D'you know you're being followed?" he asked, looking into his rearview mirror. About 100 yards behind was a green and white Chevrolet carrying three men.

HAVING SOME FUN WITH THE SHADOWERS

Wherever I went that day I never lost them. The three, in the casual dress of ordinary Cubans, became as familiar as friends.

The only light moments in the grim tailing came when they rammed another car in their eagerness to keep up with my taxi.

And, while driving with two other newsmen, we deliberately tucked ourselves behind a stopped bus, leaving the Chevrolet in the mainstream of rush-hour traffic. Refusing to move ahead and so lose us, the shadowers stubbornly halted in the middle of the road.

Traffic backed up behind them for blocks until the bus drove off and the chase resumed.

The secret police, called G–2, are not funny, however, as the many people who have been picked up and taken to their headquarters will testify.

There is still no news of two Cuban nationals, Raul Casanes and his wife, Sarita, who work for U.S. news mediums. They disappeared into G–2 headquarters more than a week ago.

So far, there has been no talk of torture by the secret police as there was in the days of Dictator Batista. The worst is the cold room treatment in which a prisoner in light clothes is put in a room at 45° temperature for hours. He is later told it was a mistake and returned to his cell.

A government official told me while boasting of improvements since the revolution: "We kill them better now. A clean death with no torture. It is better."

There are still a few good things to be found in the island. The color bar is absent and people of every shade, from deepest black to European white, mix freely.

GUITARS, DRUMS PLAY AND REDS CONSOLIDATE

The tropical weather makes the lack of good clothes less noticeable. Nearly every ordinary Cuban wears an open-neck shirt and slacks.

The pretty girls, once among the most elegant in Latin America, still retain some of their former smartness as well as their love of wiggling to the "Cha-cha."

The Russians, with their prudish background, must have tightened their lips when they first encountered the exotic walk of well-built Cuban girls and the happy-go-lucky attitude of the ordinary Cuban.

"They're being sold down the Volga and they don't care so long as they can still have their music," said one disgusted Westerner.

While the guitars and drums play on, the Russians consolidate their hold on the island. When they found that mismanagement of the Castro regime was dissipating their economic aid, they demanded control of the projects in which they were involved.

SOVIET ECONOMIC CZAR ORDERED SHIPMENTS

The Soviet economic czar in Cuba is Said Usamanov, who made a reputation in Khrushchev's virgin lands project. Only when Castro had agreed to fall in with his plans did Usamanov authorize shipments of Russian economic aid.

All military items are carried in Soviet ships. Economic aid comes in Greek, Liberian, Italian, and West German ships.

Tractors that have broken down through misuse are seen all over Cuba. Usamanov vetoed further tractor shipments until those already in Cuba were repaired and set to work.

His job is to revive the staggering Cuban economy and his method is the stark austerity which the island is now suffering.

Time will tell whether the Russians, having used Castro and his men, will move them aside.

SEEMS CASTRO STILL RUNS THE MILITARY

The issuance of cards to workers is a sign of tightening discipline. If you don't work you don't get a card. The card is needed for everything, even renting a cabin at hotel swimming pools.

Military control, however, still seems to be in the hands of the regime. Castro, backed now by Russian guns, radar, patrol boats, tanks, armored cars, and trucks, would have little trouble dealing with a repeat of the small-scale Bay of Pigs invasion.

The Cuban threat will be to Central American nations.

The official line now is that the Cuban revolution is not for export, that the Cubans are not interested in encouraging communism to spread in Latin America. They just want to be left alone to rebuild their country.

A Western diplomat told me: "It's the classic Communist procedure. The Russians want quiet so that they can consolidate their gains here, like the snake digesting its prey.

"When they are completely in control they will set about fomenting trouble in other countries. They are very anxious for all this fuss to die down until then."

SOVIET TECHNOLOGISTS BUILDING AND TEACHING

To that extent, it may be the truth when Cuba says that the Russians arriving there are helping with defenses.

The present emphasis is on defense. Bridges are being mined, military roads built, antiaircraft guns, and rockets point skyward alongside radar installations.

Russians train the Cubans in their use and oversee the construction of factories. The Russian camps I saw could well have

held the equivalent of U.S. Signal Corps troops.

Castro is setting up a network of communications so that he can get speedy warnings of any invasion attempt.

But the question is: When does a defensive position become so powerful that it becomes offensive? The United States will have to decide.

THE HAPPY MOMENT WHEN FREEDOM CAME

For me, the 8 days in Cuba were intensely depressing, relieved at the end by some heart-warming moments.

There was the time when the Pan American plane swept into Havana airport to pick up fleeing refugees. It was a needed reminded of another world where guns do not swing at everybody's hip.

There was the moment on board the plane, packed with 108 men, women, and children, when the pilot quietly welcomed them aboard in Spanish—a nice touch by Pan Am—and even raised a laugh.

And there was the moment when the plane touched down at Miami and the refugees burst into spontaneous applause. I found myself clapping too.

On the Myths and Realities of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James Reston's column in the September 19 New York Times is particularly deserving of attention, and I most heartily recommend that each and every one of my colleagues not only read it carefully but give thoughtful consideration to Mr. Reston's arguments in behalf of the administration's foreign aid appropriation request.

The article is as follows:

ON THE MYTHS AND REALITIES OF FOREIGN AID

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, September 18.—Every year the administration's foreign aid gets in more trouble. The House Appropriations Committee has now cut President Kennedy's request by over $1,124 million—the deepest slash in the 15 years of the program—and it is important to analyze why.

The popular explanation within the administration is that the man who presides over the program in the House of Representatives, OTTO E. PASSMAN, of Louisiana, is a narrow and spiteful man, hostile to everything outside his own parish. This is a hard charge to disprove, but it is certainly not the true explanation.

THE BASIC COMPLAINTS

There is, for example, a growing feeling here, not only on Capitol Hill but within the administration, that the United States is carrying an undue share of the burden of helping the developing countries. President Kennedy himself has called on the increasingly prosperous industrial countries of Western Europe to do more.

Over the last few months, Congressmen have been told that the administration was sending officials to Europe to study why the European economies are growing so much faster than ours, why they are so prosperous with so little unemployment. Yet the same Congressmen are asked to vote more funds to carry the foreign aid load, as if Europe were still recovering from the war.

After 15 years of foreign aid, there was some expectation here that more countries would be phased out of the program. Instead, new countries come into being each year, and each assumes, usually correctly, that it will get an independence grant from Washington, followed by substantial payments to keep the new state going.

Under Secretary of State George Ball, for example, was warning the underdeveloped nations at the World Bank meeting here this week about this "What have you done for us lately?" attitude.

"It may be thought by some," he said, "that a developing country should be able to look with confidence to a perpetual inflow of public funds to supplement its internal savings and thus feel free to discourage private investment."

The foreign aid cut in the Appropriations Committee, therefore, is not merely the action of a willful minority of provincial Congressmen. The truth is that the administration is getting the votes of devoted internationalists like Senators FULBRIGHT and MANSFIELD, but not their enthusiastic support.

Increasingly, they complain that the administration is trying to do too much in too many places, that it is going the easy way of attempting to buy friends, and that it is administering the program very badly.

Accordingly, the atmosphere has been charged here this week with demands for a new appraisal of Washington's relations with its allies and the underdeveloped countries.

Eugene Black, the President of the World Bank, told the 17th annual meeting of the Bank today, for example, that aid must be offered economically and effectively 'if it is not to become an intolerable burden on the lenders."

Earlier he had wondered out loud whether the starting rise in population of these underdeveloped countries was not outrunning the capacity of even the richest countries to maintain even the present low standards of living in many areas. And today he suggested that foreign aid from one country to another be replaced increasingly by international aid programs.

"My most serious criticism of bilateral aid programs," he said, "is their susceptibility to political influences, whether overt or otherwise. Even at best there is always the risk that political influences may misdirect development aid * * *. I have known cases where, as a result, a splendid new sports stadium has been built while the highway system remains primitive, or where the national airport has acquired a strikingly modern terminal building while parched but fertile land is left without irrigation."

The attitude of the prosperous Western allies to America's expenditures for defense was, meanwhile, the topic of a solemn article by McGeorge Bundy, the President's foreign policy adviser, in this week's issue of Foreign Affairs. He called for a greater degree of "reciprocity" on the part of the Allies and complained that Washington's power and responsibility in the world were now so evident, that they were taken for granted in many quarters.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL BLOCK

All these things help illustrate the growing opposition to the foreign aid program. When President Kennedy went to Yale University to make his now famous speech on economic policy, he complained about being trapped in the mythology of the past and called for an end to stereotype thinking and the substitution of reality for myth.

Essentially, this is what the Congress and even many of his friends and associates are now saying about foreign aid: that (to use his own words) "mythology distracts us everywhere * * * We must move on from the reassuring repetition of stale phrases to a new, difficult but essential confrontation with reality."

Cuba: Watchful Waiting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, we, in this Congress, and Americans across our country have become greatly, and justifiably concerned about recent developments in Cuba.

Along with other of our colleagues I have joined in introducing a resolution supporting the President in his announced determination to prevent the Castro regime from exporting its aggressive purposes to any part of this hemisphere by force or the threat of force; to prevent in Cuba the establishment of an externally supported military base capable of endangering the security of the United States; and, to work with other free citizens of this hemisphere in support of the legitimate aspirations of the people of Cuba for a return to self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, in this context, I believe the editorials by the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post, on September 18, goes to the heart of the problem and I commend its thoughtful analysis to our colleagues' attention:

CUBA: WATCHFUL WAITING

(By Walter Lippmann)

Although there are some who say that we are doing nothing about Cuba, the fact is that we are doing just about everything that can be done short of going to war.

Beside the economic embargo, we are keeping the island under "surveillance." We are watching every ship that comes to and goes from the island, and we are keeping a close watch on the loading and unloading of these ships. We have accurate and current records of building operations and the deployment of aircraft and tanks and artillery.

There may be some doubt whether we have located every missile site in the vastness of the Soviet Union. But in Cuba, unless our cameras are failing us, we are completely informed.

As a result, we are quite able to know about the development of anything like a Soviet missile base directed against the United States, and what may be more realistic, we are able to spot anything like an expeditionary force against Cuba's neighbors in the islands and in the Caribbean.

Our policy at the present is to keep ourselves completely informed, and to wait and see whether Castro and his Soviet helpers do any overt act, against the United States or its neighbors. Beyond this, there is no serious action the United States can take to remove him that would not be an act of war.

The United States, is, of course, able easily to blockade Cuba. But stopping ships under threat of seizure or sinking would be an act of war not only against Cuba but against the Soviet Union. For we would be seizing or sinking Soviet ships.

The invasion of Cuba would, of course, be an act of war against Cuba. To be sure, the United States could easily win a war against Cuba. We could close the Cuban ports within a few hours and we could occupy very quickly Havana and a few big cities. The countryside might be another story.

But what we could not be sure of doing is to prevent the retaliatory moves to which we would have laid ourselves wide open, moves against Berlin or against Turkey, or against Iran.

For we would have acted on the rule that a possible threat against our security or our interests justifies us in going to war.

We would be saying that because Cuba, which is only 90 miles away, is in the grip of an unfriendly European power, we have a right to blockade or occupy the island; we would be saying too that the Soviet Union has no such right to act against the American military positions in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, right on her own frontier.

Let us not fool ourselves. Such an argument will not wash. It would be rejected, probably even laughed at, not only by all neutrals but by powerful elements among our closest allies.

There are some who think foreign opinion doesn't matter. But when it comes to war, it means a great deal to the belligerent who is for him and who is against him. We could go to war if Castro injures us. But we cannot go to war, even against Castro, because of what he may conceivably do in the future.

We cannot wage a preventive war against Castro without establishing the rule that a preventive war is legitimate against our military position in Berlin, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Thailand, South Vietnam, Taiwan, Okinawa, South Korea, and Japan.

It is true, of course, that the Soviet lodgment in Cuba is a gross violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Yet we cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine. Why not?

The Monroe Doctrine declares that "any interposition" by a European power in this hemisphere would be "the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

But, and this is the crucial point, the American claim for the isolation of the Western Hemisphere was coupled with a renunciation of American interest in the Eastern Hemisphere: "In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with out policy so to do."

This fundamental passage in Monroe's message is, of course, a restatement of the principle laid down by Washington in his farewell address: "Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or a very remote relation."

This basis of the Monroe Doctrine disappeared in the 20th century, in the two World Wars, the Korean war, and the cold war. We cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine without meeting the question of what we are doing all over Europe and Asia.

Our right to put Cuba under surveillance, and if necessary to blockade and invade it, rests not on the Monroe Doctrine but on the elementary right of a people to insure its own security.

For two centuries the British felt that way about the occupation of Belgium by an unfriendly power. The Russians felt that way about Turkey. This right can, however, be exercised only when there is a clear and present danger.

Castro is an insulting nuisance but is not, and is not now remotely capable of becoming a clear and present danger to the United States. So we must practice watchful waiting, and hold ourselves in readiness, never for a moment forgetting the vastly greater dangers elsewhere.

In a time of watchful waiting, Congress and the newspapers are compelled to remember that the President is conducting a delicate and dangerous operation, and that he is seriously interfered with if he is forced to dot every i and to cross every t in advance of a decision.

The President should not be asked to say whether he will go to war. He should not be driven to say that he won't go to war.

A certain mystery and uncertainty are desirable, and will be deterrent to our adversaries.

Attorney General Robert Kennedy's Address to the Polish Roman Catholic Union Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy addressed the Polish Roman Catholic Union convention in Baltimore. I should like to call his inspiring remarks to the attention of my colleagues.

The Polish Roman Catholic Union is the oldest Polish American fraternal organization in America. In its 89 years of existence, this dedicated organization, which has chapters in virtually every State in the Union, has written an impressive record of contributions toward helping Americans of Polish descent become better versed on the strength of the democratic process and also to become better American citizens.

It is most reassuring to know that the Attorney General of the United States would take time out from his very busy schedule to meet with this very worthwhile organization and discuss with them the problems which confront freedom-loving people throughout the world. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Attorney General Kennedy was given one of the greatest ovations ever accorded a guest of the Polish Roman Catholic Union Convention in its 89 years of existence.

Attorney General Kennedy's eloquent message follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE POLISH ROMAN CATHOLIC UNION CONVENTION, LORD BALTIMORE HOTEL, BALTIMORE, MD., MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1962

Mr. Chairman, Reverend Fathers, officers, and delegates to the Polish Roman Catholic Union Convention, the one characteristic which distinguishes us as Americans in the world today is that in the United States we have a land of 180 million people whose cultures and background come from virtually every nation in the world, and yet we live virtually as one people.

I am particularly happy to be with you here today to participate in the opening session of your convention because Americans, regardless of ethnic background, will agree that the Polish Roman Catholic Union, through its 89 years of existence, has made an indelible contribution to the growth of America.

Over the years you have assisted Polish immigrants make an orderly transition from the customs of the Old World to those of our country. Your efforts have helped these people become dedicated Americans and made your communities across the country better places in which to live.

Although Poland is a much older nation than the United States, our destinies have been closely and profitably intertwined.

A few years after its founding, Jamestown, the first permanent settlement in America, was in trouble. The gentlemen adventurers who formed Capt. John Smith's company had little taste for the hard task of building a colony in a hostile wilderness. They were more interested in vain searches for gold than in clearing stubborn forests or plowing fields.

Smith sent to London for help. He asked for men who would work and who had the skills necessary to create a civilization in the wilderness.

The next ship brought help, not more gentlemen seeking a quick fortune, but six skilled craftsmen—Lowicki, Stefanski, Mata, Bogdan, Zrencia, and Sadloski.

These first six Poles in the new world went to work. They established a glass furnace—the first industry in America—and helped the Colony to start a soap works and a sawmill. John Smith credited their example of skill and industry with saving Jamestown.

A few years later, when the Colony was to elect the first representative legislature in America, the Governor ruled that only those born in England could vote. The Poles promptly put down their tools and proclaimed "No vote, no work." The Governor relented and the annals of the Jamestown Colony for 1619 note that Poles were extended the full rights accorded other settlers.

It is not surprising that this first strike in America was by Poles and that it was staged in the name of freedom.

The Polish love of freedom served this Nation well then and in the Revolution. The names of Pulaski and Kosciusko brighten the pages of our history.

Pulaski died in an attack on the British at Savannah after distinguished service at the Battle of Brandywine and at Valley Forge. But Kosciusko lived to serve the cause of freedom both here and in Poland long after the war.

A large cash award and a valuable tract of land were bestowed upon him by a grateful Congress, but he never used this bounty for himself. Before leaving to fight again for Polish freedom in 1794, he placed his will in the hands of Thomas Jefferson.

That last testament, as did his entire life, struck a blow for freedom and human dignity. It directed that his estate be used to buy Negro slaves and set them free.

Down through the years, Americans and Poles have shared the burden of fighting for freedom. Several years ago, I climbed that steep, rocky Italian hillside where Polish troops, under General Wladyslaw Anders, took Monte Cassino from the Nazis, climaxing some of the hardest fighting of the Second World War.

I shall never forget the inscription on the memorial to the Polish soldiers buried there:

"We Polish soldiers, for our freedom and yours, have given our souls to God, our bodies to the soil of Italy, and our hearts to Poland."

On the day the Poles captured Monte Cassino, American GI's were moving forward through the hills on their left and the Americans who died in that battle are buried a few miles from their Polish brothers.

This has been the theme of the relationship between the Polish and the American peoples—working and fighting together in the cause of freedom.

Time after time, Americans have been inspired by the stubborn courage of the Poles. We cannot forget that at the outset of the Second World War, Polish cavalrymen charged their horses against Nazi tanks.

Nor can we forget General Bor's uprising against the Germans in Warsaw, holding out for 63 days against the might of the German occupation force.

We have been able to make partial payment on the debt we owe to the sons of Pulaski and Kosciusko.

Nor have we forgotten our friend in the troubled days since the Second World War. We welcome and support the advances that have taken place in recent years.

We will continue to be concerned for the welfare of the Polish people and to maintain our traditional close ties of friendship with them.

I am happy that this Government has been able to extend over a half billion dollars in assistance to the Polish people in the past 5 years, and I am happy that this program is going to continue. This aid has been supplemented by the fine work of private organizations and citizens who have been sending generous assistance since the war.

American private and Government aid and assistance joined to build the new children's hospital which is nearing completion in Kracow.

We have invited leaders of the Polish Government and leaders of thought and opinion in Poland to visit America and see this land for themselves.

Cultural exchanges are continuing to increase. The Warsaw philharmonic and the Polish folk dance groups have toured this country. A band from Warsaw played at the Washington, D.C., and Newport jazz festivals this summer.

Our program of exchanging students, teachers, and technicians is continuing and I hope it will grow as both nations can benefit from it.

Each year, more and more American tourists are going to Poland. I hope that trend will increase and will flow both ways so that more Poles will visit us and see America.

These exchanges are but tangible evidence of the close bond between the people of Poland and the people of the United States.

Today, more than ever before, we need the courage and dedication to freedom which have made Americans and Poles such good friends through their history.

We face a resourceful foe who seeks to impose his totalitarian way on free men everywhere. The threat takes many forms. It may be a wall in Berlin, occupied domination of proud old nations, guerrilla warfare in southeast Asia, military aid to Cuba, or espionage in our own country.

We are alert to this threat and as President Kennedy said last week, we intend to do everything within our power to meet it—and our power is very great.

We are making a consistent, carefully planned effort to turn the arms race into a peace race to spread respect for the rule of law, and dedication to man's God-given right to be free.

We are convinced that a supreme effort must be made to halt the arms race, but until some progress is made, we are and will remain prepared to do what is necessary to protect our own interests and the security of our friends and allies.

As we face this challenge through the difficult years ahead, another of the great attributes of the Polish people—their loyalty and devotion to the Roman Catholic Church—will serve us well.

Poles are now celebrating their 1,000th anniversary as a Christian people. Think of it—40 generations of faith.

Ten centuries of Christianity have given the Polish people a collective dynamism and a sense of great continuing national purpose. Indeed, the birth of Poland as a nation is closely tied to the arrival of Christianity and its long and proud history has continued this close bond to the church.

We have a rich heritage of our own—revolution, toughness, industry, and unswerving belief in the fundamental rights of the individual—but we are a young nation. We look back to many lands for our basic beliefs and traditions.

The Poles brought to this country strength, courage, faith, and perseverance—and America is indebted to its Polish citizens for helping to forge our national character with this steel.

A thousand years of history shows beyond a doubt that the spirit of freedom and human dignity is so ingrained in the Polish soul that no tyrant will ever succeed in destroying them.

I know from my own experience, for on the same trip that I saw the monument at Monte Cassino, I also visited Poland. I came there from the Soviet Union, and it was inspiring to enter a country where the people yearn for the principles of freedom and meaningful democracy. It was like emerging from darkness into the sunshine.

During those thousand years, Poland has been conquered and partitioned six times. Yet Poland has never lost its concept as a nation. Stubbornly and passionately, the Poles have clung to their determination to be free. They have refused to quit. They have always come back.

This is the strength and tradition of the Polish character. This is your heritage.

So, it is a privilege to be here for not only do I feel a close bond with the Polish people, but the President shares this regard and feeling. His sister-in-law is married to a Pole. The President has visited Poland as has my mother, my brother, Ted, and my sisters. With virtually no other group has my family had a closer affiliation.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, speaking on Memorial Day, 1884, in Keene, N.H., said:

"It is required of a man that he should share the passions and actions of his time at the peril of being judged not to have lived."

I can think of no other people who have shared the passions and actions of their time as have the Poles.

I hope you will have a successful conference and that you will return to your homes with renewed dedication to our common ideals of freedom and human dignity.

And I know you share with me the conviction that Poles everywhere are dedicated to these ideals and that they will triumph, for imbedded throughout the pages of Polish history and our own is the slogan which is apt today—"Polak nie sluga"—a Pole—and I might add an American—will never be a serf.

Farmer-Elected ASC Committeemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, keeping farmers and the public informed is a major responsibility of USDA's county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation committees known throughout rural America as the ASC committees.

Because of the millions of farmers and the billions of dollars involved, I think a little explanation of the work of key people involved is in order here today as we consider the 1962 farm legislation. We all know what a tremendous success the wheat and feed grain programs are which we enacted in 1961 and again this year. Much of the credit for the success of these two congressional actions, I firmly believe, should be directed at the system of farmer-elected ASC committeemen. They have the ultimate responsibility. How they primarily meet that responsibility is through effective communication.

They are responsible for seeing that farmers and others are informed about the agricultural programs that are available and the requirements for eligibility to participate in those programs.

In every State there are usually three county committeemen, and the local extension service county agent usually is an ex officio member.

Day-to-day contacts with other farmers by committeemen and county office employees are a necessity in order to achieve the most effective distribution of information on farm programs enacted by the Congress. It is the committee's responsibility to see that the programs are carried out fairly and in full accordance with official regulations. Thus the committee could be described as a board of directors, with the county office manager responsible for carrying out the committee's policies and decisions and serving as a focal point for information activities.

So it was this year of 1962 that nearly 2 million farmers are signed up to participate in the wheat and feed grain programs. However, hundreds of thousands of other farmers also are participating in congressionally enacted programs for cotton, peanuts, tobacco, wool, soybeans, sugar, rice, beans, dairy products and others. Additionally there are the conservation programs and the soil bank. All are a part of the work of the ASC. They all add up to a formidable task for the county ASC committeemen.

So I think we owe the ASC committees a vote of thanks today as we take action on still another farm program effective for 1963 and the years beyond.

Real Estate in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents is Alexander Summer, of Teaneck, N.J., who is a past president of the New Jersey Association of Real Estate Boards as well as the National Association of Real Estate Boards. He is regarded throughout the country as one of the real leaders in the real estate, construction, and property management fields.

Earlier this year, Mr. Summer was one of a group which made a housing study in Europe. A report by him on this study appeared in the August 1962, edition of the New Jersey Realtor, the official publication of the New Jersey Association of Real Estate Boards. There is much for us to learn in this interesting and thought provoking article.

Under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REAL ESTATE IN EUROPE

Earlier this year I was fortunate to be included in a group interested in housing,

which, under the sponsorship of House & Home magazine, made a housing study tour of Europe. The participants inspected private and government-sponsored developments and held conferences with housing officials, builders, lenders, and architects in England, Denmark, and The Netherlands. After the tour I stayed on and visited Paris, Munich, and Madrid as well.

Anyone involved in any facet of the housing industry could learn a great deal from visiting projects in Europe, not only from the viewpoint of obtaining constructive ideas, but in learning what not to do as well.

European developers seem to be ahead of most Americans in land use. Much of their progressiveness is probably the result of increasing scarcity of land in and around the major cities, a scarcity even more acute than here.

Europeans make more liberal use of land planners, landscape engineers and architects than we. The results of using such professional services more extensively is very evident. I was impressed by the liberal use of walls and fencing, often of brick or masonry, which was not only more pleasing to the eye, but, more importantly, created greater privacy than is normally possible in areas of high density.

Supplementing the above with maximum utilization of land contours and generous planting, Europeans have demonstrated the practicability of intermingling high rise apartments, attached houses, and one family homes and still achieve a homogeneous effect. I got the impression, however, that they do not make adequate provision for the rapidly expanding use of the automobile, a trend definitely discernable in all of Europe.

IMPRESSED

I was particularly impressed by the fact that the newer developments install the utilities, including sewer, water, and electricity under the sidewalks. We Americans are all too familiar with the traffic snarls created by the continuous opening of streets for the purpose of repairing or enlarging utilities. This headache and expense could be avoided if our communities were to emulate Europe in this respect.

In many subdivisions over there the sidewalks are wider than here and are made of separate precast blocks, making access to the utilities still easier and less expensive. In some of our colder northern States the latter may not always be practical because of the possibility of frost getting underneath and lifting the blocks. We were all also impressed by the scarcity of ugly telegraph poles. The installation of telephone and electric lines underground enhanced even further the pleasing impression these developments left with us.

PARKS

Little parks and park strips seem to be everywhere. It seems to me that numerous small parks in a community are more beneficial and pleasing than one or two large ones, though in Europe the latter are also in evidence.

The great green belt surrounding London should set an example in planning for our newer major cities though, for the older ones, it is too late. A green belt not only represents a pleasing change from the concentration of masonry buildings to an attractive countryside made up of small farms, estates and small houses, but has many practical benefits.

It eliminates the awful monotony and strain of driving through a congested city and then discouragingly encountering dozens of miles of suburban communities which, to the stranger, seem like an endless extension of the central city itself. A change of pace somehow adds charm to the communities created beyond this buffer zone. In addition such green belts help reduce air pollution.

HIGH RISE

It was evident, especially in England, that high rise apartments and other multifamily structures are designed primarily to reduce future maintenance, an important factor in keeping rents at a minimum.

RAPID TRANSIT

Because rapid transit is still the major form of transportation, rolling stock and equipment are well maintained and have not been allowed to deteriorate as is the case in the eastern portion of the United States.

NOVEL APPROACH: MORTGAGE FINANCING

A novel approach to mortgage financing is the variable interest rate. Currently 6½ percent in England, the availability of money determines the interest rate which varies during the life of the mortgage, and may fluctuate between 5 percent and 8 percent. The monthly payments remain fixed, and the variation in interest affects only the duration of the mortgage, which is automatically lengthened or shortened to compensate for the variation in interest. Such an approach in this country, preferably with lower interest ceilings, conceivably might eliminate (or at least minimize) the extremes in availability of mortgage funds, a fluctuation that has bedeviled and slowed down building in the United States.

EUROPE BEHIND THE UNITED STATES IN CERTAIN PHASES OF LAND PLANNING

At present England has 1 car for each 11 families. The percentage of cars per family, not only in England but throughout Europe, is steadily increasing and there is little evidence that their programing, so effective otherwise, is making provision for this obvious trend. The inadequacy is not only in lack of planning for main highways and arteries, but there is a surprising lack of foresight in providing space for future parking requirements in the subdivisions, particularly where high-rise apartments are concerned.

UNITED STATES AHEAD

The United States is far ahead of Europe in providing amenities and luxury within the home and the apartment. Especially in England, the interiors are most disappointing. Rooms are tiny, windows small and inadequate in number, closets too small and too few. In some apartments there are none at all. It is true the English use wardrobes, but these consume valuable wall space and increase housekeeping problems. Kitchens and bathrooms are minimum specifications. Refrigerators are so tiny that a family cannot stock up for more than a day or 2 in advance. With the exception of some luxury homes, I found the interiors of English housing rather depressing. In the Netherlands, and especially in Denmark, the interiors are more livable but still lack the warmth and convenience of American homes and apartments.

PARIS THREATENED

In Paris I did not have the benefit of meeting with top housing officials, but was informed by my guides of some interesting facts concerning the redevelopment of their city.

According to them the rapid expansion of industrial and office buildings is threatening Paris' No. 1 moneymaker, the tourist trade. High-rise commercial structures alongside of historical buildings on Paris' famous boulevards are hardly conducive to maintaining the tourist trade at its present high rate.

Also the business expansion downtown is taxing to the limit public transportation facilities and the streets and boulevards themselves.

CO-OPS

The program now underway in the outskirts of the old city is to develop a ring of industrial and commercial areas, where all new office buildings and industrial structures will be concentrated. Already, in the vicinity of Le Bourget Airport, high-rise apartments are being erected in great numbers to provide adequate housing facilities in the new scheme of things. Most of these are co-ops.

The ultimate objective is to reverse the usual pattern of cities by having the core of Paris maintain its beauty and dignity and tradition and have commerce and industry further out. To make this possible, the subways of Paris are being extended out to Le Bourget and other outlying areas to provide two-way mass transportation and take the pressure off the present one-way load.

NO SLUMS

Madrid, too, is enjoying a tremendous boom of high-rise apartment construction, with commercial buildings not far behind. When I asked my guide to show me the slums of Madrid I was told by him there just weren't any concentration of these. By instructing him to drive me through the poorest areas of the city, I had to admit there were no slum areas as we understand them though, of course, in portions of the city there are side streets with antiquated houses, but even these had exteriors that seemed in reasonably good repair.

An interesting note. In New York one often witnesses long queues of people waiting to see a show in Radio City or movies like "Never on Sunday." In Madrid there also were long lines of people, but these were waiting to get into church.

ATTITUDE WHOLESOME

I found the attitude of the common people generally wholesome. Unlike those in London and Copenhagen, they did not seem to be all reconciled to the fact that they should let government take care of them. The considerable evidence of initiative, self-reliance, and willingness to work both amazed and encouraged me.

COMMENTS

The countries we visited as a group are countries small in area—England, Netherlands, and Denmark. Because land is so scarce and expensive, the individually owned one-family house is fast disappearing. Emphasis is on multifamily houses with the construction of high-rise apartments in the ascendancy. Available vacant land for building is so scarce that near London, land cost represents as much as one-quarter or one-third of the selling price of the finished product. To a lesser degree this is also a problem in the major metropolitan areas of our country.

LEASEHOLDS

In my opinion, the only practical solution for too high land costs, if we are to avoid socialism, is the long-term leasehold. Leaseholds, where the sales price of land is excessive, will substantially reduce the monthly cost of shelter. Certainly it is preferable to a philosophy that has been suggested, to transfer all ad valorem taxes to land only, instead of the established method of taxing land and improvements. There is still an awful lot of land in the United States, and it is obvious that the entire country cannot be built up simultaneously. If adopted, the proposals to transfer all taxes to vacant land can result only in wholesale tax foreclosures and would force the cities into the real estate business. Putting it more bluntly, it would establish immediate and complete socialism in our industry, instead of the creeping socialism with which we are confronted.

SOLUTION?

The townhouse concept of subdivision may be a happy solution here in the United States for those able to afford something a little better. It could combine the virtues of Europe's land planning and our knack of

making even a modest home cheerful and livable inside. Its economy of construction, minimum requirements of streets and utilities, and reduced responsibility for maintenance of lawns and grounds, while all the time maintaining a country-like atmosphere, deserves greater attention by the industry. It is a sound, sensible approach that needs to be sold. Most of the public and most municipal officials don't even know what it is.

During the meetings of the International Real Estate Federation last June, we were told that it took from the time of Christ until today for the world population to double, and that the population will double again in 30 years. We are aware of the population explosion expected to begin during the middle sixties, but I don't think many of us have realized how acute indeed is the problem of housing the people of the world.

Although the United States is currently building twice as many units as the increase in population, and England three times as many units as its increase in population, this rate is far from adequate. Housing units are constantly being lost because of obsolescence, fire and demolition brought on by expansion of highways, industry, commerce, schools, and other public buildings. The net gain in housing units is small indeed. If the problem is great here, imagine what it is in nations such as Russia, China, India, and all the backward countries.

Leaders responsible for housing, whether private or in government, must plan ahead, and plan well, and plan quickly, or the worldwide housing dilemma can cause housing, even here, to become completely socialized.

GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER

In England and the other countries we visited, over 50 percent of all housing we visited was public or quasi-public. We were concerned about the attitude of people in those nations who seem to take it for granted that government will supply their housing for them. In Europe there is, at least, more justification for expecting subsidy because of the great gap that exists between housing costs and family income, especially for those in the lower income brackets.

DELIBERATE PROGRAM?

In the United States, however, subsidy is too often not based upon need, but is being crammed down the throats of the American people as, for example, the so-called middle income housing legislation adopted last year. At one time many of us thought that this type of legislation was politically inspired to attract more votes, but we are becoming convinced that it has a more sinister significance. It now seems to be part of a deliberate program by those high in Government to have the Government gradually take over. Intellectuals, similar to the Fabians of England, perhaps sincerely, believe that they, and they alone—not the people—are fit to govern. There are too many in Washington who feel that housing, and eventually all real property, should become public, i.e., belong to all the people. We often hear that in 5 or 10 years we may face a serious threat to private ownership. I believe the showdown, private ownership versus socialism, is right now.

FIRST STEP

There are intelligent businessmen and politicians in this country who are not a bit alarmed over the prospects of real estate becoming socialized. They don't seem to realize that it would be only the step No. 1 in the socialization of the entire economy. All socialistic and comunistic regimes started with "land reform." As in Sweden, there need not be a bloody revolution or even a radical upheaval in the form of the central government. Sweden is unquestionably the most socialistic of all Western nations and is often pointed out as a model of how effective socialism can function.

NO UTOPIA

It should be realized that Sweden has stayed out of wars for over 100 years, had absolutely no debt, had a surplus, and therefore the financial stability to make socialism economically feasible. What has been the result? Sweden today is reputed to have the lowest morals of any nation in Europe and the highest rate of suicides in the world. Are these not positive signs that being free of care and responsibility is not the utopia suggested by its advocates, but rather a most frustrating existence, where the basic human traits to strive and achieve and earn the satisfaction of accomplishment are completely absent? It is frustration complete and no better evidence exists than its standard of morals and its rate of suicide. Socialism, even if paternal and free of graft, should be abhorrent to all thinking people.

The New Haven Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, early this year, the administration stepped into the New Haven Railroad situation in a dramatic way, heralded by much fanfare and advance publicity. At the President's direction, the Secretary of Commerce named a nine-man panel of railroad experts to survey the operations of the New Haven and make suitable recommendations. The panel was headed by Mr. Frederick B. Whitman, president of the Western Pacific Railroad. It has apparently done a thorough job and filed its report in July. Since then, it has been buried over at the Commerce Department.

Public interest in this report is intense in Connecticut and among all those who are concerned for the health and welfare of this important railroad. Those responsible for planning the future of the New Haven should have the benefit of the Whitman report before going ahead.

But for the diligence and interest of John Alsop, Republican nominee for Governor of Connecticut, and of my colleague, Representative AB SIBAL, I strongly suspect this important study, in all too typical New Frontier fashion, would never have been mentioned again.

I submit the following article from the New York Daily News which describes the situation very well and take this opportunity to call on the Commerce Department to release the Whitman report at the earliest possible date.

The article follows:

CONNECTICUT WARBLER

(By Marion and Henry Lee)

While its paint goes on peeling and its broken windows stay broken, the future of the New Haven Railroad crawls forward on the little flat wheels of Federal bureaucracy.

Way back in March, the White House announced with some fanfare that Frederic B. Whitman, veteran railroad executive and president of Western Pacific, would head up a nine-man task force of Midwest and Far West rail experts to study their ailing New England sister.

Their specific assignment: "to inquire into the condition of the railroad facilities and equipment, the commuter problem and general financial condition and prospects of the line and to evaluate studies being sponsored by the trustees."

REPORT FILED IN JULY

Of course, it's a dull week when some committee or another isn't studying the New Haven, so we clean forgot about the Whitman report. But Congressman AL SIBAL didn't.

The report, he tells us, was filed with the Department of Commerce last July, and he has been unable to prod it loose. Now he has written to President Kennedy that presumably, as the work of experts, the study is of considerable value—but "of no value at all bottled up in the Commerce Department files."

Through our associates in Washington, we tried to take it from there, and here is a Warbler report on the Whitman report.

The findings—whatever they are—have been turned over to the Federal rail experts assigned to Undersecretary for Transportation Clarence D. Martin, Jr. The feds are mulling them over as grist for their own recommendations on the New Haven that eventually will go to President Kennedy.

MAY NEVER BE HEARD

Thus, the Whitman report itself may never see the light of publicity. Obviously, if Commerce makes an official report of its own, this study by nine knowledgeable civilians will get lost in the bureaucratic shuffle.

Laid end to end, all the studies, recommendations, etc., that have been made on the New Haven would cover its shrinking trackage. But the Whitman report seems especially important to us, and for the life of us, we can't understand what damage would be done by its release.

After all, forget the commuter woes of Fairfield County and the general prosperity of New England that are involved in the New Haven and its future, if any. The public at large has a stake in this carrier—the Government having guaranteed about $35 millions worth of loans.

How's our investment doing, Mr. President?

House Resolution 211: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special

Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I support your proposal to create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. It is the best and the most appropriate one at the present time to defeat the Soviet Russians in the cold war.

Sincerely yours,

ALEX MAJOHANSKI.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 12, 1962.*

LAKEWOOD, N.J.,
June 24, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I, Andrew Boyko, a Cossack by origin and presently an American citizen, respectfully urge you to support favorably the enactment of the Flood resolution to create a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Very truly yours,

ANDREW BOYKO.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I believe your measure, House Resolution 211, to establish a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations would equip us to do battle against the emperio-colonialists of Moscow.

Sincerely yours,

W. DUSENRO.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 12, 1962.*

LAKEWOOD, N.J.,
June 23, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I, John Korsh, a Cossack by origin and presently an American citizen, respectfully urge you to support favorably the enactment of the Flood resolution.

Very truly yours,

JOHN KORSH.

SOUTH RIVER, N.Y.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I, Hayharry Buchar, respectfully urge you to support favorably the enactment of the Flood resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Very truly yours,

HAYHARY BUCHAR.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 12, 1962.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I believe your resolution, House Resolution 211, to be the best and the one we most need to win the cold war against the imperio-colonialists of Moscow.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL RADTCHEURO.

Law Observance Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in this age of rising crime I think the country should be aware of an important project which is bringing together the efforts of law enforcement agencies, bar associations, civic organizations and private industry.

The Federal Bar Association through its law observance committee is engaged in a program of promoting respect for law and those who enforce it. The committee consists of the following: Harry D. Shargel, Esq., chairman; Hon. Tom C. Clark, Justice, Supreme Court of the United States; Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General; Hon. Emanuel Celler, chairman, House Judiciary Committee; Hon. Cyrus H. Vance, Secretary of the Army; Abram Chayes, Esq., Legal Adviser, Department of State; Robert H. Knight, Esq., the General Counsel, U.S. Treasury Department; John T. McNaughton, Esq., General Counsel, Department of Defense; Daniel B. Mitchie, Jr., Esq., president, National Association of Citizens Crime Commissions.

The committee is assisted by an advisory staff composed of the following personnel: Radio and Television Advisory Subcommittee: Alfred R. Beckman, vice president, American Broadcasting Co.; Leon Brooks, Esq., Columbia Broadcasting System; Robert F. Hurleigh, president, Mutual Broadcasting System; Howard Monderer, Esq., National Broadcasting Co.; William J. Wheatley, Storer Broadcasting Co.; public information adviser; Charles R. DeHaven, manager of public relations, Philadelphia Gas Works; outdoor advertising adviser: Arthur G. Petry, director of public service, Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc.; community relations adviser: Milton A. Eisenberg, vice president, Yellow Cab Co. of Philadelphia.

This national committee is arranging to have the 50 local chapters of the Federal Bar Association organize chapter law observance committees to engage in activities to educate the public on the importance of respecting the law and law enforcers, raising the morale of law-enforcement agents, attract the best personnel to the field, and inform the public about the fine work that is being done in the law-enforcement field.

I think we must especially commend the Pennsylvania District of Kiwanis International for underwriting the cost of large outdoor posters bearing the Federal Bar Association slogan, "The Law Protects You—Respect It, Uphold It, Obey It." These posters have already been placed on billboards in the Philadelphia area donated as a public service by the General Outdoor Advertising Co. They will make possible a program pursuant to which such billboards will appear throughout the country. Industry will be asked to cooperate and the first billboard donated by a large industrial firm has already been unveiled in the Camden, N.J., area through the public-spirited contribution of the Radio Corp. of America.

The Federal Bar Association is currently making arrangements for radio and TV participation in the program and I know that we will soon see and hear a great deal about this.

The law observance committee has published a "Manual for Law Observance Committees," to assist in the formation and functioning of such committees and these manuals will be made available to any organization which is willing to participate in the program.

It would be advantageous for Government agencies and private firms to participate in this program.

Eisenhower's Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., September 18, 1962:

EISENHOWER'S COMING

South Carolina Republicans and their allies have been jubilating over the coming visit this Saturday of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President of the United States, to the Palmetto State's capital. Mr. Eisenhower, who will confer with Republican candidates from several Southern States, is scheduled to speak from the statehouse steps at noon.

It is probable that some Gaffney and Cherokee County people will make the trip to Columbia to see and hear him. But that will not indicate by any means that all who do will vote for the Republicans in the November general election.

An interesting viewpoint, which the editor of the Ledger believes is correct, was presented by Editor A. M. Secrest in the last issue of the Cheraw Chronicle. Mr. Secrest said:

"Eisenhower's coming back to Columbia.

"That's the big political news in South Carolina this week. The former President will be here next Saturday, September 22, to give W. D. Workman, Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate, a boost. Later he will go to Pinehurst, N.C., to mix a little politics and golf in the hope of strengthening Representative JONAS' chances of defeating Wadesboro's PAUL KITCHIN.

"Democrats need not be unduly alarmed by Mr. Eisenhower's plans. There must be many Carolinians who remember the former

President's ringing declaration for States rights from the steps of the Capitol in 1952.

"It later turned out that Candidate Eisenhower's campaign promises did not jibe with President Eisenhower's action. During the 8 years of the Republican administration, the Federal Government steadily increased its power at the expense of the States, the national debt grew larger, and the budget was seldom balanced. For the first time since Reconstruction, Federal troops were sent south to enforce a court order, when, as hindsight proved, a few Federal marshals could have achieved the same results.

"We do not blame Mr. Eisenhower for the way things turned out, because much of it was simply inherent in the national and international situation. What we do emphasize is that the President's words did not coincide with his deeds.

"Mr. Eisenhower, furthermore, was singularly unsuccessful in transferring his hero status to other candidates whom he supported. He was never able to erase the image of the old Republican Party, as valiantly as he tried. Mr. Eisenhower was thus the only President in recent times who failed to carry the Congress with him at midterm elections, and he was not able to name his successor. Despite his appearance here at the peak of his personal popularity, which coincided with a new low in popularity for the Democrats and former President Truman, Mr. Eisenhower could not carry the State in 1952.

"There is no chance that he will be able to carry it for the Republicans and Mr. Workman in 1962. The News & Courier, Republican mouthpiece for Workman, says 'OLIN D. JOHNSTON can no more survive in the South of the future than a mule can compete against a tractor.' Remember that when the votes are counted in November. You'll get a good laugh.

"As for Workman's comment that Mr. Eisenhower's decision to come to Columbia might 'spur President Kennedy into coming here also to try and defend his New Frontier,' that's absurd. The President, unlike his predecessor, is a very busy man. He is not retired. He has something more to do than play golf and make routine political appearances on behalf of candidates who can win without his help."

"We Asked and Now We Answer" Results of District Poll by Representative Hugh L. Carey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report the results of a survey on Federal issues which I recently conducted in my district. The response in the tens of thousands speaks well for the public interest of the people of Brooklyn.

The questions I asked and the results are as follows:

1. Medical care for aged under social security: Yes, 62 percent; no, 35 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

2. Aid to education in some form for pupils of all schools: Yes, 60 percent; no, 37 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

3. Authorize the President to negotiate tariffs with trade blocs such as Common Market and other countries: Yes, 65 percent; no, 25 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

4. Federal subsidy or financing of (1) family fallout shelters, (2) community fallout shelters: Yes, 41 percent; no, 52 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

5. My bill to revise tax deductions to afford greater allowances for student dependents to cover education expenses: Yes, 82 percent; no, 12 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

In addition to publishing the results of this survey I have decided to live dangerously and adopt a new wrinkle. The practice among some Members who conduct these surveys is to ask questions but seldom to answer them. I submit that since I am now aware of how the residents of my district feel they have an equal right to know my position. Addressing myself first to the question which generated the most comment and controversy—No. 2, I favor a fair share in any educational assistance for every child in every school. As a sponsor of the "GI bill for junior" with my distinguished colleague, Representative JAMES J. DELANEY, of Queens, I advocate that financial assistance to preserve the right of freedom of choice in education be extended through the States and to the parents of all children in all schools. This bill is an absolute prohibition against any Federal control, interference, or monopoly in education. Since it follows the same pattern of distribution as the GI bill after World War II and the Education Act for the pages of Congress, it is modeled on constitutionally unquestioned legislation which has worked well and is nondiscriminatory. The bill does not provide aid for teaching religious subjects and it is therefore not subject to objection under the first amendment.

The "GI bill for junior" is in keeping with the concept of distributive justice that every parent has an equal right to share in the proceeds of tax funds allocated to education. I believe that at every level of government, Federal, State, and local, that the parent should not be compelled to forfeit his right to freely choose a school and direct the education of his children as a condition to receiving an equitable share of his own taxes. Parents rights in education are paramount and inviolate and must remain so. This was recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations General Assembly at article 26 which reads:

Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given their children.

It is significant that when this resolution was passed in the General Assembly the Communist bloc nations abstained from voting. Under their system of education the parents have no control over the education of their children and they become creatures of the state. To avoid that in our Nation it is essential that we recognize and preserve parents' rights in education. This is particularly important in the light of the further secularization of the schools in our State resulting from the decision of the Supreme Court in the New Hyde Park regents school prayer case. Children must not be forced to attend a school where prayer is forbidden. We must move on twin fronts to restore the right of prayer to the public schools and serve the right of the parent to choose education with religion added through a fair plan of assistance. That plan is the bill for which I urge consideration as vital to our junior citizens—the "GI bill for junior." These junior citizens are voiceless and voteless but they have a right to educational excellence and I will continue to work in their interest.

On the other issues I have supported a plan of medical care for all our citizens over 65 and I intend to work for a solution which will provide that care with adequate safeguards against any threat of socialized medicine.

I strongly supported the Trade Expansion Act, a legislative blue ribbon of the 87th Congress. New York City clearly depends on trade for jobs and well-being and that trade could only be increased by effective interest in the Common Market. This legislation passed by a vote of 298 to 125.

I am in accord with the recent action of the Armed Services Committee in deleting $460 million allocated to the fallout shelter program.

Our strong defense effort, the largest in peacetime history, is the best approach to deterring Communist aggression. I favor continuing surveys to maximize the use of existing shelter facilities.

My bill to increase the tax deduction for children from the present unrealistic amount of $600 to a gradually higher figure, based upon the age of the child and therefore his needs has received universal support. The deduction would finally rest for all dependents at a new level of $800. The other provision of this bill allowing deductions to cover educational expense has been similarly well received.

Unfortunately, until the residents of our district express themselves further on these questions as only constituents can, I will not know how many disagree with me. If a majority do, then I will not be around to run this risk again, but while I am here at least my stand is clear so that, while some may question the prudence of stating my views on the questions I have asked, it must be conceded that the policy is positive.

Equality in Business Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, considerable progress has been made by this administration in the field of equal job opportunity. The scope of the administration's efforts to establish the principle of equality in many fields has now been broadened to include equality in business.

A talk on the subject was recently made by David A. Sawyer, an outstand-

ing leader in the field of human relations. Mr. Sawyer is presently Special Assistant for Intergroup Relations in the U.S. Army Materiel Command. His address was delivered before the 62d Annual Convention of the National Business League in the city of Philadelphia.

I believe the Members of Congress will be interested in Mr. Sawyer's remarks and I am including them below:

ADDRESS BY DAVID A. SAWYER, SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR INTERGROUP RELATIONS, U.S. ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND, BEFORE THE 62D ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL BUSINESS LEAGUE, SYLVANIA HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., SEPTEMBER 13–14, 1962

I am delighted to be here this afternoon to participate again in the plenary sessions during the annual convention of the National Business League.

I feel honored, indeed, that you have asked me to return for the second year in a row. Last year Ruth Bates and I participated in a radio dialog discussion on "the needed role of businessmen," and particularly Negro businessmen, in developing good community relationships and in developing community programs for improving human relationships.

Glancing at this year's program, I am especially thrilled to see that you are devoting an entire afternoon of followup and assessment of our last year's discussions.

In returning today, I wear a different hat. I no longer am affiliated with the government of the District of Columbia, though I am engaged in exactly the same endeavor.

Although I am wearing the hat of the Army Materiel Command, I am still concerned with problems resulting from bias in employment. I am still concerned with promoting job and training opportunities in such a manner that race, color, and creed will no longer be barriers to such opportunities.

Thanks to the concern of our national leadership, I have been charged with the responsibility to oversee a program within the Army of the United States which will insure equal opportunity for all persons either employed or seeking employment on such work as may be done under Government contract with the U.S. Army. This is a tall order and the stakes are very high. I trust that I will be worthy of the confidence of those who have given me these responsibilities.

In recent weeks a new name has appeared in the press of the United States in connection with Army contracts and Army procurement. Many people, including some in my own household, have asked what is the Army Materiel Command? How old is it? What does it do?

As a result of a recent Army reorganization program, the Army Materiel Command has control of a nationwide complex of military installations and activities which are engaged in developing, producing, and supplying weapons, equipment and other types of materiel for the Army. We are responsible for most of the materiel functions which were formerly performed by the Army's various technical services. We operate through seven major subordinate commands and we, at Army Materiel Command, direct the activities of depots, laboratories, arsenals, proving grounds, test ranges, procurement offices, and transportation terminals throughout the continental United States of America. The establishment of the Army Materiel Command represents a single integrated organization—and a vast one at that—especially conceived and designed to provide the Army's weapons and equipment.

Within the Army Materiel Command, are major commands which are responsible for research, development, production and procurement of such assigned commodities as weapons, munitions, transportation type materiel, including planes, tanks, automotive equipment, ballistics and guided missiles and rockets. They also include such responsibilities as communication and electronic warfare systems and such additional responsibities as delivering supplies of Army materiel to installations both within the continental United States of America and to oversea commands. In a nutshell, the Army Materiel Command had begun operations with approximately $25 billion inventory and an anticipated annual expenditure of about $8 billion; making the command one of the biggest contractors of all times.

Under the Army Materiel Command concept of operations, its Washington headquarters will furnish overall policy direction for its farflung operations. Our major subordinate commands will serve as the midmanagement level to supervise performance, while our many individual installations and activities will accomplish the actual execution of the Army materiel program.

Well, where in this vast structure is there room for an intergroup relations program?

The Army Materiel Command, as I have indicated, is big business. It is one of the largest contracting agencies of all representing the United States.

In planning the operational activities of the Army Materiel Command, the Secretary of the Army directed that seven experienced and knowledgeable intergroup relations specialists be recruited and assigned to the personnel staffs of the commanding generals of the headquarters and the major commands.

The six other intergroup relations technicians who will make up my complement will serve as policy advisers and compliance reviewers on the equal employment opportunity program policies and of the basic procedures on Government contracts as set forth in President Kennedy's Executive Order 10925. My staff and I are charged with the responsibility to oversee the implementation by Army Materiel Command contractors of the President's Executive order which insures equal opportunity for all qualified persons either employed or seeking employment—equal opportunities without restrictions and barriers of race, color, creed or national origin.

Important too, we are assigned the task of advising and assisting contractors in their efforts to implement the Executive order and to comply with the rules and regulations of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. We'll be helping firms develop affirmative action—develop programs which will actually open doors to people previously barred.

The Federal Government has for a long time insisted that all who do business with it agree not to discriminate against those seeking employment or those already in their employ because of race, color, creed or national origin. All contracts awarded have for several years contained nondiscrimination clauses. At various times during the last 25 years emphasis has been given to the need for compliance.

Regrettably, for many who have enjoyed these contractual relationships with the Government, this nondiscrimination clause was a meaningless addition to an otherwise forceful contract.

By and large most contractors conformed to the letter of the contract and fulfilled all of the agreements and stipulations, all except the one which said that there shall be no discrimination in employment, in training, in upgrading, or in salaries to persons because of their color, their religion, their race or their national origin.

In the last 18 months a new look has been introduced to this old problem.

In March of 1961 President Kennedy injected a new philosophy to the work of combating discrimination in employment.

He made it clear that discrimination because of race, creed, color, and national origin is contrary to the constitutional principles and policies of the United States.

He declared to the American public that it was the plain and positive obligation of the U.S. Government to promote and insure equal opportunity for all qualified persons without regard to race, creed, color, and national origin. Important, too, the President added his "new look" to combating this problem when he said that it was the "policy of the executive branch of the Government to encourage, by positive measures, equal employment opportunities for all qualified persons no matter of their race, color, creed."

The President has repeatedly said that he felt it was in the general interest and welfare of the United States to promote its economic security and national defense by the most efficient and effective utilization of all available manpower. He expanded and strengthened the previous existing Executive orders and the practices in Government agencies procedures related to Government employment and the compliance with the nondiscrimination contract provisions.

These efforts of the Chief Executive to promote full equality of employment opportunities have set a pace which is without precedent.

The tone set by the President has been echoed by Vice President JOHNSON, who, in referring to the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity which he chairs has often said that his Committee "means business."

In its short span of life—about 15 months—the President's Committee has racked up a record of achievement and "breakthroughts" which reflects that the President and Vice President registered their sincerity and intent to rid the serpent of discrimination from all work engaged in, for, and on behalf of the Government—Yes, people for the first time understood that the Government really "meant business."

This is the tone set by the Chief Executive and it is reflected throughout all Departments of Government. Secretary of Defense McNamara has directed that programs similar to the one I have been honored to head for the Army be instituted within the Air Force and the Navy.

I am delighted to tell you that I believe sincerely—and I am gambling 15 years of professional reputation and integrity on this—that the Army also "means business" in its efforts to insure equal employment opportunity for those seeking employment or those who are already employed on Government contracts.

In this new assignment, I am a member of the personnel staff of Lt. Gen. Frank E. Besson, who is Commanding General of the Army Materiel Command. He has insisted, and correctly so, that each of his major subordinate commanders have a full-time civilian assistant who will be an experienced and qualified intergroup relations specialist.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, this is an expression of intention—it is more than that—it is an announcement of sincerity from a commander who has said "I mean business, too."

I am reminded that in just a few days—Monday to be exact—we will commemorate the 175th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States. That history was written only a few blocks from where we now convene. The anniversary of the signing of our Constitution brings to mind what that sacred document has meant in the lives of our peoples, and to mankind.

The Declaration of Independence asserts our will to freedom—the Constitution asserts our will to self-control.

The Declaration determines that we should not be subject to any foreign powers, while the Constitution determined that we should

use our new found freedom to establish justice and peace within our own borders.

No one has ever said that the Constitution was a perfect document—no one has ever claimed that its framers had divine revelation. They realized, and admitted their own limitations. They provided that the generations which were to follow them and who were to live by the Constitution, possessed the right to amend it.

But these signers were determined to produce a firm foundation in law for a free, a just, and harmonious national life, and in this they succeeded.

They made our Government one of laws and not of men. They made it of laws which were designed to protect the rights of the weak against the encroachment of the strong—of laws to defend the liberties of the individual, not only against the tyranny of autocrats and privileged groups, but also to defend the individual against the tyranny of the multitudes. They wanted human law to reflect and enforce the divine law of justice and equity.

Our law has perpetrated some abuses but it also preserved all of our liberties. The abuses are in no way essential to our law and can be eradicated, but without the law our liberties would be ours only on sufferance.

Yes, our Constitution, is a great document, and it is with a good feeling that we sit here today almost at the hour of its 175th anniversary.

The Constitution has been the key to the door of our liberties. I would like to suggest that we be reminded of that key, as we ask business men throughout the United States to recognize that they hold the keys to whatever doors we have opened for our young people to pass through as they step from youth to the role of adulthood.

These are the keys that must be made for the young people who will make up our future workforce, our adult communities, and who will be the workers in the institutions we have built throughout this great land. These are the keys that will point to the skill or unskilled and the keys that point to employment or unemployment.

We can determine whether a man will be socially responsible, or impeded and irresponsible. Our actions today, and in the days ahead will determine whether our young people will be trained and whether they will be able to gain employment according to their talents and skills.

Yes, businessmen hold the power to eliminate the major roadblocks which now prevent the full contribution of the Negro to the work product of any community in this country. I am convinced, and I hope you will agree with me, that as any community succeeds in combatting racial bias in employment it shall find many of its other problems resolved.

How better can a community eliminate the problems of rising welfare costs, delinquency, and increased crime, than to get to the root of the problem itself?

The outlook for many communities is rather grim unless leaders of business will open the doors for minority workers and youth to develop new skills and know-how through work experience, which up to now has been denied them.

I hope management will make a set of keys for its personnel officers which will fit the doors of a program that can assure merit employment. I hope that they will develop a program that will assure that job opportunities will be extended to job applicants and to minority youth who really need and want apprenticeship opportunities.

If they can do this, businessmen will have helped to rid their communities of the major contributing factor to all of the problems surrounding dependency and poverty.

If we, in our communities, can break down the prejudice against hiring skilled and white-collar Negro workers, we shall have overcome the greatest challenge to our communities and to our Nation as a whole.

It is my hope that business and labor will agree to relax their timidity toward instituting merit employment programs. Businessmen take much greater risks in the many other things they do in their daily business ventures—and some of these risks show much less prospect of gain—gain not only to business, but in reality, gain to the total social and economic welfare of the communities in which they do their business.

As we talk about the building of our great municipalities—realizing the greater the cities, the greater the nation—there comes to mind a meditation on the lives of nations, was written by Franklin Roosevelt during a period of low ebb. The aptness and the timeliness of the Roosevelt statement come home today in September 1962.

"Lives of nations are determined, not by the count of years, but by the lifetime of the human spirit. The lifetime of man is three score years and ten; a little more, a little less. The life of a nation is the fullness of the measure of its will to life. A nation, like a person, has a mind—a mind that must be kept informed and alert, that must know itself, that understands the hopes and needs of its neighbors—all the other nations that live within the narrowing circle of the world. A nation, like a person, has something deeper, something more permanent, something larger than the sum of all its parts. It is that something which matters most to the future, which calls for the most sacred guarding of its present."

We Americans are now living in the most critical era of our Nation—we are at the point where previous civilizations have broken down through luxury, softness, and degeneration. We are now being brought to face—some perhaps are being forced to face—the real values of life. We are being forced by a powerful, a false ideology to demonstrate that we can and will practice what we preach—and that it is good.

In order to be strong enough—strong enough to win the struggle for free minds and the freedom of the world—we must be honest enough, to recognize the need to utilize all of our resources. Like it or not, we—all of us—are the Americans who are pitted against subversion and communism. And we had better be wise enough to like it; because it is only by uniting in good fellowship, and accepting, with total color-blindness, the common cause, that we shall attain the necessary strength and worthiness to prevail.

As we plan our big buildings and our new roads, we must plan far beyond the drawing board and blueprints. We must superimpose on our blueprints a plan that includes the human and the social aspects of all that is about us; because everything that we do involves people. Whether we are building a road, a bridge, a tank, or planning urban development, people are affected. And we must make certain that these people are always considered when we make our initial plans, rather than when we reach the final stages.

The Vice President and the Attorney General of the United States have recently returned from visits to a number of countries in Europe, Africa, and the Middle East. They have reemphasized the concern of many of our national leaders that some of our domestic problems reflect so badly on our Nation abroad.

It is disturbing that, on an international level, the integrity of the United States is measured by hundreds of millions of people on the basis of our racial practices. And it is good that it is disturbing.

The delegates and diplomatic missions of nonwhite countries have been encountering difficulties and embarrassment as they seek appropriate places to live and work in our country—which is the seat of the United Nations.

Too many of us don't give a second thought (or even a first thought), to the fact that these difficulties will influence the personal and international attitudes of officials in other nations toward the United States. In this year of 1962, it is imperative that those of us in Washington and our citizens throughout the land—reexamine their consciences.

Many a monument stands with an inscription: "Erected by the people—of whether the place—in honor of the martyrs who fell and the heroes who fought in defense of liberty and union." This inscription is dated 1861-65.

We are now meeting nearly a full century after the close of the war which these monuments commemorate. Today we can, in honesty, say that the indissolvability of the Union is all but universally accepted. However, if we should speak to the fallen who have fought in freedom's cause at any time in the long history of man, we would tragically have to report that victory is not yet won.

The struggle for the rights of man is endless. Each past generation has witnessed, and each future generation may expect, assaults on the dignity of the individual and onslaughts against liberty and justice. The annals of history disclose the discouraging difference between man's intended state and his reality. In the past, and even now, man has been relegated to second-class status, denied his liberty, or deprived of his life, because those in power and authority disagreed with his religious beliefs—or lack of them—his racial identification, his economic theories, his national allegiance, or his politics. Those who do not believe in, and those who do not trust, the democratic processes have been given aid and comfort by such indifference.

Abraham Lincoln once said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

This is an audible drumbeat in the halls of history that cannot be stilled. Men who value freedom march to its cadence. Today, the drummer increases the tempo, and no one, in the ranks of the free, dares stand at parade rest.

Ladies and gentlemen, it shall never be a secret that I will always be playing my favorite tune about merit employment. I am thrilled that so many of our Nation are now singing this tune. I hope that the millions who are now only humming it, will soon be singing it aloud. And maybe, then we will have a best seller—a record we will all be proud of—yes we will have that tune of merit employment on the top of the hit parade.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

What Nuclear Power for NATO?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, since the Second World War, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been the central bulwark against Communist expansion in Europe. It is through this Organization that countries upholding Western principles have presented to the Communists a united opposition. But in spite of the basic unity which guides the larger policy of the NATO members, a number of points of divergence unfortunately exist. Most of this disagreement centers around the use of conventional military forces and tactical nuclear forces in Europe.

The two questions on which a number of NATO members find themselves in disagreement are, first, should the Western countries build up their conventional military forces to provide a nonnuclear deterrent to Communist expansion; or, second, should nuclear forces be built up, and, if so, who should have final control over them? These questions must be resolved to the satisfaction of dissenting parties if unity is to be maintained. To find these answers and to maintain this unity will indeed require the wisdom and patience of a Solomon.

Not only we and our allies disagree on the use of nuclear and nonnuclear forces. In the United States itself, some military experts support a course of action different from that of the administration. But, whatever differences of opinion do exist, they exist only because each person concerned is sincerely trying to answer the larger question underlying the debate: What is the best way to counter aggressive Soviet moves?

The problem requires careful analysis and investigation. An excellent presentation of the issues involved in our attempts to keep NATO unified is to be found in an article by Maj. Gen. Max S. Johnson, retired, in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report.

I ask unanimous consent that this penetrating article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 17, 1962]

A MILITARY EXPERT SIZES UP U.S. STRATEGY IN NO. 1 DANGER AREA

(NOTE.—An independent nuclear force of its own for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization? That's what signs indicate now. But that prospect raises grave problems for the United States.

Maj. Gen. Max S. Johnson, retired, former commandant of the Army War College, now on the staff of U.S. News & World Report, analyzes a major issue of strategy in this report.)

The United States is beginning to face up, under pressure of a nuclear arms race, to the tough problem of finding a more effective defense for Europe.

That problem is a dual one, centering on these questions:

1. Should the West beef up its conventional forces in Europe, to provide a nonnuclear deterrent against limited Soviet attack and thus lessen the danger of nuclear war.

2. Or should tactical nuclear forces be stressed and built up to provide a stronger defense for Western Europe—and, if so, in what form and under whose control?

At a time when this country is changing its commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's military structure in Europe and its Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, this problem is emerging as the biggest single strategy decision facing U.S. planners.

Top-level U.S. officials, at this time, clearly prefer some solution that will not build more nuclear force in Europe.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has warned more than once against the "proliferation" of nuclear weapons on both sides of the Iron Curtain. He is strongly advising U.S. allies against building atomic weapons of their own, thus duplicating U.S. nuclear efforts.

There is increased nervousness among some civilian planners, too, over the idea that any use of nuclear arms would "escalate" into a general nuclear war and worldwide chaos.

However, the hard facts of military defense today were laid down by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, newly appointed Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, in testimony before Congress on August 9, in the following way:

"In my judgment, if an attack on Western Europe comes, we must use whatever weapons and forces are necessary to defeat it. To meet a massive attack today, because of the lack of adequate conventional forces in the West, it would be necessary to resort to atomic weapons early in the conflict."

Right now, NATO forces in Western Europe have many deficiencies which almost guarantee that if the West does not resort almost at once to a nuclear defense much of West Germany would be lost, even if the attack were mounted by no more than the Russian forces now in East Germany.

To fight a "conventional" defense in Europe, NATO has:

A tactical Air Force that is outnumbered 2 to 1 by Communist jets, and is not nearly large enough to carry out its missions using conventional weapons.

A shortage of armored forces, particularly in the northern sector.

A lack of adequate conventional artillery support everywhere, to meet a Red attack.

No mobile, midrange missiles to match the numerous Soviet missiles with ranges from 200 to 2,000 miles.

Too few Allied divisions that are properly deployed, adequately trained and appropriately equipped.

Not enough air defense of Allied ground forces and air installations.

Too few ready replacements for ground forces and air forces—either in units or as individuals.

Inadequate logistic support for many of the national contingents of forces now assigned to NATO.

No integrated, common supply system, needed under war conditions in Europe.

An insufficient defense against chemical or radiological attack, and inadequate means for retaliatory attacks.

Thus, for the time being, there is no adequate defense of Western Europe without the use of nuclear weapons. Most NATO planners agree on this.

Some battlefield nuclear weapons are deployed in Europe at present in support of the U.S. 7th Army and Allied forces. These are the Honest John, Little John, Corporal, Redstone, Lacrosse and Davy Crockett missiles, and the 280-millimeter and 155-millimeter artillery pieces. All are capable of firing nuclear warheads, but their ranges are far below 200 miles.

There are also a few IRBM's—Thors in England and Jupiters in Italy and Turkey—but these are at vulnerable, fixed emplacements. There are Polaris submarines as well, assigned to back up NATO.

BIG NEED: MEDIUM-RANGE MISSILES

But what European planners particularly want, in addition, are large numbers of light, mobile, accurate, quick-firing, land-based missiles with ranges between 200 and 2,000 miles. These are referred to as MMRBM's—mobile midrange ballistic missiles. At this time the West has no such missiles on hand, and is not likely to have for several more years.

Equally troublesome are the issues of how to organize such an expanded nuclear force, and who should control and direct its use. There has been pressure for some time, notably from France and Germany, for a reduction in the almost exclusive U.S. nuclear control that is now in effect.

One prime reason is the suspicion that, as Russia develops intercontinental nuclear forces able to blanket the United States, then the United States will want to avoid launching any nuclear retaliation against Russia in defense of Europe, unless America too has been directly attacked.

There have been a number of suggestions for a nuclear force under other than exclusive U.S. control.

Why not set up, it is suggested, an independent nuclear force controlled by all of NATO, or by several NATO nations, with or without a U.S. veto?

Early in 1962, the undercurrent of European resistance to American nuclear domination of NATO crystallized—partly in response to repeated American offers to consider modifications in the nuclear control pattern.

Both President Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk have indicated publicly that they have some willingness to appease the nuclear ambitions of our principal European allies.

The President, at Ottawa in May 1961, said that the United States looked forward to "the possibility of eventually establishing a NATO seaborne missile force, which would be truly multilateral in ownership and control, if this should be desired and found

feasible by our Allies once NATO's nonnuclear goals have been achieved."

In November, Secretary Rusk said the offer was still good, provided that the organization and the guidelines for the control and use of a NATO nuclear force were agreed upon.

As of now, only a first step toward such guidelines has been accomplished by NATO. This covers the circumstances under which nuclear weapons would be used. There is little agreement, however, on just how to organize the tactical nuclear forces.

France's De Gualle, for example, is putting his emphasis on a national nuclear force for France, not a NATO force utilizing jointly controlled weapons.

Germany, which is denied nuclear weapons by treaty, is more anxious for NATO to have a tactical nuclear force of mobile midrange missiles that could strike Soviet targets, to stop any Soviet attack before it could make West Germany the battlefield.

Both the Germans and De Gaulle want real voices in the control of nuclear strategy as well as tactics.

The Germans refer to "positive" and "negative" controls—permitting the use of tactical nuclear forces as soon as they believe them to be required, and to veto the use of such forces if they believe the time is not ripe.

The British position is less clear. The Labor Party opposes the use of nuclear weapons. The Government does not. But it is preoccupied with the question of entering the European Common Market, and must therefore avoid offending both Germany's and France's leaders on the subject of nuclear weapons and their control. On the other hand, London is reluctant to lose its preferred position as a junior member of the present "nuclear club," with a national nuclear force of its own—a situation which irks De Gaulle.

The U.S. position is almost as hard to pin down. At a NATO policy conference in Athens last spring, which Secretary McNamara attended, U.S. representatives offered to consider a fully integrated, multilateral NATO nuclear force. It now appears that if U.S. allies in Europe should come up with a proposal instead for a European nuclear force—a French-German, British-French-German, or even Common Market force—this too might be acceptable.

To be fully acceptable to the United States, the European nuclear force would probably have to be linked to NATO control. But any of these proposals could involve American participation, and an American veto over the use of U.S.-made arms. The Kennedy administration might even agree to take to Congress some proposal to curtail our veto, although this would probably involve a hassle over revising the McMahon Act, which restricts the United States on sharing atomic weapons.

WHAT THE PENTAGON WANTS

There are also some grounds for thinking that Pentagon leaders would go along with a French national nuclear force, not subject to joint control.

U.S. officials, however, are on record as opposing any further proliferation of nuclear weapons, including the development by our allies of their own strategic nuclear power and nuclear production facilities.

Secretary McNamara spelled out this viewpoint at the Athens meeting in May 1962, and later in a public speech at the University of Michigan. His thesis was this: The U.S. superiority over the Russians in nuclear warheads and vehicles for their delivery is so great that the development of further strategic nuclear forces by any of the other members of NATO would be an unwarranted duplication of effort. Needed in Europe instead, he said, are more conventional forces from the European members.

This U.S. logic, however, appears to be making no impression on De Gaulle, who is still going all out for a French nuclear force.

Where is all of this leading U.S. policymakers? As of now, it looks as though world and allied pressures will push this country toward accommodation to the French drive for a nuclear capability, and that NATO will end up with some form of tactical nuclear deterrent of its own.

Just what kind of NATO-controlled force this will be, to provide a more effective defense for Europe, is still unclear. But the signs point to at least a semistrategic force, designed to strike deeper than the tactical nuclear weapons that now accompany and support the ground forces, but limited in range to targets short of Russia itself. In addition, an increase in the number of present tactical weapons appears almost certain.

As the United States faces up to this issue, important questions are in the offing.

Will the United States soon be producing tactical A-weapons for its allies? How much, if any, control over these weapons will it retain? Will the Germans, as well as the French, soon own nuclear weapons? Will the Common Market attain its own nuclear defense? How much will the present U.S. role in Europe change, if nuclear control shifts? Can the United States reduce its conventional forces now based in Europe?

No answers are yet available. But they are to be sought diligently in the months ahead, as U.S. defense planners turn to the big problem of a better defense for Europe.

Defense Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the great strides that all States are taking to procure defense contracts.

I found the attached correspondence, which includes a letter from Mr. Charles R. Diebold, president, Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce, Buffalo, N.Y., very interesting:

(NOTE.—Below is a copy of a letter from Buffalo, N.Y., area Chamber of Commerce President Charles R. Diebold to Los Angeles Chamber President Stephen Bilheimer. The letter is in reply to Mr. Bilheimer's recent comments (quoted in the Aug. 22 Space Daily) to the effect that if the United States is to overtake the Soviet Union in the space race "it is imperative that defense contracts be awarded on the basis of merit—and not on the basis of population, tax payments, number of voters, unemployment, or any other yardstick unrelated to the capacity to best perform the work. In the interest of national security, defense contracts must be awarded to achieve procurement of the highest quality, reliability and at the lowest cost, in the shortest time possible." Mr. Bilheimer also said that "recent attacks aimed at taking away defense business from the southland (southern California), if successful, could seriously negate the progress the United States has made to date.")

AUGUST 29, 1962.

Mr. STEPHEN BILHEIMER,
President, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. BILHEIMER: I read with great interest your recent comments to the effect that defense contracts must be awarded on the basis of merit, rather than any political considerations. We in western New York have long maintained that price and quality should become the criteria for the expenditure of our Nation's defense dollars and it is heartening, indeed, to learn that such views are shared in the State which has received the largest share of defense work.

We have never questioned the premise that national security must be the overriding consideration, that defense business should go to the companies which have demonstrated that they can contribute, that they can produce.

While we obviously are in complete agreement as to the basis on which defense contracts should be awarded, I must take exception to your stated concern that any decrease in California's defense business "could seriously negate the progress the United States has made to date."

No State or any group of States has a patent on quality, economy, and production. New York State, for instance, has excellent resources for outstanding engineers and scientists and highly dedicated and competent executive personnel. Modern equipment for research and extensive production facilities are available for the development and manufacture of space age products. Western New York, in particular, has compiled a remarkable record of industrial and scientific achievement in times of war and peace.

The free enterprise system precludes the award of a disproportionate share of defense business to any one State or industrial complex and I know you will agree that our traditionally competitive way of doing business will provide the best defense possible.

The defense industries of New York State accept fair and open competition as their guiding principle and will be judged on this basis. We will continue to compete on a high level and we will continue to produce the most advanced and reliable equipment that it is possible to produce, at the earliest possible date and at the lowest possible cost.

Sincerely,

CHARLES R. DIEBOLD,
President,
Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce.

Address of the Honorable Robert N. Giaimo Before the 65th Annual Convention of the American Federation of Musicians, Pittsburgh, Pa., Tuesday, June 12, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the advancements of science invariably produce both social and economic consequences which must be dealt with by our political institutions. We have only begun to come to grips with the novel problems inherent in the development of Telstar—others will arise in the very near future to command the attention of Congress.

In an address before the 1962 convention of the American Federation of Television & Radio Artists, my good friend and colleague from Connecticut, Representative ROBERT N. GIAIMO, directed the attention of his audience to some of the new issues raised by Telstar. Inasmuch as these issues will, in some form, be before this body in the near future,

I wish to call the attention of this House to Representative GIAIMO's remarks, and I ask that they be included at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT N. GIAIMO BEFORE THE 65TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS, PITTSBURGH, PA., TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 1962

It is with great pleasure that I extend my greetings and best wishes to you at your 65th annual convention. I am happy to have this opportunity to meet with you and share with you reports of the fight in which you and I are engaged. I refer, of course, to the struggle to improve the status of the American performer and to achieve for the arts of America their proper place among the more cherished activities of a mature nation.

Too often, in the past, your union and its sister organizations devoted to the performing arts have fought a lonely battle against powerful odds. The musician knew in the early thirties that bad times for him would last longer than the depression. The sound movie drove him from the theater pit, and he learned that progress is not an altogether unmixed blessing. In the early 1940's, your president, James Petrillo, saw a storm gathering. He knew that the promiscuous use of recorded music would drive not only the musician from radio and TV but all live performers as well. His warnings were unheeded. Congress preferred to take its cue from the broadcasters, and the Lea Act was passed—paving the way for broadcasters to convert their franchises into glorified jukeboxes.

More recently, however, the strong solo horn of the American Federation of Musicians is being joined by a growing number of "sidemen." In Congress, in the White House, in many State capitals and cities the values of living art are being extolled, and there are definite signs that concern for the plight of the performing artist in America may well rival that demonstrated for the whooping crane in the halls of government.

During the past half year, a series of significant congressional hearings have been held. Pursuant to the authority granted by House Resolution 141, which I introduced in the first session of the current Congress, the Select Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor heard testimony in New York, San Francisco, and Washington on conditions affecting the income and employment of America's performing artists. The records of those sessions make interesting, if alarming, reading. The committee, in extending its invitations, tried to collect the most authoritative and articulate representatives available from all the fields directly or indirectly concerned with the financing, production, and performance of works of art. The roster of witnesses included actors, dancers, and musicians, as well as producers, impresarios, critics, record manufacturers, legislators, educators, and spokesmen for the country's major institutions devoted to the performing arts.

To my knowledge, these hearings represented the first major attempt by Congress to compile, in one place, the pertinent facts and attitudes relating to the problems faced by the performing arts in this country. This is an accomplishment in itself; but it should be, and is, only a beginning.

Those of us who were alarmed before at the situation in which the arts today find themselves had our worst fears confirmed. In addition, however, the testimony brought home the fact that the problems are extremely complicated ones and there are no simple solutions.

It is precisely for the reason that we are aware of the complexities that I and my interested colleagues have pushed legislation which would establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. The bill proposing this, introduced by Representative FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey with bipartisan support, last year, is threatened with a slow death on the shelves of the House Rules Committee.

Frankly, it is amazing that any proposal could meet with such an extraordinary amount of misunderstanding. Unfortunately, many of my fellow Representatives have no interest in any legislation pertaining to the arts. But even among those who count themselves as friends to the arts, many have insisted on viewing the idea of the Council as either "visionary," or vague to the point of meaninglessness, or as an attempt to establish just one more bit of self-perpetuating bureaucracy.

How can we ever hope to make an intelligent and comprehensive appraisal of so complex and delicate a problem without providing for some central and representative panel which is qualified to consider the mass of facts involved and offer guidance to those who have the power to take action? The Federal Advisory Council is not meant by its supporters to be merely a group of bureaucrats collecting information. It is intended that the appointments will be limited to the country's most outstanding and authoritative people, as far as the arts are concerned. It is simply beyond the power of a congressional committee to do the kind of job these people would be qualified to do. We will, in all likelihood, have difficulty enough in evaluating the ultimate proposals of such a Council, but that at least can be done. It is, however, those who have spent a good part of their lives dealing with the issues in question who should do the spadework and thus offer the Congress and the administration the necessary guidelines for action.

There is no obligation that the recommendations of the Federal Council, as proposed, be followed. The bill reflects only a desire that we have the best possible guidance for the decisions we may eventually have to make.

A Federal Council on the Arts would be a first step toward the clarification and then—we trust—solution of those knotty problems which underlie the discussion that has raged for many years on the proper and desirable relationship of the arts and government.

However, in the meantime, there are some very immediate problems which we can deal with—matters which have a direct bearing on the economic plight of the musician.

Those of us who have studied the situation have been struck by one great paradox. More Americans like and listen to music, of all kinds, than ever before. Why, then, are performing musicians in such difficulties?

The answer is that their products are being consumed but are not being paid for.

As I see it, our first concern lies here. We must do something to diminish these inequities.

The development of recording techniques has proved to be the greatest imaginable boon to music lovers. Comfortably established in my living room armchair, I can hear a complete and superb performance of a favorite symphony. The production of long-playing records and playing equipment means that I can do this with minimal interruption—either on my own set or on radio. Not only have these developments affected the individual consumer, they have also had a tremendous impact on the broadcasting industry. First, live performances were no longer necessary for good radio programs. Then, the LP's simplified matters even further. Technical quality and ease of handling meant that a full schedule of excellent entertainment could be offered by a station with even a very small staff.

With proper care, a record can be played over and over again. Even if the broadcasters paid for their records—and they don't; the recording companies send them gratis—the cost would be infinitesimal when contrasted to the mileage they get from them.

I have been informed by the Library of Congress that 80 percent of air time is consumed by music. But what do the people who made the product that is being used to such an extraordinary degree get out of it? Absolutely nothing.

The same holds true for the tremendous exploitation of records by the jukebox industry. They can make fortunes, with minimal expenditure, through one record, which represents the combined efforts of composer and musicians. Not one penny does either get, however, except for the sale of the record, if it was indeed sold, to the jukebox concern. Even then, the musicians benefit only, as you know, indirectly, through the recording industries music performance trust funds. The establishment of the fund was certainly a constructive step through collective bargaining, but it has by no means supplied a final answer to the vexing question of how the specific individual performer is to share in the profits made through his own efforts. The answer to this problem can only be supplied by Government.

I would like to see a revision of our antiquated laws of copyright. There is no reason at all for the all but complete exclusion of the performing artists from the profits which are made from the continued and widespread use of his unique effort. The performance itself is a creation; this the copyright laws must be made to take into account.

The U.S. Government is presently considering the question of whether or not we should endorse an international convention, drafted last fall in Rome, which among other things, concerns the protection of the performing artist from just such exploitation as I have described. Your own president, Mr. Kenin, was one of the advisers to the American delegation at the conference which drew up the convention. The problems touched on in the convention are very complex; the final draft was the end result of a continuing effort which reaches back nearly 40 years.

Although our ratification of the convention does not necessarily mean that Congress will pass new domestic copyright laws, at least it will have the force, for the administration, of a moral obligation to press for such passage.

In the case of records and transcriptions, then, there are two very important steps that should be taken. First is adoption of the Rome Convention. The second step, of course, is to guarantee to the performer an interest in the use made of his recordings and thus put an end to the exploitation being made of his talent through the use of records and transcriptions by the broadcasting and jukebox and other commercial industries. This would also require a change in our present copyright laws.

I wish to bring up one other matter. Although "subsidy" is not the dirty word for me that it is for some, I nevertheless think it makes sense to use all possible existing channels for relieving the plight of the performing arts before we think about creating new ones. For example, are there any revisions in the Internal Revenue Code which would help?

The cabaret tax was reduced, in 1960, from 20 to 10 percent. I think this tax should be eliminated entirely. From the time of its reduction to the date of our December hearings in San Francisso—the Select Committee on Education was informed—the 10-percent drop had resulted in the employment of 500 additional musicians in that city alone.

I am also interested in the repeal of taxes on admissions to all musical performances, whether or not they are produced by groups which can qualify as civic or community membership associations. It is possible that these latter may be made the beneficiaries

of further liberalizations in the tax laws; but, regardless—for the sake of the general economic health of the musical arts in this country—I feel that we can well afford to include the presently nonexempted concerts in the favored category.

I believe that if we put our minds to it, we can get results in the areas I have emphasized. This administration has a noticeably friendly attitude toward the arts. It has created an atmosphere in Washington, reflecting that attitude, which may yet drift up into the corridors and cloakrooms of Capitol Hill. At any rate, my colleagues are impressed by specific, well-planned programs which take advantage of existing structures. May I suggest that you all try to promote such efforts as these?

In a recent article, Mr. Richard Coe, drama critic for the Washington Post, stressed the gap between promise and performance regarding arts legislation today. "The differences must be faced," he wrote, "by those who presume to think that a new era is here and spout enthusiastically of ideas as though they are facts. Representatives of the performing arts must inspire the grassroots to speak up. Dilettantism, an inherited disease of the arts, can all too easily waste this richly promising atmosphere."

The American Federation of Musicians has been a valiant fighter for arts legislation in the Nation's Capital. You can be proud of the work done in your behalf by your national officers and representatives. But I have told them, and I now tell you. The battle lines drawn at the White House gate and the Capitol steps have their beginnings on Main Street of your own hometown.

I have little patience with those who denigrate Congress and dismiss those who oppose the program I have outlined as uncultured persons. Congress, by and large, reflects the will of the people as it is expressed. I believe the people of this Nation do perceive the value of a living culture; they do want to enhance the status of the performing arts—for confirmation I refer you to the great concern recently demonstrated for the Metropolitan Opera. This interest was found in all corners of our land. But this interest, this concern, this appreciation for the talents of the American musician and performing artist must be communicated to Washington.

The job of doing this rests with you people who will soon return to your local organizations. Are you going to report to your membership and exhort them to write their Congressmen and then rest content? You cannot. You must not be satisfied with talk among your own group. Get out and talk to the chamber of commerce in your hometown and explain to them how the arts in America are suffering a slow death. Talk to the Kiwanis and the American Legion and explain to them how good theater, good professional concerts and live performances not only bring tourist dollars to their town but also makes their town a better place in which to live. Talk to the Lions and Elks and the League of Women Voters. Tell them how mechanized music is destroying the training grounds for tomorow's musicians. Explain to them the gross inequities of our present copyright laws.

And to all of them, bring this message. They must tell their Congressmen that they are truly as concerned with America's cultural life as with their material well-being.

The production of wealth is a technique. And we in America have mastered it well. But the use of wealth is an art.

The American musician converts wealth into art. He must be encouraged. He must be supported in his endeavor.

I know it is not easy to sell such a message to audiences that may not perceive the problems as requiring immediate attention. But as a Congressman, as an elected leader in my community, I must do this nearly every week. A major portion of my work must be in educating the people I serve to the problems—national, international, and local—which they face today or will face tomorrow. So, certainly I know that what you must do is hard work. But only you who know the score the musician is forced to play from—only you can see the trends—only you can bring the cause of music and musicians to America's Main Street.

I can promise you that my own efforts in his behalf and in behalf of all of America's artists will continue, on all levels, until they achieve their rightful place in this Nation—a place of honor and reward.

Defeat on the Great Lakes: U.S. Ships, Mines Lose Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the economic progress of our country depends upon the adoption of a realistic policy relating to our national resources.

Important among these are minerals, including iron ore, not only for production of specific goods and materials but also in terms of the jobs and business and industrial activities created for the economy.

Unfortunately, however, the mineral industry in this country, particularly in iron ore—of which we have significant quantities in Wisconsin—is facing especially difficult problems economically.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published a thought-provoking article by Leo J. Hertzel entitled "Defeat on the Great Lakes: U.S. Ships, Mines Lose Out."

Reflecting upon the need for a new look at U.S. policy, both domestic and foreign, affecting this field, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Sept. 16, 1962]

DEFEAT ON THE GREAT LAKES: U.S. SHIPS, MINES LOSE OUT—COMPETITION OF FOREIGN IRON ORE SHUTS DOWN LAKE SUPERIOR AREA PITS WHILE SUBSIDIZED FOREIGN VESSELS CAPTURE GROWING SHARE OF SHIPPING AND AMERICAN LINES FAIL

(By Leo J. Hertzel)

In the second week of August, the mine at Montreal, Wis., largest underground iron ore mine in the Lake Superior area, ceased operation. Six hundred men were put out of work. No effort will be made to prevent flooding in the mine, since it is considered permanently closed. The Montreal mine was opened in 1886, and has provided U.S. furnaces with more than a million tons of ore each year since then. Mining officials say that at least several million tons of rich ore still remain in the mine.

E. W. Sloan, president of the corporation that operated the mine, commented on its closing: "It is with the greatest reluctance that we are forced to this decision. This mine and its employees have been outstanding performers for the iron and steel industry and for the Nation over almost three-quarters of a century, including two great world conflicts * * * [but] a thorough testing of the markets and our research efforts have convinced us that the future is hopeless."

FOREIGN ORE IMPORTS UP

A few days after the closing of the Montreal mine, the Peterson mine in Bessemer, Wis., announce it would lay off 80 employees and close down one shift. About the same time, the American Iron Ore Institute announced that foreign ore imports in 1962 were up more than 60 percent above last year. As the foreign ore imports continue to rise year after year, the once vigorous Lake Superior ore fields are worked less and less.

Along with the cutbacks in production and the closing of mines comes the rapid decline of the U.S. Great Lakes ore fleets. The ships that were the critical link between mines and furnaces during two World Wars are now fast being retired and cut up for scrap. Meantime, the Canadian fleet on the lakes grows rapidly, and present signs indicate that it will eventually control Great Lakes shipping.

Behind the curtailment of mining, the decline of the American fleet, and the rise of the Canadian fleet is a complicated political-economic situation made further difficult by certain technical advancements in the making of steel.

For many years, U.S. ore boats have carried iron ore mined in the rich Lake Superior area from upper lake ports like Superior, Duluth, Two Harbors, and Ashland to lower lake ports like Detroit, Toledo, and South Chicago. Blast furnaces at the lower lake ports, conveniently located near both coal and limestone deposits, turned the ore into pig iron and eventually steel. Upper lake ports have sent down an average of 58 million tons of ore a year for the last 50 years; in 1953 the tonnage reached an incredible 95.5 million tons.

With almost no variation in 50 years, the quality of the ore shipped from the Lake Superior mines has been 52 percent natural iron.

Almost every pound of this ore was shipped on the Great Lakes in U.S. vessels that were built in U.S. shipyards and manned by U.S. crews.

VENEZUELAN SHIPMENTS

The earliest act regulating commerce in our history, passed in 1789, restricts all domestic trade by water between the States to vessels of U.S. registry built and owned by citizens. Thus the Lake Superior ore deposits made jobs for American sailors as well as miners and the shipyard workers who built the long maneuverable ore boats that came to be a trademark of the Great Lakes.

But during the late years of World War II, signs of a decline in the American fleet began to appear. In the first place, a concern for the future of our ore supplies caused American corporations, often with Federal financial aid, to seek sources outside this country that could supply raw ore. It was said that the Great Mesabi was not inexhaustible. Enormous deposits of high quality ore were soon uncovered in Canada, Chile, Venezuela, Africa, and other spots throughout the world.

Today, these foreign sources of ore are beginning to produce at a high level. Venezuelan and Canadian deposits have begun to produce at particularly high rates. In 1957, for example, imports of ore from Venezuela totaled 12 million tons; by 1960 they totaled almost 15 million tons. The rate increases yearly. Canada shipped about 11 million tons in 1960.

Along with the increase of foreign ore to American furnaces came a demand for ore of a higher iron concentration than the 52 percent traditionally maintained by the Lake Superior suppliers. New refining tech-

niques called for a richer blend, and the foreign deposits, particularly those in Canada, Venezuela, and Chile, could deliver it with ease.

To complicate matters still further, the Lake Superior ore delivered at lower lake ports was expensive, because it had by law to travel in ships built and manned by American labor. But ore from Canada, Chile or elsewhere could move in foreign bottoms.

When the St. Lawrence Seaway opened the Great Lakes ports to foreign shipping, when Canadian ore deposits began producing at a high rate, and when South American shipments began arriving at the furnaces in ever-increasing quantities (often via barge shipment on the rivers), the competition began to take its toll of the Lake Superior mining vigor and the U.S. fleet on the lakes. Upper lake ore shipments to U.S. mills declined from 50 percent of the total used in 1954 to 54 percent in 1958 to 47 percent in 1959. With yearly fluctuations, the percentage continues to drop.

In the early 1950's, American fleet owners began scrapping their less economical vessels. According to the Lake Carriers Association, the American fleet tonnage declined 20 percent between 1945 and 1961. The number of American vessels actually sailing, however, was reduced even more sharply, since the smallest vessels were dropped first. One industry survey shows that the number of U.S. lake vessels actually sailing fell from 330 in 1955 to 186 in 1962.

NO NEW U.S. VESSELS

At least 10 U.S. lake fleets have gone out of business altogether since 1955. No new U.S. vessels are now under construction, nor are any planned. At a time when larger hulls are the only economical means of transporting ore, when naval architects talk only of super-supercarriers, the American fleet on the lakes is composed chiefly of old, small, inefficient vessels. This year a Canadian shipping official observed, "The simple fact is that, from a shipping cost point of view, all but a handful of the U.S. lake fleet is today as obsolescent as are the Canadian canallers."

The effects of this decline in domestic ore mining and shipping have been severe in States bordering Lake Superior. Unemployment is widespread among miners, railroadmen, sailors, shipyard workers and all of the service trades that relied on ore and its transportation for economic health. For example, some lake vessels this year sail with four licensed captains aboard. The captain oldest in seniority is master of the vessel; the remaining "bumpback" captains serve as mates.

Two years ago John S. Wilbur, vice president of Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co., summed up the situation: "It looks as though Lake Superior mines producing standard ore may be used as a safety valve with rather low rates of production until a real big year or some emergency comes along."

On the other side of the lakes, the Canadian fleet grows rapidly. Between 1945 and 1961 it expanded 80 percent in numbers and 194 percent in carrying capacity. At this rate of growth the Canadian fleet will soon surpass the U.S. fleet.

The monthly cost of operating a 20,000- to 25,000-ton Canadian ore carrier is about $54,000; cost of operating a similar United States vessel is about $78,000. Labor accounts for a substantial part of the difference. Pay for U.S. crews averages about $8,000 per man, with captains drawing as high as $20,000.

Another factor accelerating the growth of the Canadian fleet is the support it has received from the Canadian Government. Seemingly aware that Canada could now dominate lake commerce, the Canadian Government announced in May of 1961 an assistance program for Dominion shipbuilders. It provides subsidies for 40 percent of construction costs of vessels built or contracted for up to March 31, 1963, and 35 percent thereafter.

U.S. SHIPS TOO COSTLY

In effect, the subsidy means that a Canadian ore carrier can be constructed at a cost to its owner of about $188 per carrying ton, as compared to a cost of about $340 per carrying ton for U.S. owners. Total cost of a 25,000-ton Canadian carrier is now about $4.7 million as compared to $8.5 million for a carrier of like capacity built in the States. In addition to the subsidy, the Canadian Government had done much to stimulate the growth of the fleet.

In view of all this, it is clear why the Lake Carriers Association, in a report to the Secretary of Commerce last year observed: "While not a single Great Lakes vessel is under construction or conversion for a U.S. owner, Canadian owners have six ships with a combined trip capacity of 152,000 tons under construction or conversion. * * * American-flag operators have witnessed their Canadian counterparts grow in stature until newly constructed Canadian vessels now dominate the trade in bulk commodities between the United States and Canada."

Although the demand for a higher grade ore than that mined in the Mesabi is a large factor in the general picture of decline, many Great Lakes management and union officials believe that much could be salvaged for the American ore economy on the lakes if the U.S. fleet could compete successfully with Canadian operators. At worst U.S. vessels could vie with Canadians in the transportation of Canadian ore to U.S. furnaces.

The Lake Carrier Association last year appealed to the Secretary of Commerce for a four-part program that would assist in modernizing the American fleet, a program that would in some way duplicate the advantages now enjoyed by Canadian shippers. In addition to asking for construction subsidies, the lake carriers asked for a faster tax write-off scheduled for vessels, the authority to trade in obsolete ships to the U.S. Government for credit on the cost of building new ones (now done in the case of subsidized ocean shipping lines, with the requirement that the new vessels be built in U.S. yards) and authority to deposit earnings before taxes in a special construction fund.

The appeal was transmitted in part to Congress by a Wisconsin Republican Congressman, ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, who introduced legislation that would provide construction subsidies for the lake vessels. In what was an almost unique case of cooperation, the bill was supported by the Seamen's Union as well as the shipowners. Fred Neubauser, president of the Lake Sailors Union, observed in the union newspaper: "We have no quarrel with our brothers in the Canadian labor movement. We are sure that they recognize that Canadian lake shipping has certain advantages not now shared by American fleets. We in the United States feel justified in seeking similar advantages."

LAID UP SHIPS IN JULY

The Department of Commerce did not look with enthusiasm on O'KONSKI's bill and early in July recommended that Congress not pass it. O'KONSKI then issued a statement accusing the Department of "strangling" the Great Lakes shipping industry and said: "Unless our Nation's leaders wake up, it will be the end of U.S. shipping on the Great Lakes with additional thousands of unemployed because of foreign competition." But O'KONSKI's statement, like his bill, received scant attention. The bill is now considered dead.

In the meantime, some U.S. shippers began laying up their vessels in July this year instead of the usual November. A Federal food stamp program on the iron range feeds people who once earned their keep by mining and shipping ore.

Hard facts indicate a continued growth of Canadian activity and a decline of U.S. importance on the Great Lakes. The vigor and the strength seem to lie to the north.

Comments on Mississippi Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, following are comments on the Mississippi situation by two Washington newspapers, both of which have been friendly to the southern viewpoint on many of these issues:

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 16, 1962]

CRISIS AT "OLE MISS"

If Mississippi's Governor Ross Barnett stands by his guns, it is conceivable that he, as well as other State officials, will wind up serving jail sentences for contempt of court. But we do not see any way in which this can prevent the enrollment, pursuant to Federal court order, of a 29-year-old Negro in the University of Mississippi.

The Governor's defiant stand has been generally applauded in Mississippi, and he may mean it, when he says he would rather go to jail than bow to the court's edict. There is no prospect, however, that the doctrine of interposition, which he has invoked, can serve to halt enforcement of the order. This point has already been settled adversely to the doctrine by the courts. There is only one way to prevent the admission of the Negro to "Ole Miss," and that is to shut down the university. We doubt that even Governor Barnett would want to go to such an extreme.

One Mississippi legislator, Representative FRANK SMITH, has spoken out forthrightly and courageously on this matter. The Governor, he says, "would lead the State down another blind alley. The course he proposes threatens the existence of our great university, whether we like it or not, the question of State versus Federal law was settled 100 years ago."

This comment will not be palatable in Mississippi. But there is no doubt that it is the truth.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 19, 1962]

AN AMERICAN TRAGEDY

"Whether we like it or not, the question of State versus Federal law was settled 100 years ago." That was the comment of Representative FRANK SMITH, the only U.S. legislator from Mississippi to speak out against Gov. Ross Barnett's demand that school officials defy U.S. court orders to admit one Negro student to the University of Mississippi.

"Governor Barnett would lead the State down another blind alley," Representative SMITH said of Governor Barnett's demands that State school officials either resign or pledge themselves to suffer possible jail terms for defying "tyrannical edicts" of the Federal Establishment.

It is an unhappy commentary on political leadership that the only U.S. legislator from Mississippi who had the temerity to speak out had already been defeated for reelection.

Representative SMITH will soon join the board of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Representative SMITH spoke the plain truth. It was decided in a bloody century-old struggle that Federal law must prevail. Decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, including the 1954 school case, are the law of the land. The ruling in the school case has been applied in Mississippi's neighbor States of Tennessee and Arkansas and Louisiana. It will eventually apply in Mississippi.

The tragedy is that the State's political leaders dare tell the people only what they want to hear. Should civil strife result from Governor Barnett's unreasoned stand, a jail term might not suffice to atone for the human misery spawned by fear or failure to face the facts.

The Case of Kelly Versus Disorganized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, our country has become justly alarmed over the crime wave that has been sweeping our Capital city, where recently a congressional secretary was stabbed while praying at noon in a church within the shadow of the Capitol. Just this week another Capitol Hill secretary was viciously attacked within a block of the Capitol.

Many have been attempting to discover where to fix the blame for this vicious condition existing in Washington. The Washington police apparently have been doing a good job. Who is responsible for the breakdown in law enforcement in our Capital City?

An article appearing in the Washington Daily News of September 20, which is attached, apparently gives the answer to the question that is troubling so many:

THE CASE OF KELLY VERSUS DISORGANIZED CRIME

This is the story of how the office of the U.S. attorney here tried very hard to keep a criminal case from coming to court.

And of how it might have succeeded were it not for the stubborn insistence of a citizen named Tom Kelly and the energetic interest of a municipal judge, Thomas C. Scalley, both of whom seem to think it is the business of the U.S. Attorney's Office to prosecute—not to sit listlessly on its hands.

The case involves Tom Kelly intimately. He was the complaining witness.

Mr. Kelly happens to be a reporter for this newspaper, but what happened to him could have happened to almost any adult male in the District of Columbia.

Here is Mr. Kelly's story:

"Last June 30, I was stitting on a step in front of my house near the Capitol cleaning and painting a bike. It was a warm, bright, Saturday evening. My two older children were playing a few feet away. My wife and our youngest daughter, who is 2, had gone to the grocery store some time earlier.

"The time was 7 p.m.

"As I was working, I looked up and saw my wife at the corner, some 40 feet away. Two men, one in his thirties, one in his teens, were standing beside her. The men appeared to be talking to her and she to them. She looked angry and outraged.

"I put down the rag or brush or whatever I was working with and walked over.

"My wife told me one of the men had made an obscene and insulting remark to her—which she repeated to me. She said she had told them I was her husband and suggested that they tell me what they'd said.

"I turned to the younger man and asked: 'What did you say to my wife?'

"The younger man stammered a few words, not very clearly.

"The older man, who, I learned later, was an ex-convict named Andrew Redwood, shouted at me and hit me on the jaw with his right hand. I did not see the blow coming since I was facing the younger man.

"I was still on my feet and I turned toward Redwood. He drew a knife from his pocket, held it out, opened the blade, and dared me to 'come on.'

"I stayed where I was and tried to decide on a cool, logical course of action.

"I told my wife to call the police and then I ran into the house and got an empty shotgun. The gun had been empty for years. Because of the children, I've never kept any shells in the house."

THE CHASE

"When I came out I saw that Redwood and his companion were walking rapidly away. I told my wife that I would follow them and that she was to send the police after us as soon as they came. I was angry but under control.

"I trailed them for a block, keeping them in sight but not getting any closer, before they noticed me. Then they broke into a run. I ran too. I lost sight of the younger man but I followed Redwood to Massachusetts Avenue where he jumped in a cab.

At that moment two policemen drew up beside me in a scout car. I got in and told them what had happened. So we started after the cab and the cab stopped and Redwood jumped out and ran.

"The policemen sounded their siren and drove up beside him.

"As they approached, he tried to get rid of his knife, placing it on the ledge of a mailbox.

"The police got out and took him into custody. They took the knife, too.

"At the ninth precinct, Redwood denied having a knife. He also denied knowing the younger man who'd accompanied him. He admitted having done time for armed robbery.

"Precinct Detective Frank Ford, a courteous and intelligent man, questioned both of us impartially, and told us to appear at municipal court Monday for a hearing at the U.S. attorney's office."

THE FIRST GO-ROUND

"The hearing was held before an assistant U.S. attorney, a very young man. He said that he sympathized with me, but that there was no case against Redwood and that I had better drop the whole thing. Redwood was there, along with his companion of Saturday night.

"As a newspaper reporter for 15 years I have covered hundreds of court trials. I like to think I know a solid case when I see one.

"I pointed out that there were plenty of witnesses and that there could be no question that Redwood had slugged me and threatened me with a knife.

"The young U.S. attorney replied that he could charge me, too, since I had carried the empty shotgun while trailing Redwood.

"I told him to charge me if he wished, but to charge Redwood, too.

"He said, 'You know he helps the police.' My wife said, 'You mean he's an informer?' I said I didn't care what he was. I wanted to swear out a warrant against him.

"The young prosecutor said I'd better talk to Assistant U.S. Attorney William Greenhalgh, the man in charge that day and the second-ranking man in the office.

"So everybody involved went in to see Mr. Greenhalgh.

"I told Mr. Greenhalgh what had happened and I told him there were plenty of witnesses.

"Whereupon Mr. Greenhalgh sent Redwood and his companion out of the room. Then he turned to me.

" 'There is no case,' he said.

"I told him there certainly was a case.

"Mr. Greenhalgh said a jury whose members included Negroes would never convict Redwood since he was a Negro—and particularly since he was an ex-convict who might have to go back to the penitentiary.

"I told him I had a lot more faith in the integrity of Negroes on juries than that. I asked him if he honestly meant that the processes of law had so broken down that a convict out on good time from the penitentiary could pull a knife on a citizen, without provocation, and get away with it?

"I mentioned that, as a newspaper reporter, I was somewhat familiar with the courts. By saying this, of course, I let Mr. Greenhalgh know that I was a newspaperman. I don't know whether he knew this before.

"Mr. Greenhalgh then allowed that, if I insisted, he would permit me to swear out a warrant. But he certainly wasn't saying that Redwood could ever be convicted. I said I expected no guarantee from him, I merely wanted to see the case come to trial.

"So trial was set for August 21."

THE GREAT PREPARATION

"A month before the trial date I found that I would have to be out of town that day and I called the U.S. Attorney's office to ask if they could have the case continued.

"The young man who answered told me I was certainly putting the office to a lot of trouble but he'd see about it.

"I heard no more from him. When the trial date arrived, I was laid up in the hospital.

"On September 1, I called the U.S. Attorney's office again and asked if the case had been continued.

"The young man who answered said it had. It was now set for September 17. I told him that I had not yet received any notice.

"On September 14 I called again. I said I still had not received any notice and neither had any of the witnesses to the incident on the sidewalk.

"The young man said the folder on the case did not list any witnesses who should be notified.

"I asked him if I should bring witnesses with me on September 17.

"He said not to bother. Just come myself. He said if witnesses were needed, they could always get them at the last minute. That was last Friday."

WE GET STARTED

"On Monday, September 17, I was in court, alone, at 10 a.m. I was called as the only listed witness. I stood up.

"Assistant U.S. Attorney Henry Jones, who was to prosecute the case, said we would all go downstairs for a hearing. We went downstairs.

"Prosecutor Jones, obviously, had just been assigned the case. At the hearing, the attorney for Redwood asked for another continuance. The Assistant U.S. Attorney who held this hearing said, 'no.' He said the prosecution was ready to go to trial.

"Then the defense attorney said he wanted me charged too, for carrying the empty shotgun. The hearing examiner said, 'no.' He would not charge me. And he didn't.

"After some haggling, all hands agreed to ask the judge for a continuance to October 2.

"At 1:30 p.m. we were back in court. Judge Thomas C. Scalley was presiding. The

Redwood case was called. Prosecutor Jones asked for the continuance.

"Judge Scalley said, 'No.' He said the U.S. attorney's office should be prepared and the case was going to trial.

"Mr. Jones, obviously upset, asked how he could be expected to prosecute a case he knew nothing about. The trial began nevertheless."

FIRST WITNESS

"A jury of 12 persons, six Negroes and six whites, was chosen. I was called as the first witness. I recounted what had happened that evening in June.

"When I started to repeat what my wife had told me, the defense attorney objected on the grounds of hearsay. I turned to Judge Scalley and told him that, for reasons known only to itself, the U.S. Attorney's Office had failed to call my wife as a witness although she would be glad to testify.

"After I was examined and cross-examined, Judge Scalley called the attorneys to the bench and roasted the U.S. Attorney's Office for not preparing the case properly. (Mr. Jones, let it be clear, had nothing to do with the handling of the case until that every day, thorough his colleagues in the U.S. Attorney's Office certainly had.)

"Judge Scalley then postponed the trial until the next day to allow the calling of needed witnesses.

"I told Mr. Jones I would get them. I got my wife. A neighboring family, which included several witnesses, had moved away and I didn't know where to find them now.

"The next morning my wife and the arresting officers testified. Andrew Redwood and his companion—a 16-year-old boy—testified for the defense.

"Prosecutor Jones made an intelligent and effective closing speech to the jury.

"The jury left and returned within an hour.

"Negroes and whites together, they found that Andrew Redwood was guilty as charged of both simple assault and carrying a dangerous weapon. He will be sentenced soon.

"This was the case that the U.S. Attorney's Office tried so hard to do nothing about.

"If I hadn't gotten angry enough to force the issue, the case obviously would never have come to trial."

How many cases like this are quickly and quietly dropped before they begin?

What's wrong with the U.S. Attorney's Office?

"Is it lazy, incompetent or what"

Pakistan Gets $31 Million U.S. Loan for Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Bender, of Greenwich, Conn., has sent me a very interesting clipping from the New York Herald Tribune. The brief article describes a $31 million loan made September 10 by the United States to Pakistan for the purchase of railway equipment. It is an interest-free, long-term loan.

Now Pakistan is a very good and valuable friend of ours. We have great respect for the people of that country and its President who visited us a short while ago.

Nevertheless, as Mr. Bender points out in his letter to me, while "Our Old New Haven and many railroads are dying on the vine, our own administration is blithely doling out interest-free American cash to help foreign roads."

Admittedly, the New Haven has received many millions in loans guaranteed by the Federal Government, but it does seem odd that a country which balks at solving its own transportation problems is so free to oblige a distant foreign country to accomplish precisely what is needed at home.

The article follows:

PAKISTAN GETS $31 MILLION U.S. LOAN FOR RAILROAD

KARACHI.—Pakistan and the United States have signed a $31 million loan for purchase of railway equipment.

The long-term, interest-free loan was signed September 10 by Osman Ali, Secretary, Economic Affairs Division of the President's Secretariat, and John Heilman, director, U.S. Agency for International Development mission to Pakistan.

The new loan is designed to help modernize Pakistan's railroads. Under its terms Pakistan will purchase U.S. diesel electric locomotives, materials for baggage coaches and freight cars, rails and construction materials for bridge and other engineering works.

The Monroe Doctrine Is Still Alive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, there is probably no issue of more vital importance to our Nation's security today than that of the Soviet Russian encroachment in Cuba. This bold Kremlin aggression is in direct conflict with the Monroe Doctrine, which has been the keystone of U.S. policy since 1823.

Unfortunately, there is altogether too much misunderstanding and fuzzy thinking with respect to the Monroe Doctrine today, as we hear doubts as to its applicability and assertions that it is no longer a living doctrine.

Because of the importance of this subject—the applicability of the Monroe Doctrine in our current crisis—I include at the end of these remarks a very pertinent article, "The Monroe Doctrine Is Still Alive," by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in the August issue of the VFW magazine. This article by General Hittle is extremely timely and I believe it noteworthy to point out that it was written, and appeared prior to the recent landing of Soviet Russian military equipment and technicians in Cuba. Therefore, this article is of the more significance because it does not involve hindsight, but rather is based upon a sound analysis of the Cuban problem and the applicability of the Monroe Doctrine.

This article is another fine example of the sound and constructive approach to national security problems which we have come to expect from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. That organization, comprised of 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans, is an increasingly influential factor in our national security.

I believe that all those who read this article will find it to be highly informative and constructive, sound, and well presented:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MONROE DOCTRINE IS STILL ALIVE

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired)

The Veterans of Foreign Wars was among the first to recognize the deadly seriousness of a Red Cuba. This base of communism, within 90 miles of U.S. shores, creates strategic and political threats without precedent in the hemisphere of the Americas. Castro's public embracing of Marxism-Leninism and his "pledge of allegiance" to the Kremlin removes once and for all any doubts as to the inherent Communist nature of Castro's government.

It was with realization of the dangers of a Castro-controlled Cuba, and with full understanding that Castroism is communism, that the 62d VFW national convention in Miami Beach, Fla., unanimously adopted resolution No. 105, calling for the application of the Monroe Doctrine.

The increasing seriousness of the Cuban situation resulted in Commander in Chief Hansen's decision to include the call for "strict enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine" among the key objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in 1962. This decision by Commander in Chief Hansen was one of the basic recommendations of the joint meeting of the national legislative, national security, and civil defense committees, held in the VFW Memorial Building, Washington, D.C., December 9–10, 1961.

In calling for the application of the Monroe Doctrine the VFW proposes a basic remedy to counteract the penetration of the Caribbean and the Western Hemisphere as a result of Cuba's fall into the Red orbit.

This VFW action is based upon the realization that the Monroe Doctrine, contrary to some fuzzy thinking today, is not dead. It could be a vibrant and potent instrument of U.S. foreign policy and national security. It is a powerful weapon against Communist incursion into this part of the world. Its use awaits only the willingness of our Nation to utilize this historic statement of principle. This is the action the VFW proposes.

Following are some basic facts with respect to the Monroe Doctrine:

It was first proclaimed by President Monroe on December 2, 1823. The principles, referred to as the Monroe Doctrine, were contained in the first two paragraphs of the President's message of that date.

The key passage of the Monroe Doctrine states that the United States "should consider any attempt on the part of foreign powers to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and security." This is clear, concise, and understandable language. It means that this hemisphere cannot be a target for foreign colonization, infiltration, or political control of any kind. Communism is a system in a governmental, political, and ideological sense. The prohibition against a foreign system as was enunciated in the Monroe Doctrine, is today a prohibition against communism.

The doctrine further states that such effort to extend a foreign system, or gaining control of an American nation in any manner, by European powers, is considered "the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

The Monroe Doctrine was designed to protect the Americas from European imperialism and to shelter young nations in their struggle to maintain their independence. And yet there is an aspect, oft forgotten, of the doctrine that bears striking resemblance to the basic situation that confronts the Americas today.

It is frequently overlooked that the first portion of the Monroe Doctrine was pointed squarely at Russian encroachment on the American Continent. At that time Russian imperialism was exerting increasing pressure on the northwest coast of North America. Consequently the genesis of a major portion of the Monroe Doctrine was this Russian intrusion on our shores.

Thus the thread of historical continuity becomes apparent. The Monroe Doctrine is just as applicable today in resisting Soviet Russian encroachment, by proxy or otherwise, in the Caribbean, as it was when implemented by President Monroe in blocking czarist Russian threats to our national security well over a century ago.

The Monroe Doctrine has been a keystone in the defense and foreign policy of the United States. It has been reiterated and amplified by Presidents following Monroe. The doctrine, in essence, places the United States squarely in opposition to any encroachment, direct or indirect, by a non-American nation upon the independence of any nation in the American hemisphere. Clearly, this makes the Monroe Doctrine applicable in the case of a Kremlin-alined Cuba.

The Monroe Doctrine has long been looked upon by authorities in international law as a demonstration of the determination of the United States to take those steps which are necessary for her own defense. Elihu Root, a distinguished lawyer and a great Secretary of War, stated that the Monroe Doctrine was based upon "the right of self-protection and that right is recognized by international law."

It is indeed significant that the Monroe Doctrine was considered so vital following World War I, that the U.S. Senate, in the discussion of the Treaty of Versailles, declared the Monroe Doctrine to be wholly outside the jurisdiction of the League of Nations and entirely unaffected by any provision contained in said treaty of peace with Germany. It was also reserved for the United States to have the sole right to interpret the Monroe Doctrine. Thus, at so relatively recent a time as the end of World War I, the U.S. Senate recognized the Monroe Doctrine as a living, applicable and dominant feature of our national policy.

President Wilson in 1916 said, "The Monroe Doctrine demanded merely that European governments should not attempt to extend their political systems to this side of the Atlantic."

That reflects what the VFW so firmly believes—that the Monroe Doctrine be implemented to prevent the extension of communism to this side of the Atlantic.

The Monroe Doctrine still stands as a principal feature of a U.S. policy of enlightened self-determination. Its application would be thoroughly justifiable in view of international communism's seizure of Cuba through Castro and his bearded henchmen. Under the Monroe Doctrine, a Communist-controlled Cuba, working under the direction of the Kremlin, is certainly, if we use the wording of the doctrine, "the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

A nation, to protect its own independence, freedom and destiny, must take whatever action is necessary to counter an unfriendly act. Thus, under the Monroe Doctrine, the United States would be justified in taking economic, political and even military steps to eradicate this growing threat to the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere.

The increasing oppression of the Communist police state in Cuba, the importation of Communist armament to the end that Cuba today has one of the largest and most modern armed forces in the Western Hemisphere, and the capability of Cuba to be the base for Red submarines and missile launching sites aimed at the United States and the Panama Canal, make the provisions of the Monroe Doctrine more meaningful than perhaps at any time in history.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is strategically realistic, politically perceptive and historically sound in urging the application of the Monroe Doctrine today.

Remarks of U.S. Representative John E. Fogarty, Second Congressional District, of Rhode Island, at the Providence Association of Medical Assistants, Providence, R.I., September 19, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at a meeting of the Association of Medical Assistants in Providence, R.I., on September 19, 1962:

REMARKS OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOHN E. FOGARTY, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND AT THE PROVIDENCE ASSOCIATION OF MEDICAL ASSISTANTS, PROVIDENCE, R.I., SEPTEMBER 19, 1962

There is a special satisfaction in addressing the members of a young organization such as this. And when the spirit, the energy, and the planning of the members are directed toward the twin goals of better medical practice and of educational self-improvement, I feel that we have much in common.

When the people of Rhode Island sent me to Congress in 1941, I went with a determination to serve the people of my State and of this country, but I had no idea at that time that circumstances would enable me to become familiar with the financing of medical research for a healthier America. But I can assure you that since 1949, when I became chairman of the subcommittee of the House of Representatives directly concerned with the levels of Federal programs attacking health and research problems, I have had an extensive and intensive education in these fields. This day-to-day, first-hand education has convinced me that we share enormous but conquerable health problems. Though I have the privilege of participating in health programs that affect every community in the Nation, you are privileged to advance our Nation's health on perhaps the most rewarding level—on a person-to-person basis.

You who work in doctors' offices as medical secretaries and receptionists are brought directly into contact day by day with disease and suffering. Your knowledge of human relations, law and economics in medicine, medical ethics and etiquette is vital to the physicians for whom you work, and even more important to the patients with whom you work. You—and the physician—are, together, in the minds of the patients you see, that concept we call modern medicine.

To do your jobs most effectively you must know medical terminology, some anatomy and physiology, and office management practices. Or, if you specialize in assisting the physician, you have to know examination room techniques, sterilization procedures, and have an orientation to bacteriology and hematology, and to laboratory techniques.

It is, I think, particularly creditable to you that you have organized—here in Rhode Island, and though your national group, in more than 30 States. You have been encouraged in this by the physicians—the American Medical Association has supported the American Association of Medical Assistants, just as the Rhode Island Medical Society has supported your efforts. And I am much in sympathy with your certification plans through medical assistant examinations. I understand that next week, at this year's national convention in Detroit, pilot examinations will be given. Such self-examination is mutually advantageous—it advances the cause of medical practice, because it would enable a physician to more easily select qualified office assistants, and it advances the cause of the members of this group seriously dedicated to the alleviation of the suffering of those among us who are victims of disease.

I have long been impressed with the vital role voluntary associations have played in American life. Groups of citizens get together to achieve something—frequently this is something in the health field, where the authorities—local, county, State or Federal—have failed to act or were powerless to do so. Seldom has an aroused citizenry failed to achieve the action it sought.

Organizing for action is, of course, the story of American politics. Long ago someone said that in no country in the world had the principle of association been more successfully used or applied to more causes than in America. But organizing for causes has served ends other than politics. Your organization, for example, serves to raise the standards of medical practice and is as valid a contribution to health as was the organization of the American Cancer Society in 1913 or the March of Dimes in 1938. The only difference is one of degree.

Let me return to the subject of cancer. In 1937 cancer was generally considered a hopeless disease by the public and by the physicians. Only seven States had cancer control programs and young scientists were hesitant to enter upon research careers investigating this disease. Today, all that is changed.

In 1937, when the Congress passed legislation creating the National Cancer Institute, cancer research was so inadequately supported that even the meager supply of trained manpower could not be utilized. Today research is being conducted on cancer by more than 6,000 scientists, successful treatment is common, and thousands of practicing physicians—as no doubt some of you know—have received postgraduate instructions in the early detection and treatment of cancer and all the States have active cancer control programs.

Twenty-five years ago only 1 in every 7 Americans stricken by cancer was saved; today 1 in every 3 is saved. Twenty-five years ago cancer of the uterus was the leading cause of cancer death among women; today, 60 percent of the 40,000 women who develop uterine cancer are being saved—and almost all deaths from this cause could be prevented if the American woman would take a simple test for the early detection of this type of cancer.

Twenty-five years ago, surgical techniques in the field of cancer hardly existed. Today surgery—combined with newly developed radiation techniques or with some of the

newer chemical compounds—is saving thousands of lives. But this record of progress gives us little cause for complacency. We cannot afford to be complacent in light of the fact that each year there are 500,000 newly diagnosed cases of cancer. We cannot shrug off the fact that half of this number—a quarter of a million people—will die this year of cancer. And, it is even more sobering to consider that 16 in every 100 people born are destined—according to our current rates—to die of some form of cancer.

For these reasons—and others—I introduced legislation which was enacted to make 1962 "Cancer Progress Year." The National Cancer Institute and the American Cancer Society have cooperated in this enterprise which looks both forward and backward—noting progress, noting future needs—and encourages support of cancer research in this country.

I want to emphasize two things, here tonight, in connection with cancer research. I want to point out that the Cancer Act of 1937 was a milestone on the road to man's conquest of disease because for the first time the resources of the Federal Government were brought to focus on a particular disease, and I want to point out that the progress we have seen against this disease is a tribute to both Federal and non-Federal support and effort.

This should never be forgotten. Those in Congress in the late 1930's well remember that the creation of a National Cancer Institute, and the demand for Federal support of its research activities, was urged most strongly by the American Cancer Society and the Women's Field Army of the American Society for the Control of Cancer. There was no stronger support anywhere for Federal assistance in combating cancer than from these most knowledgeable private citizens who were fighting the battle with inadequate support. This cooperation has continued, and will continue, as has been publicly stated by such men as Dr. John R. Heller—former Director of the National Cancer Institute and new president of the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center.

The National Cancer Institute was the first disease-oriented unit of our medical research center at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md. This has now become the greatest medical research center in the world. The Cancer Institute—and the other Institutes set up to concentrate on other diseases—represents a new concept of Federal responsibility for the conduct and support of medical research to supplement the resources of philanthropy, contributions, or commercial enterprise.

This new concept has given this Nation world leadership in medical research. I am proud of having had the great good fortune to be in a position—as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for almost 15 years—to do everything I could to advance this concept. And I am even prouder of the public awareness and spirit that has backed the steady expansion and growth of Federal support in all areas of public health, especially that of research.

And I would like at this point to remark upon one little-appreciated aspect of the Federal growth of support for medical research: the fact that Federal aid, far from stifling private enterprise, actually stimulates local non-Federal activities. For while Federal support of research has grown from $45 million in 1940 to $800 million today, this growth has been paralleled by a remarkable increase in non-Federal expenditures for medical research—from $42 million in 1940 to more than $300 million, today.

Those of us in Congress—responding to the will of the people for a healthier, happier life for each and all of our citizens—can and must make certain that adequate funds are provided to continue to stimulate our progress against the major diseases that still plague us until they are ultimately vanquished.

Through my committee assignments, through a keen personal interest in the need for medical research programs, I have become pretty well acquainted with the health needs of our people and also with the people who do the research and with those who plan and administer our Nation's research programs. I have been privileged to talk with scientists in their laboratories and have discussed their problems and their accomplishments in the hearings before my committee on annual appropriations requests. It is a fascinating glimpse into the future.

Just now an all-out effort is being made to develop vaccines against the widespread respiratory infections—that is, the common cold. This is the largest single disease problem of man—it causes more time lost from work than any other disease, and cost us about $3 billion, last year. Big as the problem is for adults, you who are mothers know that respiratory illnesses are even more pervasive in children, and the first vaccines will be developed to combat the viruses known to cause about 60 percent of the serious respiratory illnesses of hospitalized children.

And while cardiovascular diseases are still the Nation's No. 1 killer, testimony before my committee indicates that more progress has been made in the past decade against heart disease than in all the preceding history of medicine. Damaged heart valves can be replaced; holes in the wall that separates the auricles of the heart can be closed; new anticogulants have been developed to help prevent recurrence of heart attacks.

Many of our research accomplishments are only signposts toward the future—hopeful signposts toward a better world. New drugs have been developed to combat hypertension—no doubt many of your own practitioners are using them—but still hypertension kills more than 100,000 a year and disables some 5 million. We must support more research in this area.

We live in an age of medical miracles beyond that dreamed of by any previous generation of men. Toward the end of the 19th century a great surgeon warned that any of his colleagues who would attempt to repair a wound in the heart could count upon it: he would lose the respect of his colleagues. But medical miracles trip over each other, in our time. An artificial kidney has been developed as a permanent replacement for patients with seriously damaged kidney function, and a handful of men and women are now alive, thanks to this device. This device, by the way, was developed by your and my tax money—appropriated by the Congress and administered by the National Institutes of Health. But the end is not in sight: it costs about $10,000 a year to treat one patient—what is needed is a way to simplify the treatment and reduce its cost, so that many more may live.

Because I am so vitally concerned with Federal support of medical research and so often identified with it, I want to emphasize once more that the Federal Government alone could not, has not, and does not pretend to have singlehandedly produced today's medical miracles. Perhaps the most striking conquest of our generation, that over polio, was a triumph of the people at first hand: the mothers who participated in the March of Dimes raised most of the funds for the research that resulted in the Salk vaccine.

That was a triumph of the people at first hand. What I want to make clear to you here tonight is that the Federal support of research has made possible many triumphs—less heralded than that over polio—at second hand.

Those of you here tonight—and the almost 10,000 members of your national organization—know clearly enough of one contribution you are making to modern medicine. You know that, through the performance of your various duties, you are helping to improve the practice of medicine. But you are making another contribtuion to modern medicine which is as important—perhaps more important, in the long run.

Through your tax dollars you are now supporting more than one-half of the medical research of this country.

These are the funds which it is the responsibility of your Representatives to invest wisely in the health of your children and their children. Your taxes are helping to support the development of better and cheaper artificial kidneys, a better anticoagulant, the eradication of the common cold, cures for the various kinds of cancer. The task cannot be done without those tax dollars; with them, it can, and will be done.

The Federal Government must concern itself with the interrelation of the resources for the desired ends. This means, in modern medicine, three inseparable tasks must be attended to: there must be more medical and medical-support personnel, more and better training for the personnel we need, and more and better physical facilities. Early in this session I introduced into the House bills intended to meet these problems, and my colleague, Mr. HARRIS, of Arkansas, consolidated these measures into one bill, H.R. 4999, now in the House Rules Committee.

This bill proposes a 10-year program designed to alleviate critical shortages of professional health personnel, provides for a 10-year program of matching grants for the construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental, and other public health personnel, and provides a student loan program. I hope that the House Rules Committee will report this bill out, so that this Congress may take action on this worthwhile legislation.

The kind of long-range planning reflected in H.R. 4999 is not to be forthcoming from any local, State, or private agency, but must come from Congress. Such planning is inescapable, if we are to avoid a slowdown in our medical research efforts and a deterioration of our health standards in this country due to a shortage of physicians and other medical support personnel.

I have talked to you at some length about the role of Congress, and of your tax dollars, in support of modern medicine. In summary, let me stress the importance of the conquest of disease—a problem so pressing and of such magnitude that all of us must do everything within our individual capacities to serve in that conquest. Some of us will serve in Congress, some of us will serve as physicians, some of us will serve—as you are serving—as supporting personnel in this great onslaught on disease and suffering. Our collective strength and our eventual success lies in our diversity. The Providence Association of Medical Assistants is to be congratulated for adding the diverse talents and skills represented by its members to the total effort. You are also to be congratulated for the contributions you are making directly to the patients you serve. I am confident that as the association continues to push for and achieve its goals, your contributions to an improvement of health and conquest of disease will be even greater.

District of Columbia Commissioners' Council on Human Relations Assessment of Activities and Developments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, August 8, 1962, was the fourth anniversary of actual operations of the District of Columbia Commissioners' Council on Human Relations. This is the agency established by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to help give meaning and put into effect the nondiscrimination policies and practices of the District of Columbia government.

The Council has accomplished a great deal in its 4 years of operation. The Council has dealt successfully with many problems, which, prior to its establishment, had been largely ignored within the government of the District of Columbia and within the community at large.

I requested, and received, the final report prepared by the Council's first and only executive director to date, Mr. David A. Sawyer, who is now transferring from the District government to become intergroup relations specialist for the newly created Army Materiel Command.

Mr. Sawyer's final report contains an array of accomplishments which clearly demonstrates that the Council—in only 4 years of operation—has taken giant steps toward correcting some of the problems in the District of Columbia caused by discrimination, as well as bringing a greater awareness to the entire community of the public policy of nondiscrimination in the District of Columbia government and in the U.S. Government. Mr. Sawyer's report will undoubtedly greatly assist the District government as it takes additional steps to make Washington, D.C., truly a symbol of democracy for all men and women. I believe his report will also provide useful information to all Members of Congress and all others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His report will also provide renewed hope to all Americans that the task of promoting justice and equality for all persons in the District of Columbia is being handled with vigor and wisdom. Under unanimous consent, I therefore include Mr. Sawyer's report as part of my remarks today:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, THE COMMISSIONERS' COUNCIL ON HUMAN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C., August 8, 1962.

Memorandum to: Members, Commissioners' Council on Human Relations.
From: David A. Sawyer, Executive Director.
Subject: Assessment of Council activities and developments.

Four years ago today the Board of Commissioners appointed seven outstanding community leaders to serve as members of the Commissioners' Council on Human Relations. This was a historic day for the government of the District of Columbia because it marked the first real step taken by the Board of Commissioners toward assuring that there would be compliance with the Board's policies on nondiscrimination in District government and in the use of District-owned facilities and services.

The appointment of these seven outstanding community leaders served to point up further assurances that there would be compliance with the nondiscrimination employment obligation entered into by contractors engaged in work under a District government contract. These appointments also served to mark the first formal recognition by the government of the District of Columbia of its responsibility to engage in a program to encourage, foster, and promote the observance and practice of fair employment policies by persons or firms in the District of Columbia.

Today, August 8, 1962, the fourth anniversary of the actual operations of the Commissioners' Council on Human Relations marks another turning point. For me, it marks the termination of the signal honor and privilege of serving as the Council's first Executive Director. Within 2 days, my services to the government of the District of Columbia will have ended.

As I reflect on the developments of the last 4 years—especially the 3½ years that I have worked with you—I am indeed impressed and proud of the Council. Its members have been devoted and dedicated and have given unstintingly of their talents and time.

I have been blessed, too, with an exceptionally good staff. Whatever impact the Council on Human Relations has made in the community, it has been because of the exceedingly good rapport and relationship the members of the Council and staff and I, personally, have enjoyed together.

It is always good to look back at the foundation on which one builds and examine the structure and determine its soundness for the future. As I look back and think of the many problems and concerns with which the Council has dealt, I believe that the Council may be credited singularly with stimulating an awareness of human relations concerns in the District of Columbia. I believe also that the Council must be credited with the widescale cooperation it has secured in dealing with these problems and concerns.

The efforts and accomplishments of the Council on Human Relations are many and varied. A glance through the minutes of the Council meetings reveals many activities and developments. The following is a capsule of these activities:

1. Nondiscrimination poster issued by the Council for posting on all Government contract sites and by all firms doing business with the District Government.

2. Negro union carpenters referred for employment due to Council intervention with AFL–CIO Civil Rights Department.

3. Negro reinforced rodmen referred by union to variety of Government and non-Government projects.

4. Fire Fighters Union enrolls Negro members.

5. Fire Department corrects grievances of Negro firemen and sets up procedures to assure compliance with the Commissioners' nondiscrimination policy.

6. YMCA admits Negro members in central branch (1960).

7. Woodward School adopts policy to accept Negro students, fall, 1961 (no students available for 1960).

8. Developed human relations training institute for recreation department staff.

9. Resolved complaints of discrimination in various District of Columbia departments.

10. Capital Park Apartments accept Negro tenants.

11. Developed plan for expanded training for minority youth.

12. District Government conducts surveys of Negro personnel (1960 and 1961).

13. Established District of Columbia Conference on Community Relations (40 civic organizations).

14. Conducted inquiry for Commissioners into charges of race bias in urban renewal. Recommended the establishment of community relations service and relocation service.

15. Provides counsel to private firms regarding merit hiring.

16. Convened real estate industry and State Department heads. Secured assurances which will assist the personnel of new nations in matters of housing and other accommodations. Provides counsel to Office of Protocol regarding problems relating to non-white diplomats.

17. Serves as consultant to Cultural Exchange, Foreign Service Institute, and International Cooperation Administration.

18. Served as consultant to the Commission on Human Resources of the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies.

19. Department of Labor agreed to forecast area skill needs for next decade.

20. Counseled publishers as intermediary for community organizations in successful efforts to remove racial designations in newspaper real estate ads.

21. McCloskey Co. hired Negro bricklayer to work on House Office Building and other Federal building sites (resulted from a complaint concerning District of Columbia Stadium).

22. Conducted human relations training at Police Academy.

23. On Council's recommendation: (a) The Commissioners warned contractors to comply with the nondiscrimination contract clause; (b) the Commissioners warned unions to train and accept Negro members on government construction; (c) the Commissioners issued a memorandum on human relations to each employee of the District Government; (d) the Commissioners appealed to private employers to institute merit hiring; (e) the Commissioners appealed to private business training schools to remove racial restrictions in admissions policies (Iota Phi Lambda Sorority complainant).

24. Intermediary for Delta Sigma Theta Sorority and officials of daily newspapers in the matter of removal of racial designations in newspaper employment ads.

25. Intermediary for the Ministerial Alliance, bank officials and recruiting agencies in the matter of merit employment in financial institutions.

26. Intermediary in threats for boycott of Hecht's Department Store, resulting in expanded merit employment and in a commendation from Hecht's Department Store and the complainant organization. Other stores to be included in this group are Hahn's, Lansburgh's, and Woodward & Lothrop.

27. Advised formation of volunteer counseling service to be provided by Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity for high school youth.

28. Prepared pamphlet checklist for careerists as a "guidance tool for high school students."

29. Survey to determine full representation and participation on regulatory agencies by cross section of the community has been completed by the Commissioners and is now being implemented.

30. Desegregation of the District of Columbia Fire Department has now been completed.

31. New orders, which include compliance checks and regulations, have been issued by the Commissioners to assure that there is meaningful compliance with the nondiscrimination clause in government contracts.

32. Publication of a Council pamphlet, "Human Relations in the Nation's Capital," designed to promote an understanding of the purposes of the Commissioners' Council on Human Relations and the methods by

which the Council works to improve human relations in the Nation's Capital.

23. Publication of a pamphlet, "Employer's Handbook on Merit Employment," offering suggestions to private business firms on the recruitment, selection, placement, and promotion of minority workers: (a) Cooperative arrangements with the Merchants & Manufacturers Association for use of this publication in the Merchants & Manufacturers program to guide local business firms in the development of their merit hiring programs; (b) distribution of 18,000 through cooperation arrangements with the District of Columbia Office of the U.S. Employment Service. This distribution reached every employer, large and small, in the entire District of Columbia.

The above list presents an impressive array of accomplishments by the Council. It by no means indicates that the job is done. On the contrary, it indicates that the Council, along with its members and staff, has been able to deal successfully with problems which heretofore had been ignored within the government of the District of Columbia and within the community at large.

It indicates, too, that government—in partnership with leaders of business, labor, and civic interests—has been able to discuss and resolve manifold intergroup relations problems.

This array of accomplishments is a clear demonstration that the Council—in exactly 4 years of operation—has taken a substantial step toward correcting some of the problems in our community caused by discrimination. At the same time, this record of activities indicates that the Council has taken other substantial steps on the ladder of progress as it has made the community aware of the public policy of nondiscrimination of the District of Columbia government and the U.S. Government.

There are still many more steps to be taken by the District government, business firms, and the community at large to make our community truly the symbol of democracy for all men and women.

Washington, D.C., is a showcase city; it is the Capital of our Nation. All of its residents must share equally in the rights and responsibilities of our democracy.

I am delighted that the continued concerns of the Council include the expansion and improvement of on-the-job and apprenticeship training opportunities in the skilled trades for young people of all races, backgrounds, and creeds. This is an area of activity on which hangs the future of our youth, and it can never be treated lightly.

It is regrettable that the Apprenticeship Council of the District of Columbia has, until very recently, deliberately excluded or ignored this vital community need. It is heartening that the Board of Commissioners, in recent months has assumed a responsibility in this field and has become concerned about those who administer the apprenticeship program on behalf of the government of the District of Columbia and the Department of Labor.

One of the easiest approaches to the end of racial restrictions in the building trade craft apprenticeships may be found within the varied facilities of the District of Columbia government. It is here that we find craftsmen and apprentices possessing abilities in almost every building trade craft. Unfortunately, the apprenticeship selection process within the District of Columbia government has been backward and reflects discriminatory patterns in the trade at large.

Within the last several months, we have noted the strengthening of the nondiscrimination clause which appears in all contracts awarded by the District government. The order of the Board of Commissioners and the rules and regulations for carrying on this program are as clear and as forceful as the program engaged in by the Federal Government as it seeks to implement President Kennedy's Executive order No. 10925.

I believe, that it is incumbent upon the Board of Commissioners to make it known to the contracting officers that the staff and members of the Commissioner's Council on Human Relations are available to them for counsel and assistance in all matters relating to compliance with the Commissioners' non-discrimination policies and orders. The Board of Commissioners must point out to all persons administering and supervising contracts that the council is an arm of the Commissioners and it is to be used in cases dealing with discrimination in the very same manner that the Corporation Counsel is called upon for advice on legal matters, or the manner in which the Department of Public Health is called upon for its specialization.

There has been marked improvement in the hiring and promotion practices within the various departments of the District government. The plan of the Board of Commissioners to appoint a fair employment officer in each department will enable the District government to move forward in its program of merit hiring and promotion and, at the same time, the plan will relieve many misunderstandings and misapprehensions.

The Council on Human Relations has been privileged, in the last several weeks, to experiment with this program in one department. Within the last few days, I have reported the success of this experiment to Commissioner Duncan. It is important in this activity to again point out the need for the Board of Commissioners to direct those persons who serve under them to utilize the Council in an advisory and consultative capacity.

In every instance in which the Council on Human Relations has been privileged to give counsel to other departments, the results have been successful.

The Superintendent of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia has had to cope with manifold problems in human relations. His task has not been an easy one. It has been a privilege, therefore, to have assisted the school officials in their assessment of human relations concerns, in their recognition of a need for human relations programs, and in the development of plans for manifold, long-range school-community relations programs.

We have surveyed successful human relations programs in other city school systems, and we recommended the adoption of similar programs for our public schools. We feel that it is incumbent upon the Council on Human Relations to continue to serve the school officials as they seek to develop positive human relations training programs for administrators, teachers, pupils, and parents.

Over this past weekend, the Police Department announced the first step in the implementation of a program dealing with police-community relations. This is a matter of vital concern to all who reside in this community. The knowledge that the Police Department will utilize its skills and training in an area of community relations is a matter of personal pride to each member of the Council and its staff.

Police work, at best, is not an easy job. Without a positive police-community relations program, the task has been most difficult. This void has produced many misunderstandings and many unfortunate grievances. I hope that the Police Department will continue to utilize the good offices of the Council on Human Relations, and that together they may be able to develop the best techniques and training programs in this important field of police-community relations.

The hearings on housing discrimination, conducted by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, brought forth much testimony, many ideas and suggestions. Among these was the lawyers' survey which suggested that the Board of Commissioners had the authority to develop a program designed to relieve the abuses of discrimination because of race, color, and religion. The Board of Commissioners has requested a ruling on this point from the Corporation Counsel in order to determine whether the Commissioners, in fact, have such authority under the police, licensing, and zoning regulations. It is imperative that the Board of Commissioners urge that such an opinion be written and released immediately to the Commissioners.

The Commissioners' Council on Human Relations has sought to correct injustices caused by racial and religious discrimination. It has done this through negotiation and persuasion. The Council has been an effective mediator in scores and scores of situations.

It is not mere coincidence that the Council has received accolades from many business firm executives, labor leaders, private agency heads, Members of Congress, the Vice President of this administration and his predecessor, and the President himself.

To have been a part of the machinery of the District of Columbia government which has made this recognition possible is a matter of personal pride to me. I am sure that each of you share in this pride.

It is to the credit of all who live and work in the District of Columbia—those in government and those in private business—that the members of the Council on Human Relations had the foresight in the fall of 1958 to seek and secure a grant from the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation which permitted the professional staffing of the Council. This grant also permitted the operation and activities of the Council to get underway. It was possible to begin work immediately and to establish a record of achievement which made it possible, within a few months, for the Council to request that the Board of Commissioners include the Council in the Budget of the District of Columbia government.

Congress has not been generous, but it has made allotments since the beginning of the fiscal year of 1961. The initial appropriations permitted funds for the Executive Director, Assistant Director, and Secretary. These are now to be augmented by funds for program and activities. In my judgment, the assumption of the financial responsibilities for carrying on the operations of a government activity is among the most important achievements of the Council.

Without the backing of the Council members, and without the devoted and loyal staff with whom I have worked, very little of the rewards of the past 3½ years would have come my way. For all of this I am indeed grateful.

Robert Kennedy on Purchasing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Members of Congress will recall the great deal of fanfare that accompanied the Department of Justice launching of its study of identical bidding for Government contracts. The implication was that identical bidding had become a nefarious and venal process in American industry.

The Justice Department's final report on identical bidding has now been made,

Mr. Speaker, but for one reason or another, the report has seemingly received little publicity, much less the fanfare of its launching. Perhaps the reason for this is that it has turned out that the hullabaloo that was previously raised over identical bidding was unwarranted.

The September 10, 1962, issue of Purchasing, a news magazine for industrial buyers, contains an enlightening editorial on the subject, as follows:

ROBERT KENNEDY ON PURCHASING

(By Paul V. Farrell)

Attorney General Robert Kennedy eagerly awaited report on identical bidding for Government contracts has turned out to be a very mild bit of lid lifting after all.

"It appears," reports Mr. Kennedy, "that identical bidding in Federal, State, and local procurement is somewhat less pervasive than it was believed to be." Since the Justice Department began its investigation in April 1961, following the electrical industry price-fixing scandal, it has found that identical bidding was a factor in only 1 percent of public procurement.

And, says Mr. Kennedy, "the listing of the names of the firms involved does not imply that they have engaged in collusive bidding."

The report will undoubtedly disappoint those who believe big business in the United States is just one huge conspiracy to defraud the consumer.

It will relieve those who believe (or at least publicly claim) that competition in American industry is as pure as the driven snow and that Government is the enemy of business.

It will interest, but not surprise, those who understand that the pricing process in industry is a very complicated affair, and not simply a matter of the good guys versus the bad guys.

"There are a number of reasons for the phenomenon of identical bids," Mr. Kennedy says. And the report analyzes them in terms that should be familiar to the readers of this magazine.

The most fascinating thing about the report for industrial purchasing agents, however, is the indirect tribute it pays to the kind of heads-up buying they have been doing for years.

"Identical bidding may even be encouraged by unsophisticated procurement procedures and policies of public agencies which advertise for bids," Mr. Kennedy states. And the report goes on to recommend a few methods for improving public buying: using transportation charges as a lever to get lower prices; putting pressure on other identical bidders by giving all the business to one; and—lo and behold—using negotiation after rejecting all identical bids.

This kind of official endorsement for progressive purchasing techniques should be satisfying and encouraging to industrial procurement executives. And coming from the present Attorney General it is most encouraging.

In addition to the foregoing editorial, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD, an article which appears in the same issue of Purchasing, entitled "Identical Bid Problem Gets Second Look," by A. N. Wecksler, Washington editor for Conover-Mast Publications, publishers of the magazine.

The article follows:

IDENTICAL BID PROBLEM GETS SECOND LOOK

(By A. N. Wecksler)

After considerable prodding by Congress, the Department of Justice issued its first report on identical bidding in public procurement, and offered the conclusion that the practice was less frequent than had been thought, but that identical bidding is "nonetheless a significant problem in about 10 product areas."

The report covers roughly a 6-month period and represents a canvass of Government procurement agencies—plus 2,000 State and local agencies.

Using rough statistical projections, the Department of Justice estimates that possibly 1 percent of Government procurements by advertised bids might involve identical bids—also that firms that submitted identical bids did not necessarily engage in collusive bidding.

As to the causes of submission of identical bids, the Justice Department says there are diverse factors—among them "unsophisticated procurement policies and procedures which tend to induce and perpetuate it." Collusive agreements are also cited as leading to identical bids.

BID PROBLEM IN 10 AREAS

While identical bidding as a total factor in Government buying is not as large as the Department of Justice originally suspected, it is a problem in 10 broad product categories.

There were 83 identical bids reported in road construction material contracts; 47 in chemicals; lumber, 35; textiles, 22; compressed and liquified gases, 17; stationery, 17; iron and steel plate, 16; pipes and tubes, 15; paint and related products, 14, and electrical testing instruments, 13.

In dollar amounts identical bids in textiles led with $13,100,000, followed by fruits and vegetables, $4 million; liquid propellants and fuels, $3.5 million; fuel oils, $3.3 million, and tires and tubes, $2 million.

JUSTICE PRESENTS SOLUTIONS

None of these figures wararnt all the hullabaloo that has been raised over identical bidding, but the Department of Justice report goes on to suggest methods to discourage identical bids:

"1. When identical bids include delivery costs, contracts should be awarded to the identical bidder farthest from the delivery point.

"2. When bids remain identical on successive procurements, continue to award bids to the same bidder.

"3. Empower procurement officers to reject all identical bids and utilize negotiated procurement."

Hon. Fred Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an editorial appearing in the St. Cloud Times, St. Cloud, Minn., Monday, September 17, 1962, concerning the services of our friend FRED MARSHALL, which is well deserved.

Mr. Speaker, seldom have I known a person who possessed the fine qualities of FRED MARSHALL. Strong in his opinions, courageous in his stand on issues, he possesses such a sense of fairness which is so evident, that those who may have differed with him at times are among his best friends and admirers.

Personally there have been few places where we have differed. We worked together for years on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. Here his knowledge, his devotion contributed greatly to the welfare of the people of the Nation.

A trained farmer himself, he not only served well on the subcommittee but elsewhere. In the words of an outstanding lawyer, who is chairman of another subcommittee on which he served, said of FRED MARSHALL, "He truly can reach the meat in the coconut. His questions are direct, to the point and when he finishes, he has proved something."

Mr. Speaker, this House will miss FRED MARSHALL, but his work here will have lasting benefit. Truly he has set a high standard for his successor.

The editorial follows:

EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

(By Harold Schoelkopf)

You may have read the article published a few days ago about Representative FRED MARSHALL preparing to close his office in Washington. His 14 years as our Sixth District Congressman will come to an end at the close of the year.

Since 1948 when he made political history by unseating the veteran Harold Knutson who had served 32 years, he has represented the district with a considerable degree of ability and understanding. We have known him well these 14 years, and while we have not always seen eye to eye with him on public issues, we have respected his judgment.

While elected as a Democrat, FRED MARSHALL was a conservative Democrat, more and more so, in fact as the years went by, and he had the courage to oppose many of the measures directed toward furthering the socialistic welfare state. He could not be bluffed or bullied when his mind was made up.

He was an able campaigner as witness his seven successive terms in office, and there is little doubt he could have been elected again this year in the new Sixth District had he chosen to be a candidate. And he campaigned without malice. We never heard him say a word against an opponent either on the platform or in his literature. His job was to sell FRED MARSHALL to the voters and he did a good job, too.

As he prepares to clear out his desk and close his office door in a few months, we feel it must be rewarding to him to know he has done his work well in Washington, and that in his almost 14 years his record has never been under fire and his integrity has never been questioned.

FRED MARSHALL stands tall and straight among his associates and friends. May his successor do as well.

Toward European Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at a time when the Soviet Union is successfully setting up stooges in the Western Hemisphere, it is imperative that the free Western nations present an undivided face to Khrushchev's colonialist endeavors. A companion necessity to a cooperating Western Hemisphere is a unified Europe. The Common Market, President de Gaulle's visit to Germany a short while ago, Chancellor Adenauer's trip to France, the nearing entry of Brit-

ain in the Common Market—all these recent events reveal an inexorable trend toward the strengthening of European solidarity. One wishes the best of luck to all those who are untiringly working for a Europe free and united.

Such an achievement will be no easy matter. The different views held by political leaders as to the role of their countries, differences in the economic structures of various countries, differences in tradition and temperament—these are only a few of the general obstacles which the builders of a united Europe must surmount. Yet these differences are not insurmountable. Perhaps the best proof of this is the historically amazing cooperation between the members of the Common Market in general, and the close relationship between France and Germany in particular. The number of events pointing toward at least a partial solution to common European problems is increasing daily.

Two excellent articles in the Sunday New York Times, September 16 issue, present the problems faced by the individual and groups working toward this truly constructive goal. The first article, by Mr. Robert C. Doty, deals with the political obstacles to unity. The second, by Mr. Seth S. King, discusses the economic problems.

I ask unanimous consent that these two perceptive articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPEAN UNITY: THE DIFFERENT POLITICAL GOALS—THE CONCEPT HAS GAINED WIDE ACCEPTANCE BUT THE DEBATE MOUNTS OVER THE DEGREE OF UNITY AND WHICH NATIONS IT SHOULD EMBRACE

(By Robert C. Doty)

PARIS, September 15.—The underlying purposes of the European economic groupings—notably the Common Market—and the underlying problems of British membership revolve around the idea of political unity.

Over the last 15 years, that idea has become one that no one with a claim to political respectability in Europe can openly oppose. But seldom before now have the questions of what kind and how much unity and with whom and for what ultimate purpose been the subject of more intense and sometimes acrimonious debate.

The recent public triumphs and private consultations by President de Gaulle in West Germany have served to fuel the debate with suggestions, denied by the principals, of some sort of French-German unity as a basis for further growth.

Fundamentally, the drive for unity, in all of its varieties, stems from a growing realization among politicians and ordinary citizens of this Continent that, divided, Europe cannot pull anything like its proper weight—diplomatically, economically or militarily. United, 150 million to 300 million (depending on the ultimate size of the European unit) of the best educated, most creative and skillful people in the world, living in a rich, temperate zone area, could hardly fail to become a power to the measure of the 20th century.

DE GAULLE'S IMPACT

Until the reappearance of General de Gaulle on the European political scene 4 years ago, the orthodox Europeans were confident that political unity would flow naturally out of economic integration and would follow roughly the same pattern. This would involve supernational control, producing a real federation to which individual members states would yield a substantial degree of sovereignty.

This was the concept created and put into operation by the first generation of "makers of Europe"—Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman of France, the late Alcide De Gasperi of Italy, Konrad Adenauer of West Germany, Paul-Henri Spaak of Belgium.

But General de Gaulle, with his strong views on the national idea as the continuing motor force for anything worthwhile, made his own tardy conversion to the unity idea in the form of proposals for a loose confederation of sovereign states. It was Utopian, he held, to imagine that nations were ready to yield to a denationalized central body the same degree of control in such sensitive fields as diplomacy and military affairs as they had sacrificed in the fields of economy and trade.

The best that could be hoped for the present and for a long time to come, according to the De Gaullist theory, was that by regular, organized consultations at all levels from chief of state down, the members would achieve a pattern of agreement by unanimous consent that would eventually produce something like a common European will in an ever-widening range of affairs.

FIRST-STEP STRATEGY

Whether or not it is true in theory that sacrifice of political sovereignty is unattainable, it is certainly true in practice so long as General de Gaulle is France and France is the keystone to any kind of unity in Europe. Therefore, although such profoundly orthodox Europeans as Mr. Spaak are fighting a rear-guard action in defense of the more ambitious theory, others, notably Dr. Adenauer, have accepted the Gaullist first step, and it seems likely that Europe will first take form as a confederation.

However, when Britain, more than a year ago, knocked at Europe's door for admission to the Common Market, she profoundly modified the terms of the political debate among Europeans and the prospects for the ultimate shape of Europe.

Britons were obviously even less ready than the continental peoples to sacrifice political sovereignty. This should have made of them the natural allies of General de Gaulle, the natural enemies of Spaak and the orthodox Europeans. But for a series of complicated reasons, avowed and unavowed, the reverse was true.

All were agreed that, as Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville of France once put it, Europe with Britain would be a very different thing, perhaps more impressive and in the long run more powerful, but also looser and less homogeneous than the grouping the continentals had foreseen.

No one but Chancellor Adenauer has been blunt enough to cast doubt on the desirability of British participation in the political community as well as the economic one. But it is apparent to all that the French President shares that view.

General de Gaulle sees the future Europe as an independent power center radiating influence—cultural, diplomatic, economic, even, if need be, military—on the rest of the world. To him, Britain with her special links, constitutional or sentimental, with the Commonwealth and with the United States, links she is obviously unprepared to modify, would be more likely to serve as a transmission belt for world influence on Europe than for European influence on the world.

In plain terms, never voiced so plainly here, General de Gaulle sees Britain as a Trojan horse for Washington influence in the New Europe. His will to reject that influence is not indicative of a will to switch alliances in the cold war or to reject, out of hand, President Kennedy's grand design for interdependence between the Old World and the New.

BIG-POWER CONCEPT

It does mean, however, that if Europe, ultimately, is to enter some sort of larger Atlantic community, formal or informal, General de Gaulle and an increasing number of other Europeans want it to be not as half a dozen Rhode Islands but as a New York or California. In other words, the Europeans of this school want to consolidate their own unity before risking it in a larger community.

But for Mr. Spaak and other orthodox Europeans, Britain's bid for membership posed an intellectual dilemma. On the one hand, it virtually ended prospects for the sort of tight federal European union they had always urged. On the other, it offered the smaller countries of the Continent a tempting counterweight to the threat of French-German domination of the smaller grouping.

WEST GERMAN ROLE

They have resolved the dilemma by temporizing until the question of British membership is finally resolved. If Britain is to be in the eventual political community, they say, she should have a hand in shaping it, even if on loose terms of collaboration, rather than being confronted with a de Gaulle-Adenauer accomplished fact. If Britian is not to come in, the argument runs, then there is no reason why the New Europe of the Six should not be built on supernational lines.

The other focus of interest and some suspicion in the debate on Europe is the role of West Germany, present and future.

One factor is the obvious incompatibility of Germany's two current aspirations—integration into a Western European community and reunification with East Germany. They are incompatible because no one can currently foresee the Russians accepting any form of reunification that would involve the assumption by a united Germany of the political, economic, and military commitments—to political Europe, Common Market and Atlantic Alliance—that West Germany has accepted. This raises the question as to which would exercise the stronger pull in the future, present ties or an eventual opportunity to reunite involving sacrifice of those ties.

GERMAN PRESSURES

The second question is whether the developing French-German association—presented by General de Gaulle and Dr. Adenauer as a nonexclusive practical nucleus for the growth of political Europe—will serve to restrain or ultimately to encourage possible German adventures to recover unity with East Germany and the amputated eastern territories.

So long as General de Gaulle is in power here, France is likely to be the dominant—and restraining—partner. But some observers foresee a time when France and any other adherents to a loose confederation might be swept along dangerous paths by a strong irredentist Germany. It is for this reason that they would welcome a large infusion of sober British and Scandinavian political influence in the future Europe.

U.S. economic aid in the postwar period made European recovery possible and was purposefully administered in such a way as to encourage both economic and political union. Today, the Gaullist concept of Europe arouses some concern in official U.S. circles for the reasons outlined above.

PROSPERITY AHEAD

But, on the economic front, most economists still believe that Common Market Europe, even within a common tariff wall favoring trade within it to trade across it, would be so increasingly prosperous that it would continue to be a source of thriving two-way trade with the United States.

And politically, at least in terms of alinements in the cold war, these same observers cannot easily imagine a powerful, united, and independent Europe exercising its independence in ways inimical to basic U.S. and Western interests.

EUROPEAN UNITY: ECONOMIC PROBLEMS—BRITAIN MEETS STRONG OPPOSITION OVER JOINING SIX FROM COMMONWEALTH WHICH FEARS TRADE SETBACKS

(By Seth S. King)

LONDON, September 15.—Britain is the mother country of the Commonwealth and this year she has 14 youngsters, all different in makeup, outlook, and age, in her loosely arranged household.

Last Monday Prime Minister Macmillan, as leader of the mother country, opened the family's annual gathering with an eloquent explanation of why Britain must rearrange the apron strings.

In one of those apocalyptic speeches, of which he is so fond, he unfolded his version of an expanded European Economic Community, with Britain as a member, becoming a unit rivaling the United States and the Soviet Union. He reminded the family that Britain's greatest economic service to the Commonwealth was in the growing market she offered and the capital she could provide to stimulate growth.

Britain can increase these efforts, he said, only if she can increase her wealth.

Britain's chances of doing this, he told them, are far better inside the Common Market than outside.

POLITICAL UNION

The Prime Minister recalled that neither Britain nor the rest of the Commonwealth could remain isolated from Western Europe. It would be to the members' advantage, he declared, if Britain could participate, as a member, in shaping the political union that is certain to evolve from the economic union.

When the Prime Minister finished, Edward Heath, the Lord Privy Seal, gave a sweeping review of what he had accomplished in his painful negotiations with the six members of the Common Market on economic safeguards for the Commonwealth. He also recounted what remained to be done at Brussels to secure further protection.

These matters had been explained in detail to each Commonwealth leader long before he came to London. Mr. Macmillan's Olympian words were to be the cement binding them together.

However, one after another the heads of Commonwealth governments or their representatives stood up at the huge conference table in Marlborough House and registered his doubts.

The British had not expected the Prime Ministers to endorse the idea of membership outright for there are still too many questions to be answered in Brussels, but Mr. Macmillan had hoped that the Commonwealth would at least indicate that there was a case for Britain's entry provided more safeguards could somehow be found.

The British were also aware that the leaders of Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, in particular, had political problems at home. The British were prepared for the old dominions to talk tough for local consumption; what they were not ready for was the casual way in which many Commonwealth leaders brushed aside what had been accomplished in Brussels.

The Prime Ministers of the old dominions and those of India and Pakistan were particularly critical of the vagueness of the agreements in principle already reached.

Prime Minister Robert Gordon Menzies, who leads Australia with a 1-vote majority, summed up this reaction by asking if Britain expected the Commonwealth to "sign a blank check" for a step whose full effects were so unpredictable.

Even more disappointing for the British was the African members' abrupt rejection of the offer of association with the Common Market. This was something British negotiators had worked nearly a year to secure.

Under the association plan, African and Caribbean members, like the former French colonies in Africa, would be able to sell their tropical products duty free to the Common Market. At the same time, they would be able to impose tariffs to protect their infant industries from Common Market competition. The African leaders professed to see in this the danger of continued political dominance by Europe. Ghana, in fact, curtly labeled the idea an imperialist plot.

BIG TASK AHEAD

After skimming off all the parts that seemed purely for home consumption, it was apparent to the British that a great deal of laborious persuasion was still needed. What makes this difficult is that so many of the Brussels agreements are only on broad principles.

The political future is even more obscure. The Six have not settled what they want; neither have they decided exactly how the common agricultural policy will work. until they do, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, in particular, cannot be sure of the chances their wheat, beef, butter, and mutton would have in an enlarged Common Market.

Britain has thus been asking the Commonwealth to put its trust in her, and so far the 14 widely varied independent members have not been willing to agree.

As the conference ended its first week, the British believed they had made it quite clear to the Commonwealth that Mr. Macmillan was determined to take Britain into the European bloc unless he was prevented by his own Parliament and people from doing so.

British Ministers, who since Thursday have been meeting in groups with the Commonwealth Ministers, have emphasized that Britain has no intention of going back to Brussels to change the agreements already reached. They have also been explaining just how far they can expect to get on the unresolved questions when they return to Brussels early in October.

From these explanations they hope to convince the Commonwealth leaders to announce, at the least, that they acknowledge Britain's need to enter the Common Market and that somehow the Commonwealth will be held together if she does.

The sessions of the Commonwealth leaders are closed but a great deal of what has taken place has been made public. On the basis of this the British are stiffening their backs and looking for the good rather than the bad.

"We do know that after they list their own fears and requirements, they say they still want a strong Britain at the center of the Commonwealth," a British official said.

NO ALTERNATIVE

"None of them has, so far, come up with an alternative to the Common Market," the official added. "Most of them are aware that the Commonwealth is changing and that we cannot stand still. This, we believe, is in our favor."

The Commonwealth does not make decisions as a group. No votes are registered at conferences and no resolutions are passed. When this conference ends Tuesday or Wednesday, there may be nothing more solid than a vaguely worded communique.

Prime Minister Macmillan will have to take this and send Mr. Heath back to Brussels for further battle. It is also possible that some individual Commonwealth members may want to talk with Common Market ministers.

When all this is ended, Mr. Macmillan will have a better idea of what chance he has to persuade a large segment of his own party, plus parts of the Labor Party, that the Commonwealth can be held together if his dream of joining the European community is realized.

What Do We Fear? Why Our Inferiority Complex?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Cuban problem is uppermost in our minds at this time, it seems to me that the remarks of Capt. J. H. Morse, U.S. Navy, retired, are worthy of our attention.

This speech by Captain Morse made before the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco on August 31, is as follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Commonwealth, Sept. 17, 1962]

WHAT DO WE FEAR? WHY OUR INFERIORITY COMPLEX? FORMER U.S. SECURITY COUNCIL ADVISER LAYS IT ON THE LINE—FACTS ABOUT MR. K.'S POWER—AND OURS

(By Capt. J. H. Morse, U.S. Navy, retired)

Should we fear the Soviets?

The recent Soviet feat of putting two astronauts tandem into orbit seems to add substance to these warnings which come from every side, from governmental advisers, from fearful allies and from most of the neutrals, urging that we compromise on almost every occasion.

Has U.S. power and national determination sunk so low that we must now violate our principles as to how one deals with a bully—principles instinctive with most Americans? Has the nuclear weapon changed human nature so drastically as to outmode the lesson that England had to relearn through Munich?

Perhaps we heard a clear answer to such questions more than 30 years ago, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt's first act was to declare a 3-day closing of all banks and in a fireside chat declared "We have nothing to fear except fear itself."

The effect of that message was dramatic: bank runs stopped; people took hold of themselves; the country started back on the long pull toward eventual prosperity.

Perhaps similar conditions prevail today except that the danger seems to threaten from outside rather than from within.

What happens to a man's judgment if he is fearful? Is he clearheaded? Does he assess facts realistically? Is he not more likely to resort to wishful thinking; to avoid problems by trying to deny their reality or gravity? To compromise, or to hope things are not so bad as they seem; or to assume they will go away? Is his a healthy frame of mind, likely to achieve success? Obviously not.

Where is his initiative?

Military leaders know this problem as morale. They know that without morale no army can possibly win; that one of the greatest enemies of morale is fear and uncertainty; doubt about what the enemy can and will do; and whether or not his side can win.

People in masses must believe in themselves—in the rightness of their cause and in their strength even to survive.

Khrushchev knows this and is keenly aware how much it will aid Soviet objectives if he can sow fear and uncertainty

worldwide—particularly inside America, his greatest obstacle.

Brice Harlow, formerly an assistant to President Eisenhower has listed a few facts which reflect Russia's weaknesses. He says: "In order to enjoy the glories of the present Soviet system, we would have to abandon three-fifths of our steel capacity, two-thirds of our petroleum capacity, 95 percent of our electric motor output, destroy 2 of every 3 of our hydroelectric plants, and get along on a tenth of our present volume of natural gas. We would have to rip up 14 of every 15 miles of our paved highways, and 2 of every 3 miles of our mainline railroad tracks. We'd sink 8 of every 9 ocean-going ships, scrap 19 of every 20 cars and trucks, and shrink our civilian fleet to a shadow of its present size. We would cout our living standards by three-fourths, destroy 40 million TV sets, 9 of every 10 telephones, and 7 of every 10 houses; and then we would have to put 60 million of our people back on the farm. It is plain to see that we have a lot of work to do if we catch up with the Soviets."

But some people ask, what about the Soviet rate of growth which is faster than ours; is the basis of Khrushchev boasts that they will pass us soon?

Walter Heller, Chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers answers: "The Soviet gross national product is less than half that of the United States—exactly the same relationship as existed in the pre-Communist Russia of czarist days in 1913."

In other words, no change in relative position for almost 50 years, so far as economic productivity is concerned. When we hear people say that we must "win the economic contest" with the Soviets it might be well to ask, "What contest?" We won economically more than 50 years ago.

What about our relative military strength? Before the last presidential election we heard a great deal about the missile gap. After election there was less yap about the gap—and within a few months we heard we had a missile surplus; obviously the most stupendous production feat ever accomplished by American industry in the space of a few short months. Yet no one boasts about it today. Why? Are we ashamed?

The July Reader's Digest contains an article entitled, "We Can Bury You, Mr. K." In it Bob Considine surveys Western military strength after having been welcomed and given information at every military base he visited.

He says: "The collective might defies description, and makes almost ludicrous Khrushchev's boasts and threats." Some of his statistics are: "60 H-bombs of megaton size on Thor missiles in England, ready to go with 75 percent of Soviet cities larger than 100,000 population within their range; 30 more such weapons in Italy; the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean with carriers loaded with nuclear weapons for delivery by supersonic aircraft; 6 Polaris submarines assigned to NATO, cruising with 30 megatons each from the North Pole to the Persian Gulf; additional U.S. Polaris submarines similarly equipped; 99 intercontinental ballistic missiles with megaton warheads in the United States and more to come; the Strategic Command with its air-launched Skybolt nuclear missiles; 630 B-52 bombers; 55 supersonic B-58's; 1,000 B-47's.

"Secretary of Defense McNamara has still further emphasized our military power. Probably Mr. Khrushchev reads Mr. McNamara's speeches, or has someone do it for him. If not, he still has access to what may be the most efficient spy and infiltrater system ever devised. It is, therefore, highly probably that he knows better than anyone in this room how strong we are. Certainly he knows better than anyone in this country how strong or weak he is."

Does this mean we should be complacent or arrogant? Of course not. But perhaps, as the Reader's Digest says, we should realize that Khrushchev will do his utmost to avoid a nuclear war; and the West is in a position to negotiate from strength, not weakness. We do not have to compromise anywhere, and the risks involved if we should refuse to compromise are much less than many people would have us believe.

But can we hold our relative lead? Scientific competence may hold the answer. Certainly, where the Soviets concentrate their scientific efforts, results are good—as good or better than ours in some cases.

MAY BE DECISIVE

Both nuclear weapons and space are fields representing national power and have terrific propaganda aspects. Either or both may well be decisive in weapon development—although this country still seems to believe that space will be used for peaceful purposes only—that we can thus solve in space the problems we have failed to solve on earth.

Because they put high priority on weapons and space and started early, the Soviets may be ahead of us in both. But that does not necessarily mean Soviet science is better than ours. The Soviets started intensive efforts with a lead of several years and with clear objectives. That alone would account for their being ahead in space.

In nuclear weapons they tuned our former President into a testing moratorium, which for all practical purposes was unpoliced. This gave them the option of testing secretly. They are now ahead of us in this field. Our internal fears and indecision stopped our own development.

WESTERN SCIENCE STILL AHEAD

Despite the situation in these two areas of applied science, it seems reasonably clear that as yet Western science is still ahead of Soviet science in both scope and depth. Wherever we have the vision and courage to use our science as an element of national power, we do all right. Vision and courage are the key in science as in everything else.

From the standpoint of our more tangible relative assets of national power we still have no reason to fear the Soviets but from the standpoint of our equally important relative mental attitudes there seems to be more doubt, despite the fact that commonsense should tell us that it is unhealthy to the point of being fatal for us to be seriously afraid of any opponent.

KHRUSHCHEV KNOWS FEAR

Khrushchev is well aware of what fear can do to a nation. He is a man who bides his time and strikes only when the odds are in his favor. Otherwise he would have disappeared long ago.

He has a natural affinity for power and knows exactly how to use it to advance his nation's interest. He suffers no illusions about public opinion among nations who lack real national power. He knows how to use propaganda superbly; how to turn the pressures of weak but vociferous neutrals to his advantage.

His objectives: to divide and destroy his personal or national opponents in any way he can, no holds barred.

USES LIES, MURDER

Lies and cheating and murder are normal and legitimate ways to gain his objectives. If 6 million Ukrainians must be destroyed, he doesn't hesitate. He gives the orders and goes home for a happy evening with his grandchildren.

When the Hungarians revolt, he waits a few days until it is perfectly clear America will not move—then he sends in his armies and crushes them.

He knows the real strength of any nation is (1) its military and economic strength; (2) the courage and determination of its leadership to use those national strengths.

It is instinctive for Khrushchev to strike at this second most vulnerable element of national strength—the will and determination of his opponent.

Such tactics have been used by every Soviet leader since 17 men around a table statred the Communist Party with no physical assets other than their bodies and their brains, but with ideas, objectives and a keen appreciation of how to use terror and fear to control other people.

HOPELESS PEOPLE HELPLESS

They knew, and you know, that hopeless people are helpless, and that terror and blackmail are enemies of hope. And so the Communists use them at every opportunity.

His skilled scientists and psychologists have analyzed carefully the temper of the American people—at present, quite fat and happy (though perhaps a bit uneasy). They stir occasionally, particularly at times like Cuba, but nothing happens so Mr. K. goes ahead. Here and there a few extremists appear to shout alarm, but they are easily discredited as being what they are. Americans don't like extremists, even when they happen to be right.

He watches Americans carefully. If they seem to stir too much, it is easy to withdraw temporarily from a probing venture until they quiet down, as you have done on many occasions.

It is clear to him that America is so physically strong that he cannot reduce or exceed its strength for many years, if ever. But maybe he can kill our hope and spirit, sow uncertainty, break our will. He must convince our Government and people it is hopeless to fight. And so he sets about it.

KHRUSHCHEV STOPPED WESTERN TESTS

He starts by shouting about the dangers of radioactive fallout. Many Americans, particularly scientists, are eager to inflate the dangers of testing fallout. Some are sincere and some are not. Some are his active agents. Mr. K. doesn't care who they are or what their motives, so long as they help achieve his objective.

In only 5 years of intensive and coordinated effort he stopped all nuclear testing in the West and greatly inhibited the Western nuclear weapon development program and weakened its weapon laboratories.

Meanwhile, he has done whatever he wished with regard to his own nuclear weapon progress since there is no effective policing. He nonchalantly resumes open testing when he no longer cares about any American response.

By convincing almost everyone that any use of any nuclear weapons anywhere leads inevitably to all-out nuclear war he says there is no hope for anyone. And again in every such endeavor he finds many Americans eager to help.

PEOPLE WANT TO BELIEVE KHRUSHCHEV

Usually, it is the same fearful or calculating people—who first made so much fuss about radioactive fallout. He finds it easy to discredit the few eminent scientists, like Dr. Edward Teller, who say that his theories are both false and deliberate. People somehow want to believe Khrushchev more than they do these knowledgeable and worried scientists who understand what he is doing.

It is all so easy. He delivers ultimatums, and then withdraws them after gaining a few concessions (which the grantors seldom admit as such) and further erodes their world image of courage and strength.

He evaluates our new President in personal discussion at Vienna, then, 2 weeks later, ventures for the first time a wall which violates agreements and cuts Berlin in two. When no one even protested for 4 days and no one tore the wall down, he chalked up another easy victory.

TO SHOW UNITED STATES WAS NO HELP

He sneered at the West Germans who rioted in angry protest over an 18-year-old boy who bled to death before spectators on both sides of the wall. The effect of this was to show America was no help.

He hopes to create the feeling that America will not help any of her Allies in areas where he can make such help seem risky.

On the other hand, Mr. K. must watch a few things: the satellites cannot be trusted. They never could. He must keep them convinced that no one will help them, that there is no hope. The Americans fortunately have announced that they have no intention of supporting trouble in the satellites. That gift was unexpected, but appreciated.

Khrushchev need have no serious worry about the satellites so long as he avoids a major war—which is easy to do by watching Western reactions and drawing back at the proper time. However, if he ever got involved in major war, every satellite might rise in revolt.

We know what happened when Hitler got delusions of grandeur. But—we tell ourselves—he was a maniac. What about the Japaneses warlords? Were they crazy too?

I entered Japan immediately after the armistice which ended the Pacific war. As we looked at the Japanese tangible assets lying in ruins around us, the obvious question was, "How could the Japanese warlords have been so foolish as to start a major war with only this?"

The warlords had attacked free China, and watched us; they had sunk our Navy gunboat *Panay* with loss of American lives, and watched us; they had taken Manchuria, and watched us. They saw only formal diplomatic protests as our response.

HITLER REACHED WRONG CONCLUSIONS

Hitler had already gone through a similar probing process with the British—and reached similar wrong conclusions—culminating in Munich and World War II. The Kaiser had made similar mistakes in 1914—leading to World War I. Were all these people stupid? Or, did we give them some reason to make mistakes?

Could Khrushchev make similar disastrous errors after similar probings which he could be trying now?

If so, what can we as individual, ordinary Americans do about it? We can do many things:

We can remind ourselves that there is no recorded instance in which we have stood up firmly to Soviet bluster and ultimatums—and fared badly; that there is no instance in which we have compromised or conceded to them—and fared well.

We can remind ourselves of our own great strength—of our economic and military and manpower superiority which, together with that of our allies, should have Khrushchev really worried rather than ourselves.

We can remind ourselves of the very serious internal Soviet weaknesses, of the fact that they can never socialize or enslave individual farmers or solve their internal food problems by centralized planning or by dictum which is bound to fail.

We can remind ourselves that the last thing Khrushchev wants is a major war: that we are negotiating from overwhelming strength, not weakness.

We can remind ourselves that Theodore Roosevelt would never have accepted ultimatums quietly; numerous American planes shot down over international waters; insults across a Paris summit table; Berlin walls; ad infinitum; that he would know that the nuclear weapon cannot make that much difference in people.

We can recall the courage and vision of our ancestors who made America and try to recapture for ourselves some of their approach to a dangerous and challenging life, remembering that even nuclear weapons do not change basic principles, or reform all bullies.

We can stand for more pride in America than seems to be popular in many sophisticated circles today.

We can recall the answer of General McAuliffe to the German ultimatum that he surrender in the Battle of the Bulge, "Nuts."

There are many, many things we might do to avoid a Khrushchev miscalculation and to regain the initiative which should be ours as leader of the world.

Oh, "Savannah"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, all too many years ago the idea of a ship of the future was borne in the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. It was expected that the ship would be the the prototype of a new series embodying nuclear power and the latest in equipment.

The nuclear ship *Savannah* came into being and now we find that aside from its powerplant it is equipped with electronic and associated gear that would be more at home on a World War II liberty ship. A detailed analysis of its shortcomings in this field are set forth in an editorial in the Baltimore Sun of September 16, 1962 by Helen Delich Bentley.

The allegations set forth in the editorial are serious and should be fully and carefully examined by the Secretary of Commerce, the Maritime Administration, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The defects should be promptly corrected. And to the extent the vessel is not equipped with the best and most modern equipment immediate remedial steps should be taken.

The editorial follows:

AN ARK OF THE ATOMIC AGE: OH, "SAVANNAH"

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

Whether the nuclear ship *Savannah* should be sent around the world as the prestige ship of the United States is debatable, unless a number of improvements and changes are made.

The doubt stems from the revelation that there are obsolete and nonworking pieces of equipment in many parts of the ship, not to mention the failure to solve the labor problem even now.

The fact that the entire communications setup on the $53.5 million (some say $80 million) vessel is of Liberty ship vintage seems incredible even to the average person.

Since the *Savannah* was designed to demonstrate to the world that the United States could surpass all nations in peaceful application of atomic energy, people think of the *Savannah* in terms of the ultimate—of being the leader and the best in everything, of being the real pride and queen of the American merchant marine. She should have the best of everything.

Her shortcomings range from the ship's internal communications being limited to a single 19-party-line telephone system to the use of a passageway for the chemistry laboratory because provision was not made originally for this important area, where radiation tests must be made constantly to assure that none of the crew is receiving too much exposure from the nuclear reactor.

Shortly before the ship sailed from Norfolk to Seattle, three different conversations were going on at the same time over the complicated party line and, as a result, none of the men got their messages across until they hung up and took turns, one at a time. The communications arrangement within the vast engine-room setup has some 40 outlets; if one goes bad, the entire system is unusable. An engineer often has to resort to the old-fashioned thumping method from deck to deck to let another know he is wanted.

Dripping pipes in the air-conditioning system not only have ruined rugs in the staterooms, but only last Wednesday flowed so heavily in the hospital area that the doctor was soaked as he gave smallpox vaccinations and other shots; the floor was covered with drenched towels and pans catching the drips.

The refrigerated and dry-cargo stores are scattered over four decks. Their availability is limited to movement on one of two small elevators whose doors open only one way. If the elevators opened on both sides (they could, since the elevator rears run along the galley) it would save manpower used in toting the food around to the main entrance of the galley.

These and items like a modern loran (location finder) and a 250-watt telegraph transmitter (500-watt ones are commonplace on today's freighters) may appear to be simple or unimportant things to the average person, but they are important to anyone associated with shipping and world trade. They are important when the prestige of the United States might be at stake in maritime countries where the *Savannah* most likely is to visit.

Although Greece is the only nation to give a definite "Yes," 11 other countries—all maritime-minded—are negotiating with the Maritime Administration for a visit by the *Savannah*.

This world tour probably will not begin for almost another year, which will be 3 years behind the original schedule proposed when Congress authorized the construction of the *Savannah*. If many items already are considered obsolete, what will they be in another year?

The general public, in viewing the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, will see only the sleek-lined hull and the decorative, bright public rooms. It will have no basis for comparison and think the ship is great. Maritime specialists visiting the ship will use other criteria.

The charge that some sections of the ship were obsolete was made publicly first by the unions which recently staged a strike, tying up the nuclear ship for 2 weeks and getting paid for so doing. The unions also claimed that the quarters of the officers were not good enough to display to other countries. However, the individual men aboard the ship are satisfied; their quarters might be compared to the simpler quarters of officers aboard naval craft rather than to the more elaborate ones aboard foreign freighters. The unions noted that they did not compare with those on the foreign ships, but they do compare with American freighters' quarters.

The fact that the staff captain and chief mate do not even have access to the 19-party telephone in their quarters appears ridiculous when one knows how often men in these capacities aboard ship must be contacted. The radio transmitter is weaker than those on freighters, and the radiotelephone is of the same strength and type as those on many yachts and ordinary freighters. It is not of the caliber of those used aboard the passenger ships, over which

people can talk "just like in the living room" from the middle of the ocean.

With the exception of the weather-map producing machine, the radio shack does not appear as modern or workable as those on older ships. The workbench is a discarded card table left over by the shipyard. Tools for checking equipment efficiently and quickly are on the scarce side in this area.

A new automated Japanese freighter visiting the port of Baltimore recently had a compact, sleek, 500-watt radio transmitter mounted in a modernistic round desk. The operator handled his typewriter by simply pressing a button to move it into or out of the wall. The S.S. *African Comet*, an American-flag freighter making its maiden trip up from Savannah just ahead of the nuclear ship *Savannah*, carries a 500-watt transmitter, a neatly designed, modern radiotelephone, and a built-in workbench.

Unimportant perhaps, but again the opinion is that the nuclear ship *Savannah* should have nothing but the best in everything—from communications equipment to thermometers that work. Everything should be of the same standard as the planetary gears which are the one item referred to constantly as being as much of an innovation in the engine room as is the reactor.

From talks with Maritime Administration officials, the shipyard officials, and the crew, it seems that most of the many millions spent on the *Savannah* went into the reactor and the back-up mechanisms which are not necessary on the Navy's nuclear ships because the prototype reactor was first built and tested on land.

The Maritime Administration was given a budget of $18 million by Congress and told to build the "ship part" of the *Savannah* out of that. But even then the ship part of the vessel was under the direction of Atomic Energy Commission personnel who headed the joint committee of the two agencies.

Rather than go back and ask the Maritime Administration for more money, the "Marad" people bought the cheapest and most economical, or the minimum, equipment rather than the maximum.

Because of the budget limitations, the "Marad" personnel cut down on quarters for passengers from 100 to 60. Then as a result of the extra nuclear staff, extra training engineers and others going along as "necessary crew members," half of the passenger cabins are not available to the public.

The money spent by the AEC on press kits alone would have paid for a 500-watt telegraph transmitter with a high-seas radiotelephone adapter. Money to be spent for a special $50-a-day public relations consultant, plus expenses, could probably pay for a modern dial intertelephone setup so the commodore would have a direct hookup to the man he wants.

While the "Marad" budget was tight, the AEC spent $5,000 on a "charm course" for the officers. The course consisted of running two movies produced by the Bell Telephone Co. and another major company and throwing a cocktail party in New York so the officers would learn to greet people.

The *Savannah* is scheduled to go into a shipyard in Galveston in January to have her hydraulic control rod system replaced with electromagnetic drives. New York Shipbuilding, where the vessel was originally built, said they wanted to install the new system in the first place, but were overruled.

Other items that the Maritime Administration's Trial and Acceptance Board have written down as not satisfactory from the shipyard also will be repaired. They include a malfunctioning of the air-conditioning system and poor welding on pipes.

The asbestos shielding on one of the major pipes in the engineroom is oil drenched and must be replaced—a tough and expensive task. Whenever this occurs in a yard, it is usually straightened out before the vessel leaves.

However, the Maritime Administration—given the responsibility more or less for the ship's operation at this time—was under excessive pressure to get the *Savannah* to sea. Therefore, the agency decided to get it out of the Camden shipyard in February, regardless of the fact that everything was not satisfactory.

While the ship is there for this work, it might be the time to check over the obsolete equipment and put the vessel in the best possible shape in every way. The cost would be infinitesimal compared to the original price and would not even approach the $3.5 million invested in spare parts that are carried in her holds just to have them on hand.

The *Savannah* donnybrook on both the labor and mechanical fronts can be attributed to the fact that two Government agencies were assigned to her. No private ship operator was involved in the actual construction. Maritime experts believe that a private ship operator would never have permitted the *Savannah* to become such a boondoggle.

Instead of just being a home for the engineers of the Atomic Energy Commission whose interest is limited to the reactor, the *Savannah* should be made a proud ship all the way as she carries the Stars and Stripes around the world.

Proposed Drug Regulations: Safety or Scientific Stagnation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in the field of scientific study, experimentation and clinical testing are taken for granted. Not so, bureaucratic redtape. The problem of balancing the safety of the public against the possibilities of scientific stagnation, therefore, can be answered to a large extent by comparing the restrictive influence of endless reports, investigations, records, and plans against the need for more and larger scale trials and the use of professional judgment.

This is the comparison that must be made when considering the proposed regulations on new drugs promulgated by the Food and Drug Administration. Such a comparison has been made by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, in a column appearing in the New York Times of Sunday, September 16, 1962, as follows:

DRUG-TEST REGULATIONS: U.S. PROPOSALS INNOCUOUS ON SURFACE BUT LOWERING OF STANDARDS IS FEARED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D)

Forty years ago the late Mrs. Evelyn Walsh McLean was entertaining at her Washington home. One of the guests, whose husband was a prominent jurist, excused herself during the dinner.

When Mrs. McLean followed the guest out to ascertain the difficulty, the lady broke down and wept, "My teenage daughter is a juvenile diabetic," she said. "She is in a coma, may die and there is nothing that can be done."

Mrs. McLean immediately telephoned a physician friend on the faculty of the Johns Hopkins University in nearby Baltimore. When asked if there was anything new that might help this girl, he told Mrs. McLean he had heard that scientists in Toronto had developed a new compound that controlled diabetes.

The girl was rushed to Toronoto by private railroad car. She received the new compound and is alive today.

The compound, of course, was insulin. It had just been discovered by Drs. Frederick G. Banting and Charles H. Best.

NEW REGULATIONS PROPOSED

New regulations on the clinical testing of new drugs have recently been proposed by Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Among other things, these regulations would require written approval of the Food and Drug Administration to give an experimental drug to a patient, who might die without it.

Under the new regulations, drug companies and individual clinical investigators would be required to file complete plans of their studies with the Federal Government.

This would include "Outline of the plan of investigation, including approximation of the number of patients to be treated with the drug and number to be employed as controls, if any; clinical uses to be investigated; characteristics of patients by age, sex and condition; the kind of clinical observations and laboratory tests to be undertaken prior to, during and after administration of drug; the estimated duration of the investigation; and a description or copies of report forms to be used to maintain a complete record of the observations and the test results obtained."

On the surface this requirement appears innocuous. But how does an investigator know 6 months in advance the exact age and condition of his caseload of patients for whom the drug might be indicated?

How can he know the exact clinical uses he may wish to investigate? A patient may show up with an unusual disease for which in his judgment the drug might be of value.

BARS PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT

To use the drug in such a case would require both the investigator and the sponsor to file a long brief with the Food and Drug Administration asking for permission. By the time it was received, the patient's condition might have changed considerably.

The opportunity to vary clinical investigation to take advantage of unanticipated findings would be lost.

Under these proposals scientific study would be limited to confirming or denying a hypothesis and this could be done only when the Federal Government approved of the hypothesis. In essence, they would eliminate the use of professional judgment, which is the basis for true investigations.

The new regulations would also require that investigators maintain all records and case histories for 2 years after the study and that any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could inspect and copy such records at any time.

In 1958 the ethical drug industry tested 114,600 substances, of which about 40 became marketable. In the United States new compounds are first given the most rigid series of tests in animals of any place in the world.

This testing reduces the number of compounds that shows promise of efficacy and safety down to around 2,000 to 3,000 a year upon which clinical tests in humans are held.

About 25,000 clinical investigators are involved in these tests. It is difficult even to visualize the tons of reports from these 25,000 investigators that would come into Washington under these proposed regulations.

MIGHT LOWER STANDARDS

Unfortunately there is no reason to believe that the proposed new regulations would actually improve the already high standards imposed by the drug industry on clinical testing. In fact, they might accomplish the reverse.

Our objective in clinical testing should be to encourage more testing and larger scale trials. The nature of the proposed regulations, the impingement on confidentiality of patient records, and the legal risks to which investigators would be subject should tend to reduce the number of physicians interested in doing this type of research.

During the last month, this writer has talked with scores of leaders in the drug industry and the scientific community.

All agree that everything possible should be done to strengthen the clinical testing procedures of new drugs. All also agree that the proposed new regulations would not accomplish this objective.

There is also resentment of the precipitant way in which the proposals were issued.

Usually in matters of this kind, the Federal agency involved meets informally over a period of months with the parties affected for an exchange of views.

This was not done. Even from the language of the proposals it is apparent they were hurriedly drawn.

They were then issued on August 9 and interested persons were given 60 days in which to express their opinions.

EXTENSION CALLED FOR

It is to be hoped that Secretary Celebrezze will extend this time period so that the Nation's scientific community will have an opportunity to evaluate these proposals carefully and make its views known.

There is no doubt that the new regulations have stemmed directly from the recent flurry over thalidomide. The thalidomide incident, however, illustrates rather well that our present regulations are effective.

There was sufficient toxicity data available from animal experiments to justify its clinical use with humans. The Food and Drug Administration did keep it off the market.

Had the new proposals been in effect, the thalidomide incident would have been the same except in one respect. The Food and Drug Administration as well as the producer of the drug would have had a record of the clinical investigators who had the drug in their possession.

Dr. Louis C. Lasanga, of the Johns Hopkins University, has commented, "One final paradox: on the basis of the best available information, Marilyn Monroe would be alive today if she had been given thalidomide instead of barbiturates for sedation. This fact is one which illustrates difficulties in dealing glibly with the advantages and disadvantages of useful drugs."

Witness in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year a number of students at Goshen College in my congressional district came to Washington, D.C., for the purpose of expressing their concern about a number of the important issues to officials of our Government.

They were moved to come to Washington in response to the question they posed themselves, "Can the Christian witness to the Government?"

I had the opportunity to talk with these students in my office and was most impressed by the depth and genuineness of their concern about some of the great problems facing our country as well as by their willingness to listen to points of view other than their own.

An excellent summary of the experience of the group is contained in an article by one of the students, Alan Kreider, in an article entitled "Witness in Washington," which was published in the journal, Youth's Christian Companion, a publication of the Mennonite Publishing House.

Under unanimous consent I insert the text of this article in the RECORD:

WITNESS IN WASHINGTON

(By Alan Kreider)

What should be the relationship of the Christian to the state? There is no easy answer to this question. It has been debated since the founding of the Christian church, and has not yet been answered to the satisfaction of everyone.

The difficulty and remoteness of this problem have led Christians to ignore it in the hope that it will go away. But the impact of the cold war, with its constant threat of nuclear devastation hanging over our heads, has recently raised this question with new intensity to young Christians throughout the world.

"Can the Christian witness to the government? If he can, what should he say and how should he say it?" These questions were discussed by six young people in the January 28 Companion. They have also been debated by a large group of students at Goshen College during recent months. Many of us felt that it was time for us to speak directly to our government concerning national policies. After much discussion, work, planning, and prayer, a group of 17 Goshen students traveled to Washington, D.C., on February 21–24 to convey our concerns to the Government.

Our group based its action on the belief that the Christian can and must witness to his government. As Christ was concerned about men's physical as well as spiritual well-being, so we must work to bring happiness and justice as well as salvation to the multitudes. Where there is discrimination and hatred, we must bring love. In witnessing to the state, we go as followers of Christ who have a unique message to present. If we fail to present it, we are hiding an important part of the Christian Gospel from those who desperately need it.

What specific issues should the Christian witness to? Our group faced this problem, and decided to present two major concerns. Since we believe that the arms race is leading the world to military disaster, we urged the U.S. leaders not to resume nuclear testing and to make every effort to achieve disarmament agreements.

A second major concern which we presented dealt with possible alternatives to the arms race. If the United States would exercise its responsibility for international moral leadership, we believe that there is hope for a peaceful way out of the current trend toward war. As alternative programs, we urged carefully supervised economic aid to underdeveloped nations, continued support of the United Nations as an international force for peace, and increased efforts to strengthen the Peace Corps (which, like our Pax service, has a great potential for building international understanding on a personal level).

After much discussion, we decided that the best way to communicate with our Government leaders was to go to Washington ourselves and speak to them personally. So on February 21 a group of 17 students and 1 faculty member went to the Capital.

While there, we spoke to two Senators, five Representatives, and the executive assistants of nine more Congressmen. We also met with a member of the President's Disarmament and Arms Control Commission and presented petitions to the President and the Russian, French, and British embassies.

We were received cordially everywhere. Our Representatives apparently felt (as we do) that absolute answer are hard to find in government. They were willing to hear our opinions. Several of them said that they believed that the contact between the representatives and the represented is crucial in a democracy, and they expressed appreciation for what we were doing. A few of them lectured at us, but most of them engaged in a genuine conversation about our ideas.

Those that disagreed did not hesitate to tell us so. The First Secretary of the Russion Embassy gave us a fascinating half-hour sermon on the righteousness of the Soviet Union and the treachery of the United States. We were less impressed with the validity of his ideas than the complete conviction with which he uttered them.

After 2 days of hard work in Washington, we were relieved to come home again to more familiar surroundings. In evaluating our trip, we cannot know what effect our ideas had on those to whom we spoke. But we can know that we did give our witness to government—we refused to hide our lamps under a bushel.

We can say that we learned a great deal, and had an experience which we will remember all our lives. In going to Washington, we did not resolve the problem of the Christian's relation to the state. But we did attempt to find a solution, and to put that solution into practice.

Robert Soblen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, radio station WGAC in Augusta, Ga., has recently broadcast an editorial which I feel should be read by the Members of the Congress and should receive the special attention of the Justice Department. This excellent editorial raises the question as to the assistance which the American traitor Robert Soblen received in trying to maintain his freedom from American justice. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Apepndix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOBLEN'S BILLS

We believe that the citizens of the United States are entitled to know who paid convicted spy Robert Soblen's bills.

Soblen is dead—dead by his own hand—and Scotland Yard is reported to be trying to find out who gave him the barbiturates with which he committed suicide.

We hope Scotland Yard solves that riddle—but we believe it is much more important for the American people to know who financed and helped this spy in this country.

Soblen was not a wealthy man. His legal bills were huge and he was obviously able to

pay them. Somebody forfeited $100,000 bail when Soblen escaped custody. Why was bail made for a convicted spy? Who put up the money? Who paid his other bills, his passage to Israel? Who drove him to the airport? Who helped him get away?

We agree that Soblen was entitled to his day in court. We believe he should have adequate counsel whether or not he had money. But—Soblen was a convicted spy. Who backed him? Who paid his bills?

If our public officials know the facts—we are entitled to know them. If they do not know the facts—what are they doing about it?

We believe the American people are entitled to know who paid Robert Soblen's bills.

The Van Zandt Amendment in the Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] for his diligent and dedicated efforts that culminated in amending the Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill. Without that amendment, the Federal Treasury would have been liable for any losses resulting from the operation of the proposed generating facilities at the Hanford, Wash., new production reactor.

Congressman VAN ZANDT has compiled an outstanding record in his years in the Congress of the United States, but his vigorous leadership throughout the numerous skirmishes on the Hanford issue was an inspiration to his colleagues. Recognizing the threat of the Government-sponsored electric generating station proposed for Hanford last year, he immediately undertook aggressive action against it. He took the floor time and again to call attention to the inefficiency of such a facility, to the fact that its construction would provide a key link in the nationwide transportation grid envisioned by public power proponents, to coal markets it would usurp, and to the unfair advantages this subsidized project would bring to the Pacific Northwest in its competition for new and expanded industry with other areas interested in redevelopment programs.

The 1961 battle of Hanford proved to be a long struggle. Congressman VAN ZANDT successfully mustered his forces on four different occasions before supporters of the project finally surrendered. When the program was presented under an entirely new guise in this session, Congressman VAN ZANDT recognized that, as presented, the project would still not relieve the Federal Government of losses that were certain to result. Once again he led the House to an overwhelming victory.

Sensing the futility of continuing the struggle for Government liability, the conferees finally succumbed to the Van Zandt demands and accepted the amendment originally proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. Here is the final result of Congressman VAN ZANDT's effort, as explained by the chairman of the conference committee when H.R. 11974 reached the House for final action last week:

Mr. Speaker, in the argument which I made on the Van Zandt motion to instruct the conferees on their first conference I made a pledge. I said, "I guarantee you that we, the conferees, will bring back for a vote the issue which is involved in this matter."

This we, the conferees, have done. We have brought back language which not only contains the Van Zandt amendment, but we have also gone further than the prohibition against the Atomic Energy Commission's entering into contractual arrangements for the construction and operation of generating and transmitting facilities; we have inserted another prohibition against the sale of steam from these facilities, and we have directed—and listen, please, to this—we have directed the Atomic Energy Commission to withhold from beneficial use and waste this 800,000 kilowatts of steam unless the Atomic Energy Commission could make three important determinations in the public interest. If they could make such administrative determinations, and if they could impose upon the contracting entities terms and conditions which would, First, guarantee that all of the fears of additional Federal expenditures were groundless; second, that any losses which might occur in the future as a result of these contractual arrangements would be borne not by the Federal Government but by the Bonneville Power Administration system's customers through rate adjustments in their electricity—and this is written into the statute that is offered in the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that, in these concessions and pledges incorporated into the bill which passed the House last week, Congress will find a precedent on which to base its decisions when similar proposals arise. By including the Van Zandt principle when assorted power projects are drawn up, Congress can protect the public from underwriting inefficient and wasteful programs that have no place in America's industrial complex.

White House Double-Track

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial which appeared in the New York Times on Saturday, September 15. It indicates very clearly the untenable double standard which the President is assuming as far as labor relations are concerned. I commend it to the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

WHITE HOUSE DOUBLE-TRACK

If President Kennedy wonders why so many businessmen consider his administration unfair, he might find part of the explanation in the inconsistency of the positions he took at his latest news conference on two labor disputes, both heavily weighted with public interest.

Mr. Kennedy put all his prestige behind the recommendation of a special Presidential board for union-shop elections to avert a threatened strike in plants manufacturing missiles, planes and spacecraft. The two powerful unions in this field—the United Automobile Workers and the International Association of Machinists—welcome the board's recommendation; the employers are cold to it. The President asserted that, if the latter rejected the panel's peace plan, the country should blame them for any work stoppage.

The story was quite different when Mr. Kennedy was asked about the 2-week-old strike on the Chicago & North Western Railway, which is inflicting great economic injury on nine Midwest States. This tie-up stems from the rejection by the Order of Railroad Telegraphers of a Presidential emergency board's recommendation that the union abandon its demand for a veto over job reductions caused by changing technology or other factors. The panel recommended a formula for cushioning layoffs through liberalized unemployment, retraining and severance benefits.

Mr. Kennedy had no word of personal endorsement for the emergency board's report, nor any censure for the union. Ignoring the fact that the North Western had always been ready to negotiate a contract based on the board's proposals, the President called on both sides to make "sufficient concessions" to effect an accord. This is not the first time Mr. Kennedy has made an orphan of a Presidential factfinding report that railroad labor did not like. A similar fate befell the comprehensive recommendations for eliminating featherbedding in train crews, which are still being resisted by all the unions involved.

The current application of a double standard of White House judgment is made more conspicuous by the differing legal status of the two boards. The board the President is supporting in the aerospace industry was created outside Taft-Hartley, without any specific legislative authority. The board he is ignoring in the North Western strike represented the final step in the exhaustive machinery of the Railway Labor Act. Mr. Kennedy will have to exhibit more consistency if the Nation is to be convinced that his sole yardstick in such matters is the public welfare.

Revolt and Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of September 19, 1962:

REVOLT AND REFORM

All this year the attacks on foreign aid, in both houses of Congress, have been unusually severe. And this week a House Appropriations subcommittee voted to cut $1.5 billion out of the President's request for new funds of more than $4.7 billion in the current fiscal year.

Whatever figure Congress finally agrees on, it is significant that this is the largest reduction in foreign aid the group has ever proposed and that the full Appropriations Committee yesterday went along with most

of the cut. Combined with the other congressional criticisms of the program, these actions show that many lawmakers are not only rebelling against the incessant and excessive spending; they are also beginning to sense their responsibility for forcing foreign-aid reforms.

Certainly the administration, for its part, has shown little disposition to effect basic reforms. It has rearranged the bureaucratic machinery, an exercise which has been performed over and over in the past. It has devised the Alliance for Progress subsidies for Latin America, an undertaking which is already demonstrating that it was both ill-conceived and oversold.

What has been left undone is the formulation of an effective aid policy. Our military aid is so heavy because our diplomacy has failed to persuade others to do more in their own defense. As for economic aid, the basic trouble is not waste, flagrant though that often is. The roots of the trouble, we think it should be clear by now, are these:

The assistance has gone on so long on such an indiscriminate basis that it has largely lost its leverage in influencing world affairs to our advantage. In many cases it promotes the wrong things, like socialism, and thus does more harm than good to the receiving nation. And the yearly totals of foreign aid contribute both to the Federal budget deficits and to the deficits in our international payments.

Congress alone cannot remedy all these ills. But if it will follow through with substantial reductions in aid money, it can powerfully underscore the need for fundamental reform.

Outmoded Waste Collection Systems Polluting Our Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is presently embarked on a determined and serious effort to bring about effective prevention and control of the pollution that menaces our precious water resource. Municipal and industrial wastes are admittedly the major contributory sources of this pollution. Accordingly, the predominant share of the current effort is focused on these two major contributors.

The stimulatory grants-in-aid to municipalities for construction of waste treatment works provided by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act have been greatly successful in this respect, so much so that the Congress has authorized a continuation of this program at twice its previous rate.

And yet little or no regard has been given to the outmoded waste collection systems in many of our older cities that in themselves serve to greatly reduce the benefits to be expected from the installation of new treatment plants. This is because, on an annual average, 10 percent of the municipality's sanitary sewage never reaches the treatment plant. This amount of the city's raw wastes is carried off by storm overflow directly into the nearest waters. Adding to the gravity of this situation is the fact that many cities collect the wastes from their industries in their municipal sewers to receive treatment at the central plant.

At the turn of the century, many municipalities constructed a system of combined sewers to carry their sanitary wastes and to collect the runoff from their streets after a rainfall. At that time, this was an economic course for the cities to take. The sanitary wastes from their smaller populations used only a small portion of the combined sewer capacity. The portion of this sanitary sewage that was carried off by storm overflows into the receiving wastes was readily diluted by the proportionately larger street runoff collected by the sewers.

Now the populations of these cities have increased at an unforseen rate. The continuation of this growth rate is expected at an even higher level. Already the huge population centers like New York, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., and others find that their combined sewers are sufficient only to handle the sanitary sewage with little or no capacity remaining to cope with storm runoff. Thus, with these combined sewers filled to capacity with sanitary wastes, the runoff resulting even from a short summer afternoon rainfall causes the sewers to overflow at spillways necessarily provided for this purpose directly to the stream. It is conservatively estimated that as much as 35 percent of the sanitary sewage bypasses the treatment plant and is carried directly into the watercourse after a heavy rainfall fills the sewers and pours out of the convenient spillways.

It is this factor, which in the opinion of experts, is directly responsible for the serious interference with recreational and other legitimate uses of the waters that are adjacent to our larger communities. For example, the city of New York administers conscientious treatment of its sanitary waste discharges. Its bathing beaches, however, are to a great extent posted as unsafe due to the unusually high coliform count samples obtained there. This situation is attributed in large degree to the storm overflow from its combined sewers, carrying a large amount of raw sanitary sewage. Similarly, the closed beaches at Milwaukee, now an annual affair, are also traceable to storm overflow. The pollution of the Potomac River caused by storm overflow from the combined sewers in the Nation's Capital was recognized and cited as a principal cause of the shameful condition of this stream in the Federal enforcement action begun in 1957 to restore the quality of these waters. The conferees recommended as one of the absolutely necessary remedial measures that pollution from storm sewer overflows be substantially alleviated by the end of 1966.

It can well be understood, therefore, that our programs of municipal treatment works construction should be accompanied by the construction of separate storm and sanitary sewers in our metropolitan areas. This is necessary and imperative to assure the efficiency of the treatment plants themselves, which are designed to handle sanitary sewage without the complicating factor of intermixture with storm runoff. And, more importantly, the deleterious discharge of raw sewage will be effectively halted—allowing our streams to recover without the necessity of experiencing periodic heavy doses of the pollutants that have so long plagued them.

To alleviate this problem, I am introducing a bill which should provide for the orderly conversion of these outmoded systems.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466e) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(g) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for separation of combined sewers which carry both storm water and sewage or other wastes on the date of enactment of this subsection to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into any waters and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

"Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this subsection unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this Act; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 30 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this subsection until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the separated sewers after completion of the construction thereof; (4) no grant shall be made for any project under this subsection unless such project is in conformity with the State water pollution control plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 5 and has been certified by the State water pollution control agency as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as water pollution control needs.

"In determining the desirability of projects for separating combined sewers and of approving Federal financial aid in connection therewith, consideration shall be given by the Secretary to the public benefits to be derived by the construction and the propriety of Federal aid in such construction, the relation of the ultimate cost of constructing and maintaining the separated sewers to the public interest and to the public necessity for the separated sewers, and the adequacy of the provisions made or proposed by the applicant for such Federal financial aid for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the separated sewers after completion of the construction thereof. The sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year shall be allotted by the Secretary from time to time, in accordance with regulations, as follows: (1) 50 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the population of each State bears to the population of all the States, and (2) 50 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income of the United States by the per capita income of each State bears to the sum of such quo-

tients for all the States. Sums allotted to a State under the preceding sentence which are not obligated within six months after they were allotted because of a lack of projects which have been approved by the State water pollution control agency and certified as entitled to priority, shall be reallotted by the Secretary, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable and in accordance with regulations promulgated by him, to States having projects approved under this section for which grants have not been made because of lack of funds. The allotments of a State under the immediate preceding two sentences of this subsection shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, for payments with respect to projects in such State which have been approved under this subsection. Any sum made available to a State by reallotment under the preceding sentence shall be in addition to any funds otherwise allotted to such State under this Act. For purposes of this subsection, population shall be determined on the basis of the latest decennial census for which figures are available, as certified by the Secretary of Commerce, and per capita income for each State and for the United States shall be determined on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year through and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $70,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose of making grants under this subsection. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

"The Secretary shall make payments under this subsection through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury. Funds so paid shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of construction of the project for which the amount was paid. As used in this section the term "construction" includes preliminary planning to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of separation of combined sewers, the engineering, architectural, legal, fiscal, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action necessary to the construction of such separated sewers; and the erection, building, acquisition, alteration, remodeling, improvement, or extension of such separated sewers; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of such separated sewers.

"The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects for which grants are made under this section shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing for the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the act of March 3, 1931, as amended, known as the Davis Bacon Act (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C., secs. 276a through 276a-5)."

The Postal Rate Hike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following editorial from the Warren, Pa., Times Mirror, of September 5, 1962:

THE POSTAL RATE HIKE

As of this writing, the U.S. Senate is still reviewing the postal rate increase, H.R. 7927, based on a request from President Kennedy. The bill has been attacked by many publications, by labor unions and others. It will destroy jobs, cut down the effectiveness of many of the smaller, more thoughtful magazines, hurt the farm press and hurt the American public.

Here is what the AFL–CIO has to say about the proposed rate increase:

"To put it simply, doubling the second-class rate on labor papers wouldn't help the Post Office much, but it would raise havoc with the primary means of communication within the labor movement.

"Doubling the rate would mean a cost of better than 10 percent (of the total budget of a typical trade union publication) which seems unduly high to us.

"Some weekly papers would be cut back to twice a month. Some twice-a-month papers would become monthlies. A few publications might suspend publication entirely."

Leading authors also have added their voice to the protest. They point out—and rightly—that the rate hike would hurt them by cutting down the number of markets to which they can sell their material. This means more jobs lost. The International Typographical Union has opposed the hike because of what it would do to men in the printing trades.

The Government argues that it cannot meet its post office deficit unless rates are hiked, yet, as always, the Government ignores the obvious solution: cutting expenses.

First of all the Post Office should divest itself of all the side issues it has taken on, like handing out tax forms, collecting migratory bird fees by selling special stamps, and other unimportant duties which have been dumped on the Department over the years.

The second solution is to modernize the 1890 rule book and to mechanize the Department. Why isn't our system mechanized as it is in many so-called backward countries overseas?

This question was put to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service by A. L. Cole, vice president and general manager of the Reader's Digest.

"The population of this country has increased 33 percent since 1945," he said. "Since 1945 mail volume has increased about 79 percent. Not only has population been rising but there have been more and more pieces of mail per year. More than half the mail in the post office is still first-class mail—over 33 billion of the 66 billion pieces of mail in 1961.

"If governments overseas find that money can be saved by machines, then, if it has not been done, an immediate appraisal should be made of our 60 largest post offices to find out what machines can be used, how much they'll cost, and how much money they will save.

"Most businessmen would be happy to buy machines which will pay for themselves in 6 years. Postal cost studies made in 1958 showed that the one Transorma letter sorter installed in Silver Spring, Md., would pay for itself in 5.9 years. Since that one was installed in 1957, this means there'll be some savings next year—and for years thereafter.

"This year the Post Office asked the Appropriations Committee for enough money to buy only 21 letter sorters. We have seen estimates that 400 or 500 sorters are needed. Why should we wait until 1970 to get 400 or 500 machines that could have been saving us money for the last 5 years of this decade?

"We submit that the Post Office cannot be asked to judge its own progress in mechanization. Some experts have suggested that a joint congressional committee is needed to study continuously and report to the Congress and the people on post office efficiency.

"We appeal to this committee and the administration to modernize the post office as rapidly as possible. We realize that this is the province of the Congress; we hope you will push it. The American people are entitled to the lowest possible rates for postage, and without continuing deficits. The only way to get this happy combination is through a post office of high efficiency.

"Some people say that mechanization will cost a lot of jobs for postal employees. We do not believe that the installation of modern mail-handling machinery will put any of the 582,000 postal employees out of work. Postal authorities themselves state that they do not believe they can properly handle the load without new machines."

The Integral Train Brings New Hopes to Pennsylvania's Coal and Railroad Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] issued a joint statement to call attention to the development of the new high-speed shuttle freight train developed for lowering costs of transporting coal between mine and market. At that time we promised to arrange for interested friends here on the Hill to accompany us on a trip from a western Pennsylvania coal mine to a electric utility on the east coast.

Because of the uncertainty as to adjournment date, Members of Congress cannot be certain that it will be possible to leave the Capital at any specified time between now and the end of the session. For this reason we have decided to wait until some time in the future to ask our colleagues to join with us on a trip featuring the new concept in coal transportation. Because, however, it is so important that large scale industrial consumers recognize the potential of the integral train, the gentleman from Pennsylvania's 22d District and I have accepted the invitation of the New York Central Railroad, with which we have been in communication since shortly after our April 26 statement, to take part in ceremonies planned with the departure of an experimental unit coal train from Clymer, Indiana County, Pa., on Friday of this week. We look to this event with eager anticipation because the advent of the coal flyer is going to make 1962 one of the most important years in the history of the coal and railroad industries.

Although specially designed shuttle trains that will provide even greater efficiency are now on the drawing boards, the railroad industry is not content to

stand by for the fruition of long-range plans. The New York Central's coal special will be made up of equipment heretofore used in conventional freight trains, yet it will demonstrate through special delivery and quick car turn around that the price of coal at the plant site can come down substantially and make this fuel an even better bargain than it is today.

Large consumers now on other fuel but equipped with standby coal boilers must take notice of this prospect in planning for future operations. More important, industries planning new or expanded operations should look into the price of coal to be delivered by the unit train before considering use of another fuel.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the coal industry's experience in markets where advantages have long been on the side of competitors, the coal industry recognizes that the integral train is not the complete answer to its problems. Despite the general inflationary trend, coal is sold at the mine today for less than its price of 1948. The lowering of transportation costs that will be made possible through the new train will make coal an even greater attraction in areas remote from producing fields.

Congress and the executive branch should make two indelible notations in their official records of September 21: the average selling prices of coal and foreign residual oil in east coast markets. This record is most important in view of the fact that, when the integral train goes into regular operation, foreign oil is going to take a beating at a great many points of consumption unless shippers continue their jackknifing prices. Over the years, whenever railroads and coal were able to negotiate substantial cost reductions as a means of meeting foreign competition, the international oil companies invariably dropped rates to whatever levels were necessary to undersell coal, with business economics having no place in the maneuver. Opponents of excessive residual oil imports have contended that rate adjustments are always possible because first, the selling price of other products of the crude can always be raised as a means of absorbing losses incurred in reductions on residual oil; and, second, ocean shipping rates can be shifted from residual oil to other products whenever it is desirable.

Under the circumstances, coal suppliers to heavy industrial consumers on the east coast will be at the mercy of importers unless the Federal Government takes steps to prevent continued unfair and unrealistic price-fixing practices.

While a complete review of the importers' pricing tactics over the past 15 years is in order, holding the line on foreign residual oil at this week's price levels would at least give domestic producers a mark to shoot at with the assurance that there will be no more of the mysterious manipulations that would not be tolerated on the part of any domestic producer, manufacturer, or processer, or distributor.

The experimental integral train is on the move. When coal begins its ride on a regular schedule under a new rate structure, Pennsylvania's mining and rail centers will enjoy a welcome robust economic upturn. This program must be encouraged and—if necessary—Congress will have to clear the way to make certain that the advance continues in the years ahead.

Orville L. Freeman, the Farmers' Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the time I have served in Congress I have worked with many Secretaries of Agriculture, but I have never known a Secretary of Agriculture who was more devoted to the cause of agriculture than Orville L. Freeman. He has not only been devoted to the cause of agriculture, but he has dedicated his life to the welfare of farmers, consumers, and to all of the people of America.

Orville L. Freeman has provided fine leadership and by his intelligent devotion to duty he has endeared himself to the Members of Congress and to his countrymen. He had proven himself to be worthy of the confidence placed in him by the President and I am certain that he will continue to administer the duties of his high position in a manner which will be compatible with the ancient traditions of our country.

Drew Pearson, the cruel critic of many public officials, this morning in his article which appeared throughout the length and breadth of this vast and great country, paid tribute to this public official, Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman, and I submit for publication in the RECORD this article by Mr. Pearson.

The vote on the farm bill in the House today is a compliment to the Secretary of Agriculture who is now trying to solve the perplexing problems which at this hour confront all the people of our Republic.

The article by Mr. Pearson follows:

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, THE FARMERS CHAMPION

(By Drew Pearson)

When Senators heard a top Government servant, Under Secretary Charley Murphy, say that his Agriculture Department was so big he was not surprised a Billie Sol Estes scandal could take place, they did a double take. For most bureaucrats are usually not that frank.

However, what most people don't realize is that the Agriculture Department has become the third largest agency in Government, ranking after the Defense Department and the Post Office. Also what the public doesn't know is that the Agriculture Department is not solely engaged in farm problems and farm surpluses. It does a lot of other work for the taxpayer—such as meat inspection, poultry inspection, insect eradication, supermarket design, even the school-lunch program.

Without any fanfare, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman had plodded patiently along cutting down the farm surpluses, so that this year he has 700 million bushels less in storage. He has also cut $250 million a year from his farm surplus budget—and a quarter of a billion dollars ain't hay.

CAMPING COSTS MONEY

But simultaneously, Freeman's overall budget has increased—due not to farm problems but to the public's growing demand for recreation.

In 1961, city tourists flocked to the national forests—which are under Freeman—for a total of 102 million visitor days. This was the rate which had been expected for 1970, and it meant extra rangers to prevent forest fires, extra personnel to handle campsites, making a total of 27,198 men, and a Forest Service budget of $279,400,000 for the 154 national forests spread over 185 million acres in 42 States.

A lot of Freeman's budget also goes into firefighting. He even used up part of it in the recent fire in the Los Angeles suburbs, though movie star homes are a long way from farms. When the Los Angeles Fire Department needed help, however, the Forest Service responded. Eighteen forest rangers were killed fighting fires last year, 11 so far this year.

Incidentally, the Forest Service is permitting private firms to cut 10 billion board feet of timber in 1962, which will net Uncle Sam $114 million.

The surge of cityfolks into the country has also bulged the soil conservation program, which now employs 17,189 men, with a budget of $16,500,000 to handle 312 watersheds and 18 million acres.

All this is a long way from farm surpluses and farm programs.

FOOD STAMP TO PHONES

Orville Freeman's farflung organization also governs the commodity exchanges of the Nation, regulating 500 commission merchants and 775 floor brokers. It supervises the food-stamp plan, inspects poultry in 979 plants, meat in 1,500 plants, does research in human nutrition, and administers the Rural Electrification Administration, which lends money for low-cost electricity and telephones.

Closer to farm problems is agricultural research, which employs 17,272 men in pest control. Its enemies are the Japanese beetle, grasshoppers, the fly and the mosquito.

Busy Orville Freeman also extends loans to farmers, handles crop insurance, makes crop reports which project months in advance what the crops are going to be; researches in farm machinery, has even developed machines for shelling peanuts and the commercial harvesting of pears.

Finally, the Secretary of Agriculture has the most complete records of dairy cows of any man in the world. Freeman has 6 million records on the milk production and calves of 2.8 million cows.

No wonder the Secretary of Agriculture keeps busy.

Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Norwalk Hour, the newspaper in my hometown of Norwalk, Conn., recently conducted an essay contest on "Our Flag." Miss Kathleen Dowling, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas E. Dowling of 12 Edith Lane, Norwalk, and a sophomore in the

Norwalk Senior High School, was the top winner in the contest. Because of her heart warming and stirring dissertation on the subject, I feel compelled to bring it to the attention of all the Members of this House. It is with pride and pleasure that I offer Miss Dowling's essay, which follows, for insertion in the RECORD.

OUR FLAG

"We take the stars from the heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her; and the white stars shall go down to posterity representing liberty."

This was how George Washington, the father of our country, splendidly interpreted the meaning of our new flag. Through the years, people have been trying to find new meaning in the different parts of our flag—but they have always reached the same conclusion.

This flag of ours, this Old Glory, is the symbol of a free and democratic people, the banner of liberty and peace, the emblem of honest effort. Unfurling its beautiful waves in the blue skies of America, it hails and welcomes the masses from far-off shores, assuring them that, indeed "Our cup runneth over."

The Stars and Stripes is a welcome sight to Americans wherever they may be. It is the United States itself—all thoughts, concepts, sacrifices, joys, and dreams which made our country great—in one visible, tangible, sacred piece of cloth. It has the feelings of Francis Scott Key, the Marines at Suribachi, Boy Scouts on Memorial Day, and every man, woman, and child of America woven into its threads. It is a reminder, a dedication, and an inspiration for us all. The Flag of the United States of America holds the beating heart of humanity.

KATHLEEN DOWLING.

Retraining the Unemployed: Little, Late, and Limping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the September 27, 1962, edition of the Reporter magazine by Julius Duscha:

RETRAINING THE UNEMPLOYED: LITTLE, LATE, AND LIMPING

(By Julius Duscha)

"Four hundred thousand unemployed men and women," President Kennedy told the Nation one evening in August, "are now receiving retraining so that they can find new work in new industries and new jobs." The retraining program, he noted, was one of the praiseworthy acts of a Congress that "has done more in the last 18 months to combat the recession and strengthen the economy than any Congress since the end of the Second World War." Mr. Kennedy went on to tell his radio and television audience about 52-year-old George DeMartz of Carbon County, Pa. DeMartz, said the President, had lost his job in the coal mines but had found a new life as a welder after participating in "our retraining program."

The story of George DeMartz added a nice human touch to an otherwise rather dull speech, loaded with statistics designed to show why the President had decided not to ask Congress to reduce taxes this year.

Among the many Americans who were struck by the DeMartz story was Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, Republican, of New York. As coauthor of the retraining bill, GOODELL knew that the program that the President said was already retraining 400,000 Americans had not even begun, because Congress had approved funds for it only the week before. "At this point," GOODELL told the House 3 days later, "there are exactly zero people being retrained."

Representative CARL D. PERKINS, Democrat, of Kentucky, disagreed with GOODELL and said that the President was referring to retraining programs enacted by previous Congresses. This was also the explanation offered by the White House—Mr. DeMartz had studied welding under one of the small earlier programs—but privately administration officials conceded that Mr. Kennedy was indeed in error.

The Labor Department had told Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, who collected material for the no-tax-cut speech, that more than 400,000 unemployed workers would probably be trained for new jobs by the end of the 3-year program approved by Congress last March. But, the Department added, the program was not yet underway because of a 4-month congressional delay in providing appropriations. Somewhere between Heller's office and the final draft of Mr. Kennedy's address—apparently in the speechwriting office of Presidential Aid Theodore C. Sorensen—a rather hopeful goal of 400,000 became, on paper, an accomplished fact.

COMPOUNDING THE DELAYS

By prematurely claiming credit for an administration accomplishment, Mr. Kennedy inadvertently drew attention to another of his programs that is lagging because of faulty staff work within the executive branch as well as inept Democratic leadership on Capitol Hill.

Although there has never been much opposition among either Republicans or Democrats to a retraining program, it has taken more than 18 months to get one started. (The first projects were finally approved early in September.) The story of the delays and frustrations that beset the program illustrates many of the shortcomings of the administration's relations with Congress and helps to explain why the legislative record of the 87th Congress is so disappointing.

Late in 1959, State employment and education officials began to suggest that the Federal Government provide funds to help retrain men whose skills had been replaced by machines or made obsolete by changing production and consumption patterns. Coal miners were the classic example. If an unemployed miner were ever again to find work, he would have to learn a new skill because machines were stripping jobs as well as coal from the mines.

The retraining proposal was included by Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, in a report issued early in 1960 on hearings that he had conducted on automation and unemployment. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, introduced a new retraining bill and presidential candidate Kennedy picked up the idea as he campaigned in the depressed areas of West Virginia and other States.

Soon after Mr. Kennedy entered the White House in January 1961, he asked Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg to draw up retraining legislation. Goldberg conferred with Senator CLARK and others in Congress who were concerned about long-term unemployment.

The concept of a retraining program seemed simple enough. Surveys would be made to see what kind of jobs were open. Then training programs would be set up to provide workers for the jobs. To encourage the unemployed to take courses, the Government would pay them the equivalent of unemployment compensation (the national average is now $34 a week) while they took training that could last for as long as a year. Unemployment-compensation laws prohibit payments to men who are going to school; a man on the compensation rolls is supposed to be actively looking for a job.

As an approach to what the economists call structural unemployment, retraining seemed to have all of the prerequisites for speedy bureaucratic and congressional approval. It fitted in perfectly with the conservative view that nothing is basically wrong with the economy that cannot be solved by getting capital and labor to the right place at the right time.

After several weeks of consultations between the Labor Department and Members of Congress, a bill was finally drafted and sent to the Budget Bureau, where it stayed for 2 months. The Budget Bureau has become the rules committee of the executive branch. Instead of functioning merely as a clearinghouse for a Presidential program, the Bureau more often is a bottleneck. In the case of the retraining program, it was waylaid because a lower echelon bureaucrat with a strong dislike for vocational educators wanted to write a bill that would leave all existing vocational education institutions out of the retraining program. The directors of public vocational high school programs and of private training schools may indeed be behind the times, but their political power on Capitol Hill is such that their support was essential for the passage of retraining legislation.

The bill that finally emerged from the Budget Bureau included the vocational educators in the program. It provided for a 4-year, $700 million program to retrain an estimated 700,000 persons. But the legislation was so loosely—even ungrammatically—drawn that its backers immediately became alarmed. "The bill seemed made to order for attacks by HALLECK and DIRKSEN," one Senator has since commented.

What concerned the proponents of the legislation were the broad grants of power it would have given to the Secretary of Labor. He could set up retraining schools where and as he desired—which presumably included desegregated institutions in the Deep South. Money would be given retrained workers so that they could move to cities and States where jobs were easier to find. Other undefined "qualified persons" in addition to the unemployed could be included in the program. No limit was set on subsistence and travel allowances. Youths from 16 to 21 who had dropped out of school but had no work experience would be eligible. To some legislators this amounted to rewarding delinquent and shiftless youths with Federal scholarships while those who stayed in school had to pay their own way.

Once the legislation got to Congress late in May 1961, hearings were promptly held by both the Senate and the House Labor Committees and bills were quickly approved. Before the end of August the Senate had passed its revised version of the administration's proposals by a comfortable two-to-one majority. To assure passage, Senator CLARK, who managed the bill on the floor, persuaded the administration to drop its relocation proposals, which senators from the smaller and stagnant States regarded as an open invitation for pirating of workers and perhaps industry too. CLARK also drastically tightened up the discretionary authority in the original bill and included a provision giving eligibility for retraining to persons on farms that brought in an annual cash income of less than $1,200.

CAUTIOUS LEADERSHIP

The bill that emerged was one that its Senate sponsors as well as administration

lobbyists thought the House could quickly accept. The House Labor Committee, however, had approved only a 2-year program, and had not made any of the changes that the Senate had, except for dropping the relocation proposals.

But it was August, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn was ill, the House was becoming increasingly unpredictable, and the leadership decided it would be best to put over the retraining bill until 1962. The White House was jittery about what the unruly House was doing to the program and concurred in the decision to postpone action. And Representative ELMER J. HOLLAND Democrat of Pennsylvania, the chairman of the House Labor subcommittee that was handling the retraining legislation, did not like the Senate amendments.

So retraining became the first priority in the House for the 1962 session and was approved late in February by an overwhelming vote of 354 to 62. The vote indicated that the White House as well as the House leadership had been needlessly cautious the summer before.

Representative GOODELL, a Rpublican, proposed the amendments to the bill that assured its passage. "All GOODELL did was to steal our amendments," one of Senator CLARK's aids commented bitterly. But if the House leaders had been alert they would have realized that such amendments would have quickly pushed the legislation through the House in 1961.

A Senate-House conference committee promptly agreed on a 3-year, $435-million program that was expected to retrain more than 400,000 workers and also provide limited on-the-job training for another 250,000. The legislation confined youth-training expenditures to 5 percent of the program. It provided that youths be given only $20-a-week living allowances and be at least 19 years old to qualify for training.

When the bill finally got to the White House early in March, more than a year after it had first become part of the President's program, Mr. Kennedy hailed it as "perhaps the most significant legislation in the area of employment since the historic Employment Act of 1946." He promised to "move promptly and vigorously to launch this program." Goldberg called the law "a powerful new weapon to alleviate long-term unemployment."

However important the President may have considered the retraining program, it languished from March until late summer because the two most stubborn octogenarians on Capitol Hill, Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, and Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, could not agree where their Appropriations Committee members should hold conferences to resolve differences between Senate and House bills. In midsummer a truce between HAYDEN and CANNON was finally arranged, appropriations bills began arriving at the White House, and early in August $70 million was provided for the first year of the retraining program. This is only enough money to retrain from 50,000 to 70,000 workers, which is far less than the first-year goal of 100,000 and not even one-sixth the number the President told the Nation were already being retrained.

George DeMartz, the former coal miner singled out by Mr. Kennedy, had done some welding before and learned advanced techniques under the small retraining program run by the Area Redevelopment Administration. Only some 12,000 persons have been enrolled in this depressed-areas program. Of the 2,300 who had completed their ARA courses by the end of this June, only 60 percent found jobs.

To be successful, of course, a retraining program must graduate workers into jobs. Under the limited ARA program, jobs have been easiest to find for welders and machine-tool operators. Other persons have been retrained as auto mechanics, machine operators, farm-equipment operators, and clerical workers.

The ARA program has been so limited that it will be at least a year before enough results will be in to indicate whether the new retraining program will help to reduce unemployment. But even if 70,000 men and women can be retrained by next June 30, this figure amounts to a tiny fraction of the nearly 4 million unemployed, 934,000 of whom have been out of work for at least 15 weeks and 593,000 of whom have been unemployed for 6 months or more. Surveys have shown that it is among these long-term unemployed that the need for retraining is greatest.

Advocates of retraining have been careful to warn that it is not a panacea for unemployment. The Labor Department and Health, Education, and Welfare Department officials who will jointly administer the new program are aware of the difficulties encountered by other retraining projects in persuading middle-aged men to go back to school. Some of these problems stem from the inability of the men to read and write well enough to be auto mechanics, television repairmen, or supermarket clerks. (There are no provisions for basic reading and writing courses in the new retraining program.)

Yet so much attention has now been focused on the program by the President's mistake in his August speech and by the administration's new determination to get courses under way quickly that the retraining expectations have been accordingly increased. The expectations may soon turn to resentment if the slow-starting program fails to live up to the administration's superlatives. Then the White House may have reason to consider some retraining for its speechwriters and for the strategist who so badly misread the mood of Congress last summer.

The Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, our good friend Art Hoppe has inserted the following four articles in the San Francisco Chronicle on September 2, 17, 6, and 7. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I hereby insert the above-mentioned columns at this point:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 2, 1962]

WELL, THAT'S THE WAY IT GROWS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

That acute crisis in Cuba has grown like Topsy. Which is the way crises grow these days. In hopes you might care to know more of the way crises grow these days I've been studying the growth of this one. It's the darnedest thing you ever saw.

The seed was planted a week ago by "The Cuban Report—Information Direct from Communist Cuba," a periodical published in non-Communist Miami by Cuban refugees. Who understandably wouldn't mind a little action.

The report said 12,000 Soviet bloc troops and "heavy armament" were landing in Cuba, "a transcendental event that threatens the peace of the Western Hemisphere." To prove it, the report gave details. Like one whole garrison was "mainly from Russia, Red China, and South Africa." South Africa? That's very transcendental.

Our ace newsmen, deleting only the South Africans, happily retyped all this information direct from Miami, crediting "eyewitness reports." Banner headlines. As usual, editorials viewing with alarm. As usual Congress going out of its mind. As usual.

Senator LAUSCHE demanded an investigation. Senator YOUNG said the Russian troops were in Cuba to crush a revolt. No, said Senator LAUSCHE, they were in Cuba to invade Jamaica. It was quite an argument. Republican Campaign Chairman BOB WILSON said it was both and, whatever it was, it would be a major campaign issue. "It wouldn't have happened," said WILSON, "under Teddy Roosevelt." Which there is no denying.

Meanwhile, back at the old State Department, U.S. officials armed with all the U.S. official reports kept plaintively denying any Soviet troops had landed in Cuba. Those weren't 12,000 troops, they said, those were 5,000 civilian technicians. Nonsense. Which source are you going to trust, Washington or Miami?

Senator HOMER CAPEHART demanded we invade Cuba. Every conservative in the country said "bully," and began polishing up his cavalry saber.

What a crisis. It was the top issue at Mr. Kennedy's news conference. Okay, now, what was he going to do about these 12,000 Russian troops who had nefariously snuck into Cuba with who knows what evil intentions to * * *. What troops, said Mr. Kennedy. "We have no evidence of troops," said Mr. Kennedy. "I am not for invading Cuba," said Mr. Kennedy firmly. "At this time."

So that's how a crisis grows these days. It is planted by the hopeful, fertilized by the sensational, and nurtured by the righteous. I am proud Mr. Kennedy nipped it in the bud. It makes me feel better to be an American. I admire his steadfast courage and morality on this issue. At this time.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept 9, 1962]

CAN OUR BOYS LICK THE AMERICANS?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to another in the distinguished series of Nutshell Lectures, designed for busy people who wish to keep abreast of world affairs so they will know whom to root for. Today's lecture is "Our Military Aid Program in a Nutshell."

In a nutshell, our military aid program is perfectly understandable.

Currently, for example, we are making plans to increase our military aid to our friends, the Cambodians. So they can better shoot it out with our friends, the South Vietnamese. But it's perfectly understandable.

You see, our Cambodian friends and our South Vietnamese friends have been happily shooting each other up in border incidents for years. But we had to go and send South Vietnam $2 billion and 8,000 American troops to shoot up the Viet Cong guerrillas, who are the Bad Guys. And we only sent Cambodia a couple of hundred million or so. Because they were not fortunate enough to have a revolution on their hands.

Our South Vietnamese friends have naturally been pursuing the Viet Cong Bad Guys across the border into neighboring Cambodia. Unfortunately, their motto seems to be: "If you can't shoot a Viet Cong, pot yourself a neighbor." And underarmed Cambodia is naturally sore. They're demanding we equalize things a little. It's the least we can do for our friends.

It's perfectly understandable. The only problem arises with our troops. You see, our troops often accompany our South Vietnamese friends on their raids into Cambodia. And now if we send more American troops to our friends in Cambodia, then eventually.

Well, as the Associated Press puts it in a dispatch from the Cambodian capital:

"U.S. officials here do not discount the possibility that American servicemen might face other American servicemen in a border clash involving a Cambodian unit and Vietnamese forces."

As you can see, this would be perfectly understandable. But the question arises as to whom a loyal American should root for in such a battle: The Americans or the Americans?

The results may cause some confusion. The patriotic newspapers will announce: "Big Victory: Americans Clobber Americans." While the more sensational press will decry: "Terrible Defeat, Pentagon Shake-up Ordered."

Politicians will have an awful time castigating "the deviously cruel and pitiless enemy our boys in the trenches are facing." War bond rallies may well turn into riots and the producers of Hollywood war movies will go smack out of their minds.

But it's perfectly understandable. As long as we send guns and bullets overseas to help our friends shoot each other up, it's only logical we send them Americans to show them how to do it.

The only alternative is to knock off all military aid to our friends forthwith. We might mail the money to Russia instead. Russia could then send Russian troops to Cuba, Red China, Albania and so forth. Eventually, by the perfectly understandable laws of military aid programs, the Russians would exterminate themselves.

If our military aid program is good enough for our friends to put it in a nutshell, it's good enough for our enemies.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 7, 1962]

FLORIDA, SI; MICHIGAN, NO

(By Arthur Hoppe)

The grave crisis in Cuba, which used to be a simmering crisis until it exploded into an alarming crisis, has now exploded once again into an alarming crisis, if not a perilous crisis, and thank goodness for my friend, Mr. Robert Hardin.

The crisis became alarming because Cuba today is, or is not, swarming with Russian troops. Many of our militant Congressmen, like Senator GOLDWATER, wish to invade Cuba immediately. Just in case. Mr. Kennedy says there are definitely no Russian troops in Cuba, but just let them try to start anything and we'll show them.

The heart of the Cuban crisis all along, of course, has been that we are bigger than they are. They can't invade us because they're too small. And we can't invade them because we're too big. We'd look like bullies. It would be immoral. So it's very frustrating.

That's where Mr. Hardin, an ace newsman, comes in. "What we do," he says, "is let Cuba fight it out with Florida. If we win, we win big." But what if we lose? "So," says Mr. Hardin with a shrug, "we blow a State."

It's a fine, fair idea Mr. Hardin has there, all right. If anything, it's a little too fair. There are 6,743,000 Cubans and only 4,951,000 Floridans.

Better odds for our side would be to sic Michigan on Cuba. We have more than 7 million Michiganders. But invasions either way would prove most difficult. Not to mention expensive, due to the high tolls on the Pennsylvania Turnpike. Besides, innocent States lying between might be severely damaged by artillery shells falling short.

Personally, I would prefer tossing Mississippi in the pot instead. It's handier to Cuba than Michigan. True, Mississippi's population is only 2.1 million and it would probably be captured in a week. But look at it this way: what have we got to lose?

Realistically, however, I suppose it must be Florida, because Florida is, when all is said and done, closer to Cuba than the United States. And we have to be practical, above all.

It's a question of anticommunism. Everybody says we have to be practical, above all, in world affairs because we are engaged in a cold war with an immoral enemy. And being moral would be a handicap.

So we have to be practical, above all, and support, arm, and protect dictators all over the world in order to save their people from being enslaved by dictators. Which is very practical. If not very moral.

Of course, some may argue that democracy, by its very nature, cannot be rammed down people's throats. It can be spread only by emulation and can exist only in a moral world. And that morality, therefore, is not our handicap, but our strength.

Thus I'm against the great big United States invading Cuba. It's immoral. But tiny little old Florida? That's moral. In fact, it's overly moral. I think we ought to let Arizona, say, in on Florida's side to equalize things. It would solve everything:

Go get 'em, Floridans. And take Senator GOLDWATER with you.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 17, 1962]

ONE SNICKER, NIKITA, AND YOU'VE HAD IT

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Mr. Kennedy keeps telling us to remain calm over the Cuban situation. Communists in my life. What do they think we are? Squares?

I admit it took me some time to tumble to their little game. I think I first suspected what they were up to during the grave troubles in Laos when their Prince, who was supposed ot be a Communist, demanded everybody address him as "Your Royal Highness." These nagging suspicions grew in the Ruanda-Urundi crisis when the Russians backed a native tribe known as the Tutsis. But with Cuba, they've overplayed their hand.

Look at the facts: Somehow the false rumor is spreading that 12,000 Russian troops have landed. Cuban refugees in Miami retaliate by shelling a Havana night club and shooting up a British ship. Half of America wishes to invade Cuba to wipe out these nonexistent Russian troops. The Kremlin issues a grim statement saying this could mean war.

And then, way down at the bottom of the statement, the Russians say that, by the by, they've decided to postpone the Berlin crisis until after the November elections in the United States. Until after what? I can take a joke as well as the next. But this time they've gone too far.

Obviously, Kremlin foreign policy has fallen into the hands of a nefarious bunch of practical jokers. And they're getting carried away. As I see it, they probably meet daily over vodka martinis to lay their plots.

"Comrades," say their ringleader, Nikita Sergeyevich, "it's been pretty dull since the shoe bit at the U.N. But I got a great one. We'll start the rumor that we got—ho, ho, ho—12,000 troops in Cuba. Five rubles gets you 10 the Americans'll buy it. They'll believe anything these days." He slap his thigh and they all go off into peals of laughter.

A week goes by and the reports roll in. "Listen," says Nitika, spluttering. "They got so excited they shoot up a night club and a British ship. Maybe they'll declare war on England. Or the Diners' Club. Tell them they better not invade Cuba or our 12,000 troops will cream them. GOLDWATER will die of apoplexy." And they all guffaw like crazy.

"But what," says one, gasping for breath, "about Berlin?" Nikita ponders a moment. "I got it," he says, bursting with glee. "Tell them we won't start a nuclear war over Berlin until after their November elections." There are cries of "But that's too preposterous" and "Who'd believe that?"

"And in November," says Nikita, tears in his eyes, "we'll say we're postponing the holocaust until after the next Miss America pageant." It's too much. They all dissolve in hysterics and several of them, holding their sides, fall off their chairs to roll helplessly in the aisles.

A joke's a joke. But I don't think it's very funny. The panicky reaction of our Congressmen to the goings-on in tiny little Cuba has made this great Nation a laughing stock. And I'm getting pretty sick and tired of these Kremlin comedians goading us into all sorts of harebrained positions.

Keep calm? I demand we drop an ICBM on the Kremlin. Those pranksters will die laughing. And we should announce immediately that we're going to do it. Right after the Greater Smolensk Crape and Folk Art Festival.

The Constitution: A Living Document

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the document we revere as the Constitution of the United States is no ordinary scrap of paper with written inscription upon it. Long after all original member States of the Union have revised their own fundamental law at least once, the Constitution stands with but a few changes in its original makeup.

This week we honor as Constitution Week, for 175 years ago this past Monday, September 17, 39 members of the Constitutional Convention signed the ageless document.

As a timely tribute to the Constitution, I offer the following editorial from the September 17 edition of the Paterson News:

THEY BUILT WELL

It probably won't last more than 20 years, Washington was said to have predicted. James Madison, the "Father of the Constitution" no less, called it only "the best that could be obtained from the jarring interests of the States."

Rhode Island had failed to pick any delegates at all to the Convention that drew up the document in 100 days in Philadelphia. Nine of the 74 delegates selected from the other 12 States flatly refused to serve, 10 others didn't bother to show up. So the number actually at the Constitutional Convention was 55.

Only 39 of those 55 signed the Constitution 175 years ago today, the beginning of "Constitution Week." Some of the 16 nonsigners abstained because they had had to go home, but at least 7 because they were opposed to it—including George Mason, Edmund Randolph, Elbridge Gerry. Others who wanted the Constitution rejected were Patrick Henry, Richard Henry Lee, and over 45 percent of the delegates in the ratifying conventions of Massachusetts, New York, New Hampshire, Virginia, and Rhode Island.

As every school child knows, or should know, the first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights, are for all practical purposes part and parcel of the original Constitution. Much later one amendment was adopted simply to repeal that on prohibition. So

really only 10 lasting changes have been made in the Constitution an average of only one every 17 years.

Yet every one of the Thirteen Original States has completely replaced its original Constitution at least once. And as a sign of the veneration today for the document that was damned with faint praise 175 years ago, the bitterest opponents of racial integration in public schools don't blame it on the Constitution but on the Supreme Court for allegedly distorting the Constitution.

In forwarding the amendments to the States, September 25, 1789, Congress recommended their adoption in the belief that "extending the ground of public confidence in the Government will best insure the beneficient ends of its institution." The rights guaranteed by the amendments became part of the fundamental law on December 15, 1791.

The Constitution's protections of civil rights are not limited to those set forth in the Bill of Rights amendments. The Constitution itself insured the individual rights of habeas corpus and jury trial, and forbade convictions under ex post facto law. It prohibited religious discrimination in qualifications for Federal office and sought to promote equality through provisions which prohibit titles of nobility and require uniformity of taxation. Safeguards against reckless charges of treason were provided by a specific definition of that crime and special legal requirements for conviction.

The American Constitution is the oldest written document of that sort now in force anywhere in the world. The fact that it has served for the better part of two centuries with a minimum of change is testimony to the wisdom of its authors and to the skill of jurists who have found ways to adjust its requirements to modern needs.

Even in these days of turbulence, dissension and rancor, the basic commonsense of the document is still sound. What is needed is adherence to its tenets and perhaps less of personalized interpretation.

Attorney Fees in Connection With the Litigation of Social Security Cases Before the Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been concerned as to the rights of applicants for social security benefits in proceedings before the district courts of the United States. This concern comes from a generally expressed opinion by members of the legal profession with reference to adequacy of compensation allowable to counsel for these applicants which has resulted in attorneys avoiding such cases. The inescapable result of this attitude of the profession has been to deny to many worthy people an opportunity to have their cases adjudicated once the Appeals Council of the Social Security Administration has denied the claim.

Every applicant who is dissatisfied with the administrative decision in his case has a right to take his case to the district court for determination. At that stage of the proceedings it is absolutely necessary that he have competent legal counsel. Under our system of jurisprudence these are deemed to be elemental propositions.

Due to my concern for the many social security applicants I wrote to former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Hon. Abraham A. Ribicoff, on July 9, 1962, requesting a formal opinion on this important subject. Due to the retirement of Secretary Ribicoff an answer was not forthcoming. On August 29, 1962, I addressed the same request to the present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Hon. Anthony J. Celebrezze. Under date of September 19, 1962, Secretary Celebrezze, gave me his reply, together with a written report on the subject prepared by Hon. Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security, and a copy of Bulletin OASI 856, dated March 1962.

It is apparent from data provided by Secretary Celebrezze and his associates that the opinion generally held that attorneys in social security cases before the Federal Courts are limited to a fee of $10 per case is completely in error. I believe that the dissemination of the correct information on this subject will be of tremendous value to many hundreds of social security claimants who may lose their benefits by reason of their difficulty in employing competent legal counsel if the misapprehension as to the law is not removed. I, therefore, insert under unanimous consent, my letter of July 9, 1962, to Secretary Ribicoff, the replying letter of Secretary Celebrezze, the report of Commissioner Ball, and Bulletin OASI 856 be made a part of the RECORD of today.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, these data will be of great interest to many of our citizens. I express the hope that the public interest will be served through this interest.

The letters, report, and bulletin follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1962.

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been quite concerned for some time about the inability of claimants for social security benefits under the disability provisions of the law being able to litigate their claims before the Federal district courts.

This concern arises out of my observation that members of the bar are reluctant to represent claimants in the courts because of what they believe to be drastic limitations upon the compensation available to attorneys in such cases. Just last week in discussing it with one lawyer in my district he expressed the view that an attorney was limited to a $10 fee in an action brought to recover such benefits under the Social Security Act.

Since this is a matter of great concern to me and to many of our people who have claims under the Social Security Act, I would appreciate your advising me as to whether you know of any limitation upon compensation available to attorneys in such cases.

I am aware of the statutory authority of the Secretary to limit fees paid to attorneys for appearances in such cases at the departmental level, and this inquiry is, therefore, confined to the question of attorneys' compensation in judicial proceedings before the courts.

I will greatly appreciate a prompt relpy to this communication.

Sincerely yours,
BASIL L. WHITENER,
Member of Congress.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, September 19, 1962.

Hon. BASIL L. WHITENER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WHITENER: This is in reply to your letter of July 9 to Mr. Abraham A. Ribicoff and your letter to me of August 29, concerning attorney fees in connection with the litigation of social security cases before the courts.

Your letters were referred to Mr. Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security. Enclosed are two copies of his report on this matter.

Sincerely yours,
ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary.

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION REGARDING THE INQUIRY FROM REPRESENTATIVE BASIL L. WHITENER

Mr. WHITENER expresses concern about the inability of claimants for social security benefits under the disability provisions of the law to litigate their claims before the Federal district courts. This concern arises out of his observation that members of the bar are reluctant to represent claimants before the courts because of what they believe to be drastic limitations upon the compensation available to attorneys in such cases. In a recent discussion one lawyer expressed to him the view that an attorney was limited to a $10 fee in an action brought to recover such benefits under the Social Security Act.

Mr. WHITENER mentions that he is aware of the statutory authority of the Secretary to prescribe the maximum fee which an attorney may charge for servies performed in connection with a claim before the Social Security Administration. His inquiry, therefore, concerns principally the question of whether or not the Secretary also may prescribe the maximum fee which an attorney may charge for services performed in a court case.

When the Social Security Administration regulations on representation of parties were amended, effective April 26, 1960, there was included section 404.974 (20 C.F.R. 404.974) which clearly provides that services rendered by any representative in connection with any State or Federal court proceeding are not services before the Social Security Administration. Therefore, the Social Security Administration regulations governing fees for services in a social security matter do not apply to fees charged by attorneys for services rendered in a court proceeding.

With respect to the attorney's view that the fee was limited to $10 in an action brought to recover social security benefits, it is possible that he gained that impression from the amount set out in the regulations, prior to their amendment, as the amount any attorney could charge without prior approval. This $10 figure was never, however, an absolute limitation on the amount of the fee an attorney could charge his client for services before the Administration on a claim for benefits. The regulations of the Administration, even prior to their amendment, allowed an attorney, as they do now, upon petition therefor to the Administration and good cause shown, to charge and receive fees in keeping with the nature and value of his services on a claim, and our records indicate that in many instances attorneys have been allowed substantial fees for their services on claims for benefits. Moreover, the $10 figure to which the attorney referred is no longer

in effect. Section 404.976 of Regulations No. 4, 20 C.F.R. 404.976, provides that an attorney may charge, without obtaining prior approval therefor, $20 for services before the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance; $30 before a hearing examiner, and/or the Appeals Council only; or $50 before the Bureal and a hearing examiner and/or the Appeals Council.

Over the years we have, through various mediums, disseminated information with respect to the right to representation and the charging of fees under the law and regulations. The Social Security Administration pamphlet, "Right to Representation," is furnished a claimant, and his attorney, or other representative, by the local social security district office when it is learned that the claimant has, plans to have, or inquires about having, a representative to assist in the prosecution of his claim. This pamphlet mentions that a representative's services performed before a State or Federal court are not subject to the fee provision in the Social Security Administration regulations. It also sets forth the requirements for approval of a representative's fee for services performed in a social security matter before the Social Security Administration.

ROBERT M. BALL,
Commissioner.

RIGHT TO REPRESENTATION

You have the right to be represented by a person of your choice in any business you might have with the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance or the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

This does not mean that you will need a representative. Most people handle their social security affairs with the help of the people in the social security office.

If you wish to be represented, the people in your social security office will be glad to work with your representative just as they would work with you.

This leaflet explains your right to be represented and gives additional information which might be helpful to you and your representative.

Who may represent you? You may be represented by an attorney or other qualified person of your choice. A corporation or organization cannot be recognized as your representative, but an employee of one may if he acts in an individual capacity.

How do you designate a representative? An attorney may act as your representative without written appointment, although a written statement may be requested to make the record complete. If you want to be represented by someone who is not an attorney, his appointment and acceptance must be in writing. A form for this purpose may be obtained at your local social security office.

What can your representative do? When you appoint a representative, he may act for you generally on social security matters except for signing the claims application. He may request a reconsideration, hearing, or Appeals Council review. Any notice or request sent to your representative has the same effect as if sent to you. A copy of any determination or decision made in your case will be sent to your representative.

A representative's authority generally ends when final action is taken in your case or when you request it.

How much can a representative charge you? Under regulations established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, an attorney without prior approval of the Social Security Administration may charge you a fee which may be no more than: (1) $20 for representation before the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance only; (2) $30 for representation before a hearing examiner or the Appeals Council of the Social Security Administration or both, and; (3) $50 for representation before the Bureau and a hearing examiner and/or the Appeals Council.

An attorney who wishes to charge a higher fee must secure the approval of the Social Security Administration.

A representative who is not an attorney may not charge or receive any fee for his services in a social security matter without prior approval of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, a hearing examiner, or the Appeals Council.

The Social Security Administration, when asked, may approve the charging of a fee. Any fee approved will compensate the representative for his services and yet be consistent with the purposes of the social security program—one of which is to give a measure of security to the aged, the disabled and widows and children.

The fee provision applies to any services performed regarding social security matters, including the advising and assisting of claimants in the representative's office, home, etc., even though the representative does not personally contact a social security office or employee. A representative's services performed in a proceeding before a State or Federal court are not subject to the fee provisions.

What is required for approval of a fee? To secure any needed approval of the amount of a fee for services performed in connection with a social security matter, the representative should submit a written request to the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, the hearing examiner or the Appeals Council, which ever last handled the claim. The request should show the services performed, the date his services began and ended (if ended), the nature of the services, the type of each service, the time spent on each, and the amount of the fee he wishes to charge. If the representative is asking reimbursement for expenses, his request should list and describe each item of expense. When the fee applies both to services in a social security and a nonsocial security matter, the request should explain and state the amount of the fee that is for each of those services.

Who cannot act as a representative? A person may not act as a representative if he has been disqualified or suspended from representing claimants before the Social Security Administration. Such action may be taken where a representative has participated in a fraud against the Social Security Administration, charged an unauthorized fee, or violated any other penal provision of the Social Security Act. Also sections 281, 283, and 284 of title 18 of the United States Code make it a criminal offense for certain employees and former employees of the United States to render the Government or to aid or assist in the prosecution of claims against the United States.

Criminal prosecution: A representative who charges or collects an unauthorized fee may be subject to prosecution under the penal provision of section 206 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 406), which provides that such individual, upon conviction thereof, shall for each offense be punished by a fine not exceeding $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both.

J. L. Sims, Times & Democrat Publisher, Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on September 14, 1962, South Carolina lost one of its most distinguished citizens and the journalism profession lost one of its best newspapermen when Mr. James Loyal Sims passed away. Mr. Sims was publisher of the Times & Democrat of Orangeburg, S.C., and served as president of the Sims Publishing Co., president of radio station WTND and president of Orangeburg Theaters, Inc.

Mr. Sims was a very respected leader of the newspaper profession and was greatly admired and beloved in his community.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorial comments on Mr. Sims' passing from the following newspapers: The State, of Columbia, S.C., of September 19, the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., of September 18, and the News & Courier, of Charleston, S.C., of September 16, and also an article from the September 15, 1962, issue of the Times & Democrat.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Sept. 19, 1962]

J. L. SIMS

The death of J. L. Sims was a loss to the daily press of South Carolina. He had lived a brave and productive life. Even while in a long struggle with disease, he retained a spirit that helped build the Orangeburg Times & Democrat into a strong and serviceable instrument. Orangeburg and the daily press will miss him and the qualities which endeared him to his colleagues.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Sept. 18, 1962]

DEATH WAS NOT A STRANGER

Death was no stranger to J. L. Sims. He lived in its shadow for more than half his years.

From his student days at 21 until his passing last week at the age of 48, he was the victim of cancer.

Life was a series of reprieves and he valued it more highly than ordinary men. He saw each day as a special gift. Each respite was a time of opportunity "to strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

He kept his work before him. Even the last day before his final coma was spent busily at his desk.

Possessing infectious enthusiasm and joie de vivre, he had an abounding interest in the opportunities and privileges of life.

He was a man of many attainments and several vocations, not the least of which was the executive leadership of the Orangeburg Times & Democrat.

The newspaper fraternity of South Carolina was honored to claim him as a fellow member of the fourth estate and was enriched by his cooperation, example, and counsel.

His career was marked by friendliness, kindness, and brotherhood.

He gave death no easy victory.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Sept. 16, 1962]

J. L. SIMS

In the death of J. L. Sims at the age of 48, Orangeburg has lost a prominent citizen and South Carolina journalism has been deprived of an active leader.

Taking over as publisher of the Orangeburg Times & Democrat after his father's illness, Mr. Sims soon gained prominence in the newspaper business. He held high offices in the South Carolina Press Association and pioneered in the South Carolina Associated

Press News Council. Though afflicted with a grave illness while a student at the University of South Carolina, he played a leading role in the business and civic life of Orangeburg. Mr. Sims came of a family that has made many contributions to the State, and in his span of life he compiled a solid record of achievement.

The News & Courier joins with his many friends around the State in expressing profound sorrow at the death of this prominent citizen of South Carolina.

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times & Democrat, Sept. 15, 1962]

J. L. SIMS, TIMES & DEMOCRAT PUBLISHER, DIES—FUNERAL RITES TODAY AT 5 P.M.

James Loyal Sims, 48, publisher of the Times & Democrat and president of the Sims Publishing Co., died in the Orangeburg Regional Hospital Friday at 3 p.m. after an extended illness.

Funeral services will be conducted Saturday at 5 p.m. at St. Paul's Methodist Church, of which he was a member. The pastor, the Reverend Ted E. Jones, will officiate, assisted by the Reverend Thomas S. Tisdale and the Reverend Dr. Carl B. Caughman. Burial will be in Sunnyside Cemetery.

Death did not come unexpectedly to Mr. Sims. Afflicted with cancer while a student at the University of South Carolina, the condition had slowly, but progressively, grown worse and for the last 2 years he had submitted to an increasing number of surgical operations. Every treatment known to medical science was given, but in vain.

"J. L." as he preferred to be known to his friends—and he had no known enemies—was born in Orangeburg, February 15, 1914, a son of the late James Izlar Sims and Mrs. Isabelle Wannamaker Sims. He attended the Orangeburg public schools and, despite his small size and lack of weight, was an outstanding football player and took part in other student activities at the Orangeburg High School.

He later attended the University of South Carolina where he studied business administration and journalism. While there he was a member of the Sigma Alpha Epsilon social fraternity.

He immediately became associated with the Times & Democrat, a newspaper founded by his grandfather, the late James Loyal Sims, for whom he was named, in 1876. He and his father, the late J. Izlar Sims, were the only three of the newspaper's publishers in its 86-year-old history.

His association with the newspaper came at a time when Orangeburg was in the midst of the depression in the 1930's, when at the age of 19 he joined the circulation staff.

Under Mr. Sims' aggressive leadership the newspaper experienced a tremendous circulation hike within a short period of time. He expanded the Times & Democrat's distribution area over Orangeburg, Calhoun and Bamberg Counties and into parts of Dorchester, Lexington, Clarendon, and Aiken Counties.

By 1936, the Times & Democrat's growth warranted a move into the daily newspaper field—prior to that it was a triweekly—and began publishing on June 13, 1936, every day but Sunday and Monday. Later he carried the paper to even greater heights—six-day and finally full-week publication.

From the day he moved into the circulation department, the Times & Democrat became one of the greatest interests of his life. The other was his family. Progressing slowly through the circulation, advertising, mechanical, and editorial departments of the paper, he became thoroughly conversant with all phases of its operation.

In the mechanical field, his aptitude was unusual. He was able to determine the reasons for failure of the complicated linotype machines, the rotary press, and had a thorough knowledge of all the functions and operations of all other typesetting and stereotyping equipment in the newspaper's composing rooms.

In the editorial department, he was a writer of unusual ability and, through his hobby of photography, was one of, if not the first, publisher to push, and actively take part in, photojournalism in the South.

Through his keen interest in things mechanical, he was the first publisher in South Carolina to install typesetting machines for use in setting type mechanically from punched tape—a procedure that is followed to this date in the Times & Democrat's composing room.

In this connection, he and his late father encouraged and supported an out-of-State company which serviced other newspapers with prepunched tape of syndicated articles and features which have found wide use all over the Nation.

And it was through the teletypesetter installations in the Times & Democrat office that a team of girls from the News & Courier in Charleston were trained to punch type at a time when that paper faced a renegotiation of a union contract and a strike, or walkout, was feared there.

Further indication of his long-range planning was the installation of a photoengraving machine in the Times & Democrat office, the first for medium-sized dailies in South Carolina, and it is believed, one of the first in the South.

It was not until 1947, when his father suffered the first of a series of heart attacks to which he finally succumbed August 14, 1957, that J.L. became publisher of the paper, his father becoming president of the Sims Publishing Co., Inc.

It was after that, that the two became instrumental in the establishment in Orangeburg of Paintset Fashions Inc., a garment manufacturing plant which has become Southwide although no factory now exists in Orangeburg.

They also became interested in the sale and erection of Gunnison Homes, one of the first of the prefabricated dwellings to be offered on the national market. Some 25 were built in Orangeburg.

His interest in journalism was not confined to Orangeburg. He held many high offices in the South Carolina Press Association since its organization and had missed few of its meetings. He also attended the annual meetings of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association, and pioneered in the South Carolina Associated Press News Council.

It was only a few years ago that J.L. began to turn his interests more strongly to the business end of the newspaper. But even then, employees would find him seated in his office into the early hours of the morning discussing photography, current events in the city, county, State, Nation, and over the world.

In his relationships with those who worked with and under him, he was kindly and understanding. He had a great compassion for the physically and otherwise handicapped and gave many job opportunities to such people.

A man of infinite patience, it was his wont to give anyone the benefit of the doubt, often overlooking occasional failures on assurance of readjustments. But he was also an intensely loyal man and had little patience with those of whose disloyalty he felt assured.

With the Times & Democrat by far his greatest business interest, "J. L." also had other business connections. He was also president of Radio Station WTND and of Orangeburg Theatres Inc., which operates the Edisto Theatre. He and his two brothers-in-law, Dr. James H. Gressette and Dr. John B. Rembert, were owners of Edisto Homes Inc., operating a number of duplex apartment houses in Orangeburg off the Columbia Road.

He evidenced a keen interest in the Masonic Order, having the unusual distinction of being a Master Mason, a Scottish Rite Mason, a York Rite Mason and of the Ancient Arabic Order, Nobles of the Mystic Shrine. He was a member of the Edisto Shrine Club, and was one of those instrumental in obtaining its clubhouse on U.S. Highway 301, north. He was also a former member of the Rotary Club and a member of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.

He married the former Miss Alice Culler, of Orangeburg, who survives along with two daughters, Miss Alice Culler Sims, a student at Converse College in Spartanburg, and Miss Georgia Sheridan Sims, 9, of the residence; two sisters, Mrs. James H. (Mary) Gressette and Mrs. John B. (Cherry) Rembert, both of Orangeburg; his mother, Mrs. James Izlar Sims of Orangeburg.

And, two uncles, Rear Adm. Gelzer L. Sims, U.S. Navy, retired, of Orangeburg, and Henry R. Sims, of Rock Hill, a former president of Winthrop College; three aunts, Mrs. Julian S. Smith, of Alexandria, Va., Mrs. Willie Lew Griffith, Miss Georgia Sims and Mrs. Alma Cherry, all of Orangeburg, and Mrs. Lois Wannamaker Pettit of West Palm Beach, Fla.; and eight cousins, Edward H. Sims, editor of the Times & Democrat now on leave of absence in Germany, Hugh S. Sims and Henry R. Sims, II, acting editors, both of Orangeburg, Lt. Gelzer L. Sims, Jr., of the U.S. Navy, Mrs. Charles Marshall, of Lancaster, Mrs. Georgiana St. Amand, of the University of Mississippi at Jackson, Mrs. Annette Griffin Parker, of West Palm Beach, Fla., and Bill Griffin, of Palm Beach, Fla.

Pallbearers will be Fred H. Carr, Dean B. Livingston, Herman T. Bass, Thomas O. Crowell, T. Edward Hall, Ray Linn, L. Richard Rhame and Larry Styles.

Overdue Safeguards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important article by Josephine Ripley which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of August 24. This article outlines the desperate need for the passage by the Congress of the drug legislation proposed by Senator KEFAUVER. As the article points out, the tragic thalidomide case merely highlighted the necessity for legislation—a necessity which, as Senator KEFAUVER has shown, has existed for a long time. I hope that my colleagues will read the following article and that the drug bill will be passed without delay:

OVERDUE SAFEGUARDS

(By Josephine Ripley)

The very fact that Congress is now speeding legislation to impose new and stronger curbs on the sale and distribution of drugs is in itself an indication that something needs to be done.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, has been saying this for more than 2 years. He has brought out in long and searching hearings the fact that many drugs on the market today are overpriced and oversold.

But in trying to force down the price of drugs and promote greater honesty in their

sale, he was up against some powerful adversaries.

Comparatively little might have come of his efforts, or even the President's appeal for more stringent drug regulations, had it not been for the thalidomide scare which shocked the public into sudden awareness of the extent and extremes of drug promotion.

Few people realized until then the fact that new drugs are eventually tested on human beings before they are approved for sale.

The effect of a drug on humans is a part of the necessary record submitted to the Food and Drug Administration when the product is up for approval.

A Massachusetts physician, Dr. Chester S. Keefer, Wade professor of medicine at Boston University School of Medicine, and senior member of the Evans Memorial Department of Clinical Research and Preventive Medicine at Massachusetts Memorial Hospitals, recently told a congressional committee that "there is no substitute for the trial of drugs in man," no matter how many animal tests may precede it.

He went on to state that "medicine is at best an uncertain science. There is no way of putting a new drug application through a computer and knowing what adverse side effects may occur."

One question which has arisen in this respect and put to witnesses by legislators is: Should a person be told by his physician that he is being given an experimental drug?

Most have responded in the negative, saying the decision should be left to the physician. It is considered unlikely that the Federal Government will step in and insist upon such disclosure.

But there are many areas in which it does intend to exert greater control, if Congress passes pending legislation.

For instance, the Government wants to make sure that physicians are fully warned of the side effects of new drugs. In the Kefauver hearings, evidence was produced to show that some drug companies in their eagerness to promote the use of a new drug by physicians played down possible serious side effects in the interest of playing up the drug.

In one case, the FDA had instructed the company to put the warning at the head of circulars to physicians descriptive of the drug. Instead, the drug was extolled at length, while the possible side effect, found, and even fatal in some cases, was brushed off in a sentence at the end.

The Government also wants authority to remove a drug from the market immediately if there is reason to feel it is a hazard to public health. Representatives of the drug industry are objecting.

They contend the Government already has such authority. However, it may only do so, under present law, after hearings have been held, or a court injunction ordered. Hearings are timetaking, and to obtain a court injunction there must be specific evidence, such as that in the thalidomide case, to warrant court action.

The Government also wants an extension of time in which to consider a new drug application. FDA now has 60 days in which to register objection before a new drug automatically goes on sale. The industry indicates it will go along with some extension of time, to 90 days, but not up to 180 days or more.

The Government is asking for more authority to examine the manufacturer's investigatory records with respect to drugs, and authority to make certain it is produced under sanitary conditions.

These and numerous other regulations for greater public protection are set forth in the Kefauver bill just passed by the Senate.

The House has just begun hearings on two bills, one relating to drugs, the other to cosmetics. While other bills have been introduced, these two represent the wishes of the administration and are now under consideration.

The bill dealing with cosmetics requires that all cosmetics should be pretested for safety before they are put on the market. It would also repeal the exemption of hair dyes which at present are not subject to tests like other coal tar dyes.

All this is considered needed and long overdue legislation. And except for the "recent unpleasant situation," as one drug industry representative called it, these bills in all probability would not have made much in the way of headlines or progress.

Assembly of Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most capable Members of the House of Representatives, and I assure you one of the most capable members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, gave an address at the plenary meeting of the Assembly of Captive European Nations in New York. His address is of note and I feel that all should read it with care.

He emphasizes the grave mistake of Hungary. This mistake was reported by my committee in this manner:

The Hungarian revolution which broke out October 23 was catastrophic in nature and caught the free world totally unprepared.

In this address he referred to one of the reports made by the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I am the chairman of this Subcommittee on Europe and at the time the report was written, I was fortunate to have the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] as a member of my committee.

He was a member of the special study mission to Europe following the Hungarian revolution which was the subject of the study mission's report. His contribution to the study mission is now equalled by his reports on Cuba and the enormous problems involved in the Communist takeover with the assistance of Fidel Castro, of these peoples by the leaders of the Kremlin.

I regret that the aggression and seizure of the peoples of eastern Europe was not a lesson and forewarning to us and to the nations of the Western Hemisphere in meeting the subversion of Cuba by the U.S.S.R.

We must meet the problem of Cuba with calm deliberation. I regretted the day President Eisenhower withdrew recognition of Cuba. Recognition has not been withdrawn from other Communist controlled nations and by not withdrawing recognition, a nation can always maintain a foothold in a country by maintaining an embassy, even though small.

I know my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], will help to keep the spark of liberty alive in the hearts of the peoples of the captive nations throughout the world and I hope we will all see the day when we will again see them a free people.

I am happy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address of our colleague, the Honorable ARMISTEAD SELDEN:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE ARMISTEAD SELDEN AT PLENARY MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS, CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT INTERNATIONAL CENTER, NEW YORK CITY, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1962

Five years ago, following the Hungarian Revolution, the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs undertook a special study mission. In Paris, Vienna, Munich, Bonn, London, Warsaw, and Belgrade, members of the subcommittee sought to determine the effect of U.S. policy toward Soviet satellite nations, in the wake of the massacre of Budapest.

As a member of the subcommittee I learned firsthand, from Hungarian refugees, the grim results of the failure of the United States and the free world to meet the challenge of Budapest.

Five years have passed since our subcommittee, in its report to the Congress, said:

"The forces of communism are committed to making colonies of all nations by any means available, with no recognition of any standard except that might makes right. In any consideration of policy, it must be remembered that peace will not be secured by any evidence of weakness in the free world's struggle against Soviet power and Soviet propaganda.

"The survival of Western civilization," said the 1957 subcommittee report, "depends on the influence exercised by the United States, not alone upon the nations which are free today, but, more important, upon those nations which yearn for freedom now—the satellite nations. We have reached a turning point in history where, unless we formulate and implement policies of action, courageously and firmly executed, scholars might someday read the history of the decay of Western civilization under faltering U.S. leadership."

As a member of that subcommittee and as a Member of Congress, as well as an American concerned about the future of freemen and men who would be free, I regret to say that these words are as true today as they were in 1957.

Indeed, the subcommittee report has proven prophetic—tragically so.

Today, Soviet power subjugates not only the people of Eastern and Central Europe, but the people of a nation a mere 90 miles from the shores of the power center of the free world.

Today, Soviet propaganda works unceasingly to corrode not only the will of captive nations, but the power and will of free nations as well.

Today, the Soviet threat to the survival of civilization is greater than ever before in history.

This is not alarmist talk. It is not defeatist talk. It is simple historical truth, and to ignore it is to compound the errors of the past. For the bitter fact is that during the half-decade which has elapsed since Budapest, time has worked against the free world.

Yet I submit that the reason for this weakening of the free-world position is not that which Soviet propaganda and dogma would have us believe. Our power has not receded because the march of communism is inexorable, but because we did not learn the lesson of Budapest.

In short, the history of the cold war since 1957 is not so much that of Communist success as of free world failure—let me quote again from the subcommittee report—to

"formulate and implement policies of action, courageously and firmly executed."

Incredibly, there remain policymakers in the free world who still cling to illusions regarding the true nature of Soviet imperialism. These people continue to urge on the free world a policy based on their illusions—a policy not of action, but of inaction.

We therefore have witnessed in the past 5 years the emergence of a cold war policy which denies the existence of the cold war, the so-called policy of coexistence.

"Coexistence," "accommodation," "relaxation of tensions"—these are the current words and phrases of the free world's diplomatic vocabulary this autumn of 1962. They are words which gloss over the essential truth of the world in which we live today.

The value of the Assembly of Captive European Nations lies in your continuing efforts to cut through these illusory words and phrases—to lay bare for the people of the free world the grim realities of Soviet power.

Your organization is not simply a symbol of hope for the captive peoples. It is also an instructor and guide for the people, as well as the policymakers, of the free world.

This assembly understands, from the harsh experience of recent history, that Soviet communism allows for only one kind of coexistence, the coexistence known by the captive peoples of Russian imperialism.

This assembly knows, from the cruel lessons inflicted upon your nations and your compatriots, that Soviet communism permits only one form of accommodation—the accommodation forced upon captive peoples by Russian brutality and deceit.

And this assembly can see through the cloud of illusion to reject the foolish and dangerous notion that there can be any true relaxation of tensions in a world half slave to the Kremlin.

No, the cold war continues relentlessly, and those who counsel coexistence, accommodation, and relaxation of tensions do not understand our adversary. As a strategy for survival of our civilization, any policy based on such illusions must fail. It can only hasten a time when, and I quote again from the subcommittee report of 1957, when "scholars might someday read the history of the decay of Western civilization under faltering U.S. leadership."

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I am especially aware of the free world's failure during the past half decade to learn the lesson of Budapest. For during this period we have seen the arm of Soviet imperialism extend, from the bloody streets of Budapest to the bloody prisons of Fidel Castro's Cuba.

From Kadar to Castro—from the enslavement of Eastern and Central Europe to the enslavement of a people neighboring the United States—that is the tragic summary of our failure to act, courageously and firmly, against Soviet aggression.

Cuba today is a captive nation in every sense. All the implements and apparatus which enforce Soviet domination of Central and Eastern Europe, including Russian military personnel and equipment, are today present on that island.

But while the American people are immediately concerned about the Soviet threat in Cuba, and while our attention is focused there, it would be well to trace the policy steps leading to this crisis of the Western Hemisphere.

In my opinion, the free world's failure to formulate a purposeful and sustained policy concerning the captive nations of Europe is a direct cause leading to the establishment of the first captive nation in the Western Hemisphere. A policy which grants and permits the Soviet Union's subversion and overthrow of legitimate governments in Europe has resulted in the Kremlin's challenging the United States on our own frontier.

This course of events is really not surprising. For although there are those policymakers in the free world who think in terms of so-called spheres of influence, the Communists neither know nor respect any limitation on their world aspirations.

"The forces of communism," declared our congressional report 5 years ago, "are committed to making colonies of all nations by any means available, with no recognition of any standard except that might makes right."

Predictably, when the free world assures the Communists that they need fear nothing from us in their own so-called sphere, the Communists intensify their efforts to extend that sphere. Their goal remains world domination, nothing less.

In 1956, when Khrushchev declared "hands off Hungary," the West accommodated. We heard much expert talk then about so-called spheres of influence and the alleged political and military realities of Eastern and Central Europe. The result is that today the Soviet dictator is emboldened to tell us, in the same strident tone, "hands off Cuba."

Where now are the experts who ceded the freedom of 100 million Europeans on the basis of their inhabiting areas within the so-called Soviet "sphere"? Surely these authorities must now recognize that Soviet imprialism is not satisfied by concessions, nor is it derived from or limited by geography.

Cuba, we may be assured, is not a Soviet satellite because of its geographical proximity to the Soviet Union. I submit that the same can be said for the captive nations of Europe. Subversion, force, denial of the right to self-determination, these are the political and military realities which support Soviet domination over Budapest and Havana.

The point is clear, if only our experts will see it. The nations of Eastern and central Europe are not Communist-dominated because of political inevitability, but because the forces of Soviet tyranny have been permitted a free hand by vacillating and indecisive Western policies.

If we begin by accommodating ourselves to Rusian domination in Eastern and central Europe, we inevitably must end by accommodating ourselves, whether we like it or not, to this same domination in the Western Hemisphere.

But this the people of the United States, who bear the greatest share of responsibility for free world policy, will never permit. And that is why I am hopeful that we may yet learn from Havana the lesson of Budapest.

Let us hope that these points are now brought home, to our policy framers as well as our people.

First, that we cannot cede or abandon any people or nation anywhere to Soviet tyranny, but must hold as a tenet of our world policy and faith the ultimate self-determination of all peoples.

To believe or to act otherwise is not simply immoral—it is irresponsible to the interests of Western civilization.

Second, that Communist ambition is global in scope and must be met by global counterstrategy.

Our failure has been that we continue to meet the Communists on cold war battlefields, within the bounds and upon the terms which their interests dictate. Berlin, Vietnam, Cuba, these are the stakes in the world struggle today. Significantly, they are all Western stakes.

A global counterstrategy for the West would mean that Khrushchev would not be given a free hand to pick and choose pressure points convenient only to the Soviet timetable. The vulnerable segments of the Soviet empire can and should be targets for Western political strategy.

Third, that we take the lead in extending the meaning of anticolonialism to include the nations of eastern and central Europe, as well as those in other parts of the world.

If the principle of self-determination means anything, it must be universal and unqualified. Our policymakers speak of taking the lead in the so-called revolution of rising expectations. Let us not overlook the expectations and hopes of the suffering peoples of eastern and central Europe, and let us not forget the brutal suppression of their revolutionary goals.

Here the United Nations faces one of its longstanding challenges, a challenge that cannot be evaded. For the repression of the European captive nations cannot be ignored by the United Nations if its pronouncements concerning self-determination are to be taken seriously.

Self-determination of peoples and nations is not subject to two definitions, one for the underdeveloped parts of the world and the other for Soviet captive peoples and nations. Let the moral finger of the United Nations point accusingly at Communist repression—and let the free world exert its influence in the United Nations toward that end.

Lastly, let the lesson be learned that the greatest hope for world peace and the security of the free world lies in carrying the cold war battle to the enemy—in extending the boundaries of freedom. Communism and Soviet imperialism will not recede or soften or mellow of its own accord. History shows that only the unremitting pressure of freemen, and men who would be free, can subdue tyranny.

Can we then look ahead to "policies of action, courageously and firmly executed?" We may hope that the swift pace of events in this hemisphere in recent weeks may spur courageous and firm action. Two years ago, almost to the day—on September 28, 1960—a program for such action was put forward in simple and direct language.

"I am tired of reading what Khrushchev is doing," said John F. Kennedy to an audience at Erie, Pa. "I would like the people of the world to be reading what the American President is doing, and what the United States is doing, not merely what Castro is doing or Khrushchev is doing or Kadar or Gomulka is doing."

These words of a man who is now President of the leading Nation of the free world reflect the feeling of the people of the United States and of anti-Communist lovers of freedom everywhere.

The time is overdue for this country and its Allies to be up and doing. We must seize the initiative in the cold war through policies aimed at the ultimate elimination of Soviet imperialism—not only in the Western Hemisphere, but throughout the globe.

We live for a day when there need be no assembly of captive European nations. Only, however, when the lesson of Budapest and of Havana is truly learned by freemen—and acted upon by the forces of freedom—can we be assured that this day will come.

Anthony J. Celebrezze: An Excellent Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in selecting Anthony J. Celebrezze as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, President Kennedy has added another truly

outstanding member to his official family.

Mr. Celebrezze brings to his new position the sort of proven talent and character that are at once so difficult to find and so absolutely essential for the direction of one of the Government's most complex and important Departments.

Rarely has an appointment been greeted with such universal applause—and deservedly so. Members of both parties and new mediums espousing many shades of political opinion have been united in their enthusiastic support of this choice.

Mr. Celebrezze comes to the Federal Government from the position of mayor of Cleveland. Five times the people of this great city elected him as their chief executive, and his popularity seemed to increase the longer he stayed in office. For example, the last time he was elected, in 1961, he received almost three-fourths of the total votes and carried every ward in the city.

This overwhelming endorsement was thoroughly deserved. He brought tremendous energy, skill, and dedication to duty to city government.

One of his chief sources of pride lies in the accomplishments under his administration in the fields of slum clearance and urban renewal. This, however, is only the beginning of the rich heritage he has left to the people of Cleveland. His terms also showed great gains in the construction of streets and roads, airports, and seaway facilities. His long-range program to revitalize the central city is well under way.

His interest in education dates at least as far back as his service in the Ohio State Senate where he introduced legislation on this subject, and both welfare and health problems have long engaged his attention and concern as mayor.

He has always been an outspoken supporter of civil rights. When some "reverse freedom riders" were sent from their homes in Alabama to Cleveland, he declared that no action would be taken to bar other Negroes from coming to this city. "They're Americans," he said, and "have a right to free movement."

Mr. Celebrezze has a reputation for frank talk and full discussion about public problems under his jurisdiction. He is soft spoken and blessed with a lively sense of humor. But he cannot be pushed around, as some of his opponents have found out.

He is a former president of the American Municipal Association, a member of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and, at the time President Kennedy appointed him, he was president of the United States Conference of Mayors. These are positions of honor and distinction, as well as being demanding in terms of hard work. They are additional measures of his capacities and of the esteem in which he is held by his colleagues.

The new Secretary was born in 1910 in Anzi, Italy. His parents were naturalized American citizens who were visiting in Italy when young Anthony arrived. He is, incidentally, the first Cabinet member of Italian descent in American history.

His career in the public service has been, in the words of the Christian Science Monitor, "something akin to Horatio Alger." One of 13 children, young Anthony started working as a newsboy and at other odd jobs when he was only 6 years old, and he has been working hard ever since.

After receiving his law degree from Ohio Northern University, he practiced law, served in the Navy in World War II, and entered public life through election to the Ohio Senate. In 1953 he began his remarkably successful administration as mayor of Cleveland.

As head of a Federal department administering more than 100 programs, employing almost 80,000 people, and spending annually several billion dollars, Anthony Celebrezze will have his hands full. We cannot, of course, know now what sort of Secretary he will be, but surely the evidence indicates forcefully that he could be a great one.

We know about his character, his courage, his integrity, and his great administrative ability.

We know that when he accepted President Kennedy's appointment he said: "I took the job because I like to help people and am interested in what happens to them."

What more practical and more meaningful philosophy could we hope for in the man upon whom millions of Americans depend for their health, security, and well-being.

Russian Roulette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Reverend A. McKay Brabham, Jr., editor of the South Carolina Methodist Advocate, has written an excellent editorial in the September 13, 1962, issue of the South Carolina Methodist Advocate entitled "Russian Roulette." I commend it to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIAN ROULETTE

(By A. McKay Brabham, Jr.)

For quite some time past, critics of our Nation's moral life have pointed out that we are doomed to God's retribution if we do not remember our heritage and seek to return to Him in penitence.

Recalling the days when the Hebrews, the chosen people of God, were reduced to slavery and carried away into exile by pagan armies of Assyria, of Babylon, and of Rome, the critics have wondered if this fate is to be our own, with Russian armies in the role of the ancient captors.

Some have believed this so extensively that they have appeared also to believe that "peace at any price" is better than risking the destruction of the world by any forceful opposition to the enslavement of great portions of the world.

Whatever the motivation may have been, our generation has seen the abandonment of China to the Communists, the utter waste of clear-cut victory in Korea, the desecration of freedom in Hungary, the walling in of Berlin, and now it views the occupation of Cuba by Russian troops.

Shortly we expect to see the Russian flag raised over that island and the announcement that Russia is protecting it from the United States.

We believe our Nation is at a crossroad in history's unfolding.

Our Nation's history discloses that we have been willing to preserve human freedom by the use of force when necessary. Many valiant men have died for that preservation.

If this is still a part of our Nation's belief and action, then the time has come to move swiftly, without announcement, and before further rottening of the world situation sets in.

Either we invade Cuba now by all of the force necessary to remove Communist forces from that land, or we as a nation and as individuals, had best go down upon our knees and ask God to teach us every available technique of nonviolent means of living in slavery.

If we believe in pacifism as the solution to our problems, we had best be learning how to practice it as a nation, for we now have a gun at our heads, a knife at our throats, and the Communist needle is ready to inject the virus of abject slavery into our veins.

If, however, we believe that God still treasures human freedom, and if we believe that we have a moral obligation to preserve that freedom for ourselves, for our children, and our children's children, then we had best ring Cuba round with ships, fill the skies overhead with planes, move into the island, send the Russians home, and without fear or equivocation declare to the world that this is still the land of the free, and the home of the brave.

We must make no mistake about this. Russia is dedicated to the destruction of freedom in this land of ours. In Cuba, she has the foothold which will make it possible. To allow her to retain control of Cuba will simply signal to her that the fear of death has infected this Nation to such a point it will take no steps to preserve its very life.

The Lincoln Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as a student and collector of Lincoln books, memorabilia and lore, I have been fascinated by and greatly interested in a recent discovery by the charming corn tassel lady, Margo Cairns. Her avid interest and persuasiveness in promoting the corn tassel as a national flower is well known, but her great interest in the heritage and history of our country is unfortunately not so well known. In order to make known her interest in the patriots and the early fabulous development of our country and to help her at the same time to advance the cause for which she works with such charm and diligence, I am inserting, under unanimous consent, the fine article entitled "The Lincoln Memorial," by Margo Cairns, in the RECORD so that this interesting revelation may get wide distribution:

THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL

(By Margo Cairns)

Inspired by the highest precepts of Americana architect and sculptor have given to the people of the United States that which is considered as being one of the finest memorials in modern times.

This superb tribute to a man who has become an immortal is many things to many people. To the architect, it is a notable example of a Grecian temple. To the sculptor, it is a shrine worthy of his great statue of the Emancipator. To the student of symbolism it is a marble tablet to be read with spiritual senses alert.

To the lover of Lincoln lore it seemed to lack the vital link that gave meaning to the whole. Amid all the exquisite symbolism reflecting the glory of his mature life was there nothing to tell of Abe Lincoln's early year spent in three log cabins, and of that which sustained his life? The memorial would not, could not, be complete without some beautiful tribute to our native American plant—corn.

Born in a crude log cabin on a rocky farm in Kentucky little Abe was put to work early by his improvident father dropping seed corn in holes made with a pointed stick. His boyhood years were spent in a cabin in Indiana. Here the trees had to be felled and the land cleared before the corn could be planted. In Illinois, again his home was in a log cabin and cornbread the primal necessity of life. As a country lawyer he lived in close proximity to fields of the golden grain.

I had visited the Lincoln Memorial several times, drawn in reverence up into the inner chamber and embraced by the monastic hush that always pervades this shrine, but I saw no evidence of corn. I inquired of guards and guides, searched descriptive literature, but found no answer to my seeking. Sunday I called a cab to again search for what I was sure must be there. It was. Skillfully, with deep understanding, the sculptor had placed the tribute to corn at the approach to the edifice, in the beginning as corn was in Abraham Lincoln's life.

On each side of the wide flight of gleaming marble steps leading up 45 feet into the inner sanctuary are tripods chiseled from Tennessee marble and mounted on mammoth blocks of stone. On each of the 3 sides of the tripods is a stalk of corn bearing 5 ears of corn, 30 ears in all. The numeral 30 is fascinating, symbolizing the first 30 years, or the formative years of Abraham Lincoln's life. Born in 1809 he was 40 years of age when he entered the fuller life of public service in Springfield, then in Washington.

Writing of Lincoln the poet Malone says:

"A blend of mirth and sadness, smiles and tears;
A quaint knight errant of the pioneers;
A homely hero, born of star and sod;
A peasant prince; a masterpiece of God."

Tuscaloosa, Ala., News Pays Tribute to Samuel A. Hobson, Brother of Spanish-American War Hero, Adm. Richmond Pearson Hobson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Tuscaloosa News about the passing of Samuel A. Hobson, brother of Spanish-American war hero, Adm. Richmond Pearson Hobson.

I might add that both of these distinguished citizens of Alabama were the uncles of my distinguished colleague from Louisiana, Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON, their sister, Florence Hobson Morrison, being his mother.

The following is what the Tuscaloosa (Ala.) News said in its editorial:

HIS LIFE WAS UNUSUAL ONE

They buried a man in Greensboro the other day who had lived a full and useful life. He was Samuel Augustus Hobson, brother of Spanish-American war hero Adm. Richmond Pearson Hobson.

Trained in law, experienced in journalism, and active in geology, Hobson didn't realize his dream and great ambition—to develop a major oilfield in northwest Alabama. But before ill health caused him to retire from active efforts in oil exploration, he had made arrangements for 10 wells to be drilled in the Phil Campbell area where he had great hopes that a producing field could be developed.

Hobson is credited with bringing in the State's first gasfield in Fayette County and was among those who brought in the White House gas well near Haleyville. In the latter development he was associated with local businessmen. Haleyville had been his headquarters in recent years as he endeavored to widen the scope of the White House well area and to develop a field that would make the northwest portion of the State realize its full potential as an oil-producing area.

He often told his friends that his ambition was to develop a great oilfield that would bring prosperity to this area of the State. He didn't realize that ambition but the work he did has laid the foundation for others to take over his efforts amid the hope that his dream will come true before too many years pass.

His life was an unusual one.

What Total Government Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent editorial from the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth, which is published in my congressional district. The editorial is an excellent succinct declaration of what totalitarian government means:

The editorial follows:

WHAT TOTAL GOVERNMENT MEANS

The new Soviet triumph in space has given the free world an awesome glimpse of what the "total" means in totalitarian.

Why are the Soviets ahead in space? Basically, because they decided this was an area in which it was to their advantage to excel—from the propaganda standpoint at least, perhaps also from the military standpoint.

Having so decided, the Kremlin channeled people and materials in that direction, ruthlessly, inexorably.

High up in the Kremlin, it was decided that space science would come before everything else—the people would have to get along without both luxuries and what many Americans consider necessities.

Once this was decided, there were no labor unions to protest by strike, no investors to protest by withholding their funds, no legislature to filibuster, no Supreme Court to hear an appeal, no informed public opinion to raise serious questions.

That's what total means.

And when a government like Russia's has total control, all the elements are like puppets on a string.

The movements are coordinated and timed, for total effect.

Note that the Soviets timed this space spectacular to coincide with the first anniversary of the shame wall in Berlin. Undoubtedly they wanted to take the world's attention away from that wall.

Within a week after Cosmonaut Gherman Titov orbited the earth 17 times last August, the Communists gambled that the West would not react and erected the wall dividing Berlin.

In September 1959, just prior to Khrushchev's first visit to the United States as a guest of President Eisenhower, the Russians landed their famous lunik rocket on the moon.

During his American tour, Khrushchev constantly referred to the lunik shot in his claims of Communist superiority over capitalism.

That's what "total" means: Economics, politics, science, and propaganda welded into a single instrument aimed to dominate the world.

Abraham Lincoln raised the challenge whether a nation so conceived and so dedicated as ours could long endure.

We believe the answer is a resounding yes. But it will take a great deal more plain hard work, sacrifice, and cooperation within the framework of freedom to get the job done.

Reminder on Genocide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, 1962, a framed certificate of honor was presented to Mr. James Russell Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post, by Mr. Louis E. Shecter on behalf of the American Jewish Congress, for the excellent editorial on the Genocide Convention which appeared on May 24, 1962, in the Post.

In view of the general interest in the Genocide Convention, I would like to call this excellent editorial to the attention of our citizens:

REMINDER ON GENOCIDE

It is peculiarly appropriate that the prosecutor of Adolf Eichmann, Israeli Attorney General Gideon Hausner, should remind the American people that their government has not yet ratified the Genocide Convention a decade and a half after its adoption by the United Nations. Genocide, designated a crime under international law by the General Assembly in 1946, means the deliberate destruction of a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group.

Although the American delegation was largely instrumental in bringing about unanimous acceptance of the Genocide Convention by the General Assembly, the U.S. Senate faltered over ratification. The reason lay in a neurotic anxiety, rooted no doubt in a

sense of guilt, that the convention might be invoked against this country because of discrimination here against Negroes. The anxiety was absurd, of course. The convention defines genocide in such a way as to forbid its application to any denial of individual rights; it does not outlaw discrimination but only an attempt at outright destruction. It is aimed, obviously, at the sort of extermination of a whole ethnic group planned by the Nazis against the Jews.

Ratification of the Genocide Convention is important as an elementary step toward the establishment of a rule of international law. The United States should no longer lag behind the rest of the civilized world in taking this step.

Our Foreign Aid Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, if the United States is to continue to set an example to the world with the generosity of its foreign aid contributions, perhaps it is time to think of what other examples we can set as well. We have at our disposal, in this country, the most effective economic system as yet conceived by man. With it, we have maintained a degree of freedom for the individual unequalled by any nation. Though neither system and state of conditions is perfect, both are available as examples to follow and goals to strive for by other human societies.

Our failure to exploit our unique position in this regard, both for our benefit and for those abroad seeking freedom and economic improvement is vividly illustrated in the following editorial which appeared in the Cortland (N.Y.) Daily Standard of September 11. The article is particularly timely in view of our present consideration of the foreign aid bill, now before the House:

WHY POISON OUR OWN WELL?

For a nation which has established the highest living standards in the world out of its hard-headed knack for creating wealth, we certainly have developed a strange way of showing others how it is done.

The trouble appears to be that in sharing our abundance with other nations through aid programs to help them build their own economies, we have persistently refused to point out that if these funds are used to destroy the free enterprise that generates them, then obviously the funds must eventually dry up.

This theory holds that we can't intervene in the plans of other nations by laying down certain spending conditions, despite the fact that the lack of such conditions has continued to operate to the detriment of these programs and against the best interests of the free world economy.

Take India. In face of a desperate national need for schools, roads, dams, and other social facilities, our aid funds are being poured into projects that compete directly with private enterprises which operate much more efficiently.

As a case in point, some time ago the Tata Iron & Steel Co., a private firm in India, was licensed by Mercedes-Benz to develop with its patents a cheap automobile badly needed to meet transportation requirements. The Government refused to grant Tata permission to produce the automobile, and instead assigned the job to the public steel mills which Tata outproduces by a 3 to 1 ratio. The result: India's Government officially announced this month that they had given up on the production of a cheap automobile.

No wonder manufacturers and financiers take a dim view toward committing private investment in foreign aid countries. And without such private investment, our aid programs will continue to drag their feet.

The Alliance for Progress in Latin America, launched only a year ago, is no exception. It is compounding the same fatal error of allowing funds to be expended for projects which work against the free enterprise which generated those funds.

The objectives of our overall aid, however desirable and essential, are not enough. We must safeguard the means of achieving them. We must adopt the inflexible rule that no aid funds will be granted to those countries which use them directly or indirectly to compete with free enterprise.

Let's give ourselves a chance.

London's Lessons for New York's Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the best articles on the subject of the importance of parks in crowded urban centers has recently been written by Whitney North Seymour, Jr., and was published in the September 9 issue of the New York Times magazine.

Mr. Seymour makes a comparison of New York parks and the London parks. Having long been an admirer of the parks of London and spent many hours in past years exploring them, I know first hand some of the things that the city of London has done in this regard. New York City can learn much from this. Mr. Seymour, a distinguished constituent of mine who has long been active in civic causes in New York, has brilliantly laid out the case for improved parks in New York City. He has done so by portraying the great comparison that exists between the park systems of two of the world's leading cities.

I commend Mr. Seymour's article to the attention of all of those who are interested in urban growth and development.

LONDON'S LESSONS FOR NEW YORK'S PARKS

(By Whitney North Seymour, Jr.)

(Whitney North Seymour, Jr., has been active in civic groups in New York for many years. He is currently chairman and a director of the Park Program Committee of the nonprofit Park Association of New York, Inc.)

When Maj. Gherman S. Titov, the Russian astronaut, visited New York last spring, he was asked by reporters what he thought of the city after the first day of his visit. His answer was quick and disconcertingly accurate. "There are too many cars here," he said, "and there is very little green in the town."

Major Titov would not have been able to say the same thing about London if he had been visiting there instead, certainly as far as the amount of green was concerned. London boasts one of the finest collections of city parks in the world. Yet, not satisfied with its past achievements, the city is currently engaged in a new and exciting program of park development which would make any visitor gape in wonder.

The basic components of London's current open-space program are three. First of all, there is an ambitious working plan for land acquisition, particularly aimed at creating green acres in slum areas. Second, each new park currently being developed in London is custom made to fit its neighborhood. Third, the aim of the whole park program is to give greater enjoyment to the people who use the parks, from infants to octogenarians.

The contrast between London's park program and New York's is dramatic. The nearsighted policy of New York City in fixing austerity budgets for both park operations and park expansion has made our parks unattractive and unappealing. Much of the glory of New York's existing parks goes back to the 19th century. Hard pavement, concrete benches, iron fences and "Keep Off the Grass" signs are the hallmarks of the city's newer parks. In sharp contrast, London's parks are bursting with flowers, inviting green expanses and decorative physical facilities. Moreover, London's park program is producing new and attractive sitting parks every year.

At this moment there are three brandnew large parks being created in heavily populated parts of London where no open space existed before. The most ambitious of the new projects is in North Camberwell. The London County Council has planned a 135-acre park in the midst of a large slum area, to be developed over the course of several decades as land is acquired and cleared.

Thirty acres of new park space have already been created in a jigsaw pattern, with pieces ranging from one-fifth of an acre up to 5 acres. Each piece has been developed into an operating park available for immediate use, yet with an eye toward its inclusion in an overall park area over the course of 30 or 40 years. A similar project to create new park land is underway in London's East End, with the ultimate goal being a green area a mile and a half long.

Typical of the enterprise being used in the new park acquisition program is Haggerston Park in Shoreditch. This 3¾-acre sitting park is the first stage of a proposed 27-acre park in an overcrowded neighborhood. It is laid out on a site formerly occupied by a canal and defunct gasworks. The canal has been transformed into a sunken garden and the rusted gas tanks have been replaced by a broad green lawn. Additional reclaimed land will be available for public use this fall, while on adjoining blocks other buildings are marked for future demolition.

London's current open-space program is not limited to these larger projects. The County Council also hopes to create more parks along the banks of the Thames River, which runs through the heart of London. In recent years three new sitting parks have been created along the river as well as a number of other small sitting parks scattered throughout the city's heavily populated districts.

London's park achievements include more than the creation of open space. They also include the manner in which the space is used. Each new park is custommade to serve the community in which it is placed. Instead of grinding out concrete benches and pavement like urban sausages, London has planning teams which make a study of existing facilities and expected future developments in schools, population change, and similar factors, and then reconcile the various needs for quiet areas, children's playgrounds, playing fields for older children,

and other use requirements to achieve the best possible balance.

In the process of creating new parks, the London County Council has kept the pleasure of citizens uppermost in mind. The results can be seen in a number of park features that would make any New Yorker jealous.

Probably the most striking thing about London's parks is the profusion of flowers. Some parks, like the Victoria Embankment Gardens, have splendid floral displays all summer long. Others provide particular seasonal attractions like the spectacular rhododendron and azalea blooms in Dulwich Park. But virtually every sitting park in London has flower beds of some sort. The tiny sitting areas have flowers growing in tubs, or raised beds, while larger parks frequently boast formal gardens. Flowers are obviously the pride of the Park Department personnel, who tend them with loving care. Many of the medium-sized parks have special fenced-in nurserywork areas where seedlings are started in cold frames to be later set out in the beds.

Another appealing feature about London's parks is the frequency of expanses of green grass. Any well-indoctrinated New Yorker is surprised to see how many parks have only two or three benches, instead of endless rows. If you ask a park department employee why, he will give a forthright explanation: most people sit on the grass. They are glad to have them do it. London's horticultural experts have apparently found a variety of grass that is a good lush green and yet tough enough not to suffer from shoe leather or elbows.

A delightful aspect of the general use of lawns is the availability of deck chairs for rental at a nominal fee. Particularly in the downtown parks such as Lincoln's Inn Fields and Victoria Embankment Gardens, hundreds of happy Londoners can be seen reclining in canvasbacked chairs enjoying the out-of-doors.

Another agreeable London park feature is the intentional creation of "depressions" in grassed areas to make them more comfortable for reclining. These are shallow, bowl-shaped areas 15 to 20 feet across which provide comfortable reclining slopes that just fit the curvature of the spine. They are designed deliberately to encourage more people to use and enjoy the grass.

London probably has some advantage over New York when it comes to growing grass and plants because of the higher incidence of rain and fog there, but this does not give it as great an edge as one might suppose. London, like New York, also has an air pollution problem, which means that flowers and grass have to fight for survival against fumes and soot just as much as they do here. The occasional flowerbeds in New York's parks, like the one at the base of the Holley statue in Washington Square or on the mound in Madison Square, amply demonstrate that the main reason for the flower shortage in our town is the city's budget and not the city's climate.

Some of the "furniture" in the parks in London also deserves admiration. There are picnic areas which consist of nothing more than large flat rocks set out on the grass to serve as tables for picnickers. Refreshment stands have brightly colored umbrellas as well as attractive tables and chairs for open-air use. There are well-designed wooden fences instead of chain-link where parks abut on private property. Attractive shelters have been built as protection against sudden showers.

Sundials are frequent items of park decoration, as are raised flowerbeds and tubs. Low brick walls, just the right height for sitting on, are often worked into park layouts. Park lighting fixtures and even water fountains reflect enterprising contemporary design. Special attractions often add to the delight of park users, such as the dovecote in Haggerston Park and the group of peacocks on the lawn in Holland Park.

London helps insure public enjoyment of parks by an ambitious program of entertainment throughout the warm-weather period. There are some 1,500 performances given in public parks in London during the summer season. These include symphony concerts, open-air "grass theater" performances, where ballet, opera and drama may be seen, and folk music and folk dancing. The most popular performances, of course, are brass-band concerts of which there are often over 30 a week.

Children are particular favorites under the London County Council's entertainment program. During 1962, over 500 children's shows will have been given, with performances by magicians, clowns, ventriloquists, puppets and Punch and Judy. Mobile motion-picture trucks will have visited 60 different locations during the summer with films especially selected for children. There are also special children's symphony concerts.

London's parks also boast exciting sculpture exhibitions, which are held every 3 years. Two years ago, the pieces of sculpture shown in Battersea Park included works by Picasso, Henry Moore and Epstein.

To make sure that all Londoners know about the wealth of entertainment available to the public in the parks, the park department publishes a sixpenny handbook which gives a comprehensive listing of the program for each day in complete detail. On a typical Saturday during the summer, one can choose among a symphony concert, a play, a ballet, several band concerts, 3 or 4 music-hall variety shows, dancing for older persons in several parks, 8 to 10 children's programs, plus 1 or 2 other special events such as swimming competitions and bicycle races.

The Sunday program is almost entirely given over to band concerts, with upward of 20 different concerts available in different parks throughout the city. A similar schedule of varied entertainment also is available on weekdays. On any day there are half a dozen band concerts or musical entertainments, as well as a score of children's shows.

The London County Council distributes other official publications to increase public park enjoyment. One is a comprehensive pocket map of London parks which not only itemizes the recreation facilities available in each park, but also gives precise directions on how to reach particular parks by bus or subway.

In 1961, the council started another innovation by publishing special annual booklets to encourage public interest in particular parks in various parts of the city. These attractive publications include maps, color pictures and a full description of the features of parks in some sections of the city, including a full walking tour. A comprehensive guide book also exists for the royal parks of London.

Two other recent London park developments deserve special mention. One is the concept of "play parks," a program instituted in 1959. Scattered throughout London, there are a total of 10 park areas specially set aside for use by children under supervision but without strict controls. Play leaders are instructed to let the children play freely without unnecessary interference. The play parks operate after school hours during the year and all day on holidays, which permits the recruitment of qualified play leaders on a part-time basis.

The play park areas usually comprise about 2 acres and are divided into as many as five sections. One is a "quiet area," another is for team games, a third for games played by girls, a fourth is an "adventure area," and the fifth area usually a sand pit for very small children.

The new playgrounds being built in London, both in conjunction with the new parks and in the new public housing projects, are highly imaginative, with frequent use of bright colors. Each one is designed separately with its own special facilities, and one may find such varied playthings as steam rollers, castles, rowboats, and giant maps. A spirit of adventure is encouraged through the use of devices like stockades, climbing nets and log piles.

All in all, the current park program in London sets a standard which New York could emulate to great advantage. Make no mistake, not everything in the London parks is perfect—there appear to be not enough trees in the newer parks, for example, and sometimes the effect of newness gives a somewhat clinical feeling—but the tremendous advances of the current program far outstrip anything we are doing here.

Slowly but surely we New Yorkers are coming to the realization that urban living is here to stay, and that we need to give more and more attention to making city life tolerable. Our parks are obviously one of the major areas that need expansion and improvement. With increasing leisure time through a shorter working week, retirement, greater longevity and mechanized household worksavers, we must make more and better recreation space in the heart of the city for leisure-time use by citizens.

Happily, our present parks commissioner, Newbold Morris, has expressed a fresh interest in the need for small sitting parks in congested areas. He points out that such parks pay for themselves eventually because of the increased property values in the adjoining neighborhood. Commissioner Morris deserves full support in his efforts to obtain new open space in the built-up parts of the city. Those efforts, however, should not be timid. What is needed is a bold approach to the actual creation of new parks by clearing the space to build them.

The real stumbling block to such a program lies at City Hall in the failure of the board of estimate to authorize an adequate budget for the acquisition and maintenance of parks in the first place. Interested citizens could help turn the tide by reminding the mayor, the comptroller, the borough president, the president of the city council, and the individual councilmen, that we citizens want more parks and better parks just as much as we want decent schools and hospitals. The city planning commission needs to be told, too.

The park department can in turn do its part by discarding its fixed-formula approach to park and playground design and by giving stimulus to custom-made recreation areas and park entertainment programs with a premium on greenery, imagination and enjoyment.

There is no reason why we could not have all that London has, and more, if we would only speak up and demand it.

Conflict Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue my insertions on a series of articles, this being the third article, by Edward Scannell Butler, of New Orleans, La., on the conflict management schemes of Communist agents, and the manner in which American businessmen

can meet this threat to our free institutions by establishing conflict management corporations of their own. Mr. Butler, who is the staff director of the Information Council of the Americas—INCA—in New Orleans, wrote his series of articles for Challenge, the publication of the Young Men's Business Club of Jefferson Parish and the thoughts he presents in them are important for us as Americans to grasp.

The third article on "Conflict Management" is entitled "Part III: Conflict Corporations for Counterattack" and follows:

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT: PART III—CONFLICT CORPORATIONS FOR COUNTERATTACK

(By Edward Scannell Butler)

Conflict management is a new business for American businessmen. Conflict management can help existing businesses insure themselves against expropriation and outright confiscation, preserve and extend the total market, defend individual life, liberty, and property—while at the same time providing a challenging new career field for thousands.

At present there are only a few hundred non-Communist conflict managers in the free world. To utilize their talents and know-how best, private industry should grant funds immediately for the following purposes:

CONFLICT CONSULTATION

Political warfare counsel at the top-management level should become a recognized requirement for every U.S. business with foreign interests. With proper counsel, standard trade missions, advertising and public relations, could become both selling aids and cold war weapons. Similarly, our farflung corporate personnel (both United States and foreign nationals) could be taught to perform conflict management tasks of great value to freedom, without impairing their normal business functions. Business today has a willing, but untrained army which it could mobilize to defend itself, with the proper counsel at the top level.

CONFLICT COLLEGES

In the United States, public demand has created a legion of professional, semiprofessional, and amateur anti-Communists. It's difficult to determine who the proportionally few conflict managers are.

To complicate matters more, in spite of giant Soviet expenditures on it, and proven successes with it, there is still some debate as to whether conflict management exists—i.e., whether political warfare can be studied and practiced as an operational science. Business could end the debate, chase the charlatans, and provide the needed stream of accredited manpower by earmarking funds to establish chairs of conflict management within the universities. From these seeds would come the private "colleges of conflict management" needed to compete with the annual massive manpower advantage of the Communists.

CONFLICT CORPORATIONS

There are huge areas of conflict—too big for any normal business to cover, but too low for any free government to reach. These conflict twilight zones are vitally important nevertheless, because the mass base is where the Communists now concentrate. Here is the arena of the conflict corporation—a private, nonprofit, usually tax-exempt enterprise, geared specifically and exclusively to counterattack Red psychological, political, and economic probes beneath the official level.

Because conflict corporations are a most practical way to mobilize private enterprise ("The one weapon we have that the Communist cannot duplicate"), let's take a closer look at what they are and how they operate:

FREE CONFLICT CORPORATIONS IN CROSS SECTION

Today the United States has about 150 recognized groups and organizations, uniformly underfunded and understaffed, which claim to be anti-Communist. Scores of local discussion groups are growing up each day. Obviously, not all of these organizations can be called bona fide conflict corporations. They range from childish to extremely professional. In the latter category are: The University of Pennsylvania's Foreign Policy Research Institute, the Rand Corp., and the Institute for American Strategy.

All of these scholarly organizations are engaged in research on Communist conflict management and the development of affirmative strategies to overcome the long Communist leadtime. The IAS adds an extra dimension by sponsoring seminars for executive personnel in education, government, and industry, all have published studies on conflict management.

The most noteworthy books are "Protracted Conflict," "A Forward Strategy for America" (FPRI), "The Organizational Weapon" (Rand), and "American Strategy for the Nuclear Age" (IAS).

A new kind of conflict corporation which operates domestically is the recently chartered Cold War Council, headed by Henry Mayers, a Los Angeles advertising executive.

The Cold War Council's top-priority job is to make legislators aware of cold war issues by informing "the folks back home." Mr. Mayers believes that ironically, although there are literally hundreds of lobbies for various special interests, there is no lobby for freedom to explain conflict management to the electorate and its representatives, yet conflict management should be everyone's special interest.

One special interest which the Cold War Council (as a political action group) is currently pressing, is the freedom academy bill designed to inaugurate a West Point of cold warfare. The Communists have 177 such propaganda colleges in Russia alone, the United States has none.

Another of Cold War Council's efforts will be to focus publicity on little-known facts which will forewarn the public. For instance, events suggest that few businessmen have any idea that there are specific Red propaganda themes beamed toward them now, in 1962, much less what they are. Hence they can't act to protect themselves.

There are numerous conflict corporations operating internationally. One, Radio Liberation, is beamed at Russia itself. Another, the recently founded Information Council of the Americas (INCA) is the first conflict corporation designed to help prevent the communization of an entire continent. It will operate throughout Latin America. INCA's program is aimed at supplying the need for eyewitness information on Communist tactics from an effective source. INCA will feature testimony of Cuban refugees and other living proof of Red lies. Its first project, weekly half hour truth tapes, will be broadcast by local Latin radio stations. INCA will establish regional councils in several Latin nations.

The best known and biggest conflict corporation is Radio Free Europe. Radio Free Europe is privately financed, nonprofit and beamed at the Iron Curtain countries. Many people confuse Radio Free Europe with the Voice of America, which is the official voice of the U.S. Government, operated by the U.S. Information Agency. Voice of America is doing a magnificent job on a relatively small budget.

Radio Free Europe has grown from a little 7½-kilowatt mobile transmitter in Germany, to a professional organization which employs about 1,200 people and is budgeted at about $10 million per year.

THE ECONOMICS OF CONFLICT

Those U.S. businessmen who consider the cold war their business know that the Reds fear Radio Free Europe so much, they spend $100 million per year trying futilely to jam its broadcasts. This is a 10-to-1 ratio in our favor, and an estimated 75 percent of the Radio Free Europe message gets through.

Russia, whose gross national product is still far below ours, just can't afford to spot us a Radio Free Europe-like 10-to-1 advantage very often. So they must diagnose our greatest weakness and focus upon it their greatest strength.

Logically then, we have tried to pinpoint our own weakness by closely analyzing the Red effort, in comparison with our own competition to it.

In so doing, the preceding articles have not stressed the free world's many victories—from Greece to Guatemala—over Sino-Soviet expansion. In the public sector, the Marshall plan, NATO and now the concept of an interdependent Atlantic Community and the Alliance for Progress, are positive programs which can succeed, if they are shielded from continual sniping and harrassment at the nonofficial level.

The mass base is the battleground of the free conflict manager. Here, decisive battles of today and tomorrow will be won or lost.

End of Segregation of Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the best informed persons on Indian affairs in my State is retired Superior Court Judge Joseph Wicks. I have known him for many years as one of our outstanding citizens. He has established an enviable record as a jurist. He is an enrolled member of the Cherokee Tribe and his interest in Indian affairs is understandable. His excellent and timely article "End Segregation of Indians" appeared in the September 13 issue of the Omak Chronicle.

For the information of the Members of the House I insert it in the RECORD:

END SEGREGATION OF INDIANS—JUDGE WICKS FEELS RESERVATION SYSTEM SHOULD GO

(By Joseph Wicks, superior court judge, retired)

(Few if any persons in Okanogan County might be considered more competent to discuss the question of State jurisdiction over the Colville Indian Reservation than former Superior Court Judge Joseph Wicks of Omak. Recently Judge Wicks expressed some of his thoughts at the request of the Oroville Chamber of Commerce. His letter is printed here virtually in its entirety.)

It is true that I have some knowledge of the issue of State jurisdiction over our Indian citizens other than my contact with it as superior court judge of this district for approximately 15 years.

In fact, I have been in personal contact with the issue all of my life. This is by reason of the fact that I am an enrolled member of the Cherokee Indians, one of the five civilized tribes of the State of Oklahoma.

On the issue of jurisdiction, I have never been able to see eye to eye with the policies of the Federal Government in its dealing with the Indian and his property and have very often found myself at variance with many people of Indian blood, wherein they have sought to have the Federal Government to continue its supervision and jurisdiction over the Indian and his property.

The fact that the Indian was here before the coming of the white man, the black man, and the oriental, does not, in and of itself so far as his rights, powers, privileges, responsibilities and obligations, make him any different from the other American citizens.

Specifically, it is my observation that in many instances the more vocal Indian is the first to demand the benefits provided under State laws for its citizens, but is often reluctant to assume the responsibilities those laws impose upon its beneficiaries. This attitude is wrong in any segment of our people.

I find among the people of Indian blood the learned, the intelligent, the stupid, the industrious and the lazy, just as are found in those of our people who boast a different ancestry. But I also find an attitude among many people of Indian blood of a wish and desire to have the Government support and supervise their property and actions.

This, I think, has been brought about because of the continued policy of the Government to act as a guardian and in many instances as a nursemaid of the Indian. In my opinion this policy is wrong.

That this policy should be changed, and the Indian placed upon the same footing as any other citzen has been recognized by the Federal Government for more than half a century.

There are many instances where the Federal Government has terminated its relation with many of our people of Indian blood, sometimes as individuals, sometimes as a group. In some instances this termination has been on an individual basis by measuring the degree of Indian blood of the individual.

It apparently was the thinking of the powers that be, that if the individual was only of half or a quarter Indian blood, through some mysterious process, he was more intelligent and capable of handling his own affairs than if he were a full-blooded Indian.

This to my mind is fuzzy thinking and reasoning. How can you measure a man's capabilities by the degree of blood he bears from certain of his ancestors?

INDIANS GRANTED U.S. CITIZENSHIP

But, be that as it may, the Federal Government has, as stated above, sought to divorce itself from its paternalistic influence over the Indian. To this end, in 1924, the Congress enacted a law making all Indians citizens of the United States.

This citizenship does and should carry with it responsibilities and obligations. But at the same time the Government held onto the supervision of the Indian and his property. Many States have provisions in their laws that an Indian who does not pay taxes is deprived of the right to vote. (Examine proposition No. 19, a proposed amendment to our State constitution to be voted on by you in the election this fall.)

In 1953, the Congress enacted a law enabling the States to assume jurisdiction in both civil and criminal matters over the Indian and the Indian country within their respective borders. (Indian country is defined by Federal statute as Indian reservations, Indian villages, Indian allotments, and lands held by the Government for the exclusive use and benefit of the Indian.)

In 1957, our State legislature enacted chapter 240, which provided the State "assumes, as hereinafter provided, civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indians and Indian territory, reservations, country and lands within this State in accordance with the consent of the United States given by the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law 280, 83d Congress, 1st sess.)."

If this act had embodied only the portion previously stated, we would not, in this country, be confronted with some of the issues now facing us and which are vital to our local economy and law and order. But the act went further and provided that in the State assumption of this jurisdiction:

"Whenever the Governor shall receive from any tribal council or other governing body of any Indian tribe, community, band or group in this State, a resolution expressing its desire that its people and lands be subject to the criminal and civil jurisdiction of the State of Washington to the extent authorized by the Federal law, he shall issue within 6 days a proclamation to the effect that such jurisdiction shall apply to all Indians and all Indian territory, reservation, country, and lands of the Indian body involved in accordance with the provisions of this act."

Comment: It will be observed that for the State to assume jurisdiction over the Indian and Indian country, it had to come about at the instance of the Indian by the governing body of the tribe presenting a resolution to the Governor. Upon receipt of the resolution, the Governor had no choice but to issue his proclamation assuming jurisdiction by the State.

The choice is all left up to the Indian, with the State powerless to act, but if the Indian desires to come under State jurisdiction, the State has no choice but to accept. Since when must a sovereign State act at the whim of a small group of men representing a small group of our people?

But the law also has a proviso added to the above-quoted section that vitally affects our community. To quote further:

"*Provided*, That with respect to the Colville, Spokane, or Yakima Tribes or Reservation, he shall not issue such proclamation unless the resolution of the tribal council has been ratified by two-thirds majority of the adult enrolled members of the tribe voting in referendum called for that purpose."

Comment: Now we see the question of the State assuming jurisdiction further limited so far as these three tribes are concerned. Not only must the resolution be approved by the tribal council, but it must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the adult enrolees of the tribe who vote upon a referendum called for that purpose. Thus, first who would call for a vote on such a referendum?

Must the vote be called for by the State? The act does not so provide. Must it be called by the tribal council? The act does not so provide. Can it be called by petition of the tribal members petitioning the Indian council or the State? The act does not so provide. Can it be called by the Indian agent? The act does not so provide.

Now, what has been the result of this law? Some seven or eight small bands of Indians who had no means of protecting themselves from the criminal element or any police protection of any consequence, have seen fit to place themselves under the protective cloak of our State government.

The three largest tribes of the State have not only refrained from doing so, but have taken strenuous action to prevent it.

JUSTICE BLACK RULES ON SEYMOUR CASE

Now this has been known to us whose duty as public officials it was to meet and contend with the issue, and these are some of the tools with which we had to work. More than 40 years ago the supreme court of this State handed down a decision holding that what was known and referred to as the diminished Colville Indian Reservation was no longer an Indian reservation and that the State courts had jurisdiction over criminal offenses committed by an Indian when the incident did not occur on an Indian allotment, title to which was held in trust by the Government, or on tribal lands.

Under the authority of that decision, your local State court took jurisdiction over cases so long as the offense did not occur on an Indian allotment of tribal lands by an Indian. In that field the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction.

But recently in the case of *Seymour* v. *The Superintendent of the Washington State Penitentiary* (363 U.S. 351; 7 L. Ed. (2d) 346, 82 Supreme Court 424), Justice Black of the U.S. Supreme Court held our local and State supreme court were in error and that the Diminished Colville Indian reservation is still an Indian reservation, is Indian country over which, so far as criminal offenses committed therein by an Indian, the Federal has exclusive jurisdiction.

The effect of this decision is that though more than half the lands in that portion of the reservation lying in Okanogan County are privately owned, the State has no police powers therein over an Indian who might violate our State laws. He may steal, assault, commit homicide or any other vicious crime against which the citizens of our State are protected against our laws, but the State is powerless to act.

It must rely on the Indian police and Federal officers to protect both the Indians and non-Indians therein. There are four incorporated towns in this territory. They are helpless to enforce their police ordinances against an Indian.

This is an unhealthy and, to say the least, an extremely unusual situation to exist in a sovereign State. It is an unhealthy situation for both Indian and non-Indian. They are both deprived of the police protection of the State against an Indian offender.

Since the Indians and governmental agencies are not equipped to meet this problem, by lack of facilities or personnel, there are many offenses the Indian may commit with practical impunity from punishment. This does not make for good citizenship.

The State having no jurisdiction in civil matters in this territory, the Indian being deprived of the rights to contract, so far as his property is concerned, is to deprive him of one of the basic freedoms of American citizenship.

In short, when he is deprived of the use of our court from the criminal element and deprived of the right of contract, he is made a second-rate citizen and I, for one, do not believe there should be any second-rate citizen in this country, no matter what his origin, so long as he conducts himself as an American citizen.

If he violates our laws he should pay the penalty for his transgression. We give the criminal the right to rehabilitate himself and regain full citizenship, but not so with the Indian.

It is my humble opinion that the sooner the Indian is required to assume the responsibilities of American citizenship as well as the acceptance of its benefits, the better for him and the better for all of our people.

Now this situation could very easily be corrected so far as it affects us locally. The Congress has, by Public Law 280, enabled the State to assume jurisdiction over the Indian and Indian country. A simple law declaring that the State, under the Federal statute does assume such jurisdiction is all that is necessary.

Such a bill was before the last session of our legislature. It passed the senate and the house, but in the dying hours of the session it was referred back to the committee for further consideration, and there died.

During this session, the members of the legislature were pressured by members of the councils of these three larger tribes of the State and their attorneys, and even some of our county offices, not to pass this law. In that they succeeded.

Since then, the Seymour case has brought the matter to a head. It has dawned upon the people of this county the seriousness of the situation.

So today we find many of the Indians themselves advocating the legislature to pass a law whereby the State assume and perform its obligations. It would seem an act of folly for such a law to fail to pass at the next session of the legislature in 1963.

JUVENILE SITUATION IS ALSO CONFUSED

There are many other aspects of the issue not here discussed. For instance by the case of *Adams* v. *Superior Court* (57 Wash. (2) 187) it is held that the juvenile court has no jurisdiction over a dependent or delinquent Indian child residing in the Indian country.

The Indian child may be deserted or neglected by its parents or those responsible for its care and education, but your local State court is without power to protect it. It can freeze or starve, but the State courts are powerless to act.

There is a serious question as to whether the State has jurisdiction over the mentally incompetent Indian. May a State court admit him to a State institution for care? May a State court appoint a guardian to protect him and his property that is not held in trust for him if he resides on the reservation?

If the welfare department in its program of aid to dependent children provides a foster home for the child, how can a delinquent parent be prevented from removing the child from such foster home care? If an Indian child is a delinquent, the State is powerless to act, if he resides on the reservation. If the parent refused to send the child to school, may the State enforce its compulsory school law? The ramifications of this tragic situation are endless.

Segregation of the American Indian should end. No other segment of our people have been so segregated as the Indian under the policies of the Government, in its dealing with these people. No other people have been rounded up as cattle and placed on a tract of land and compelled to remain there.

No other of our people have had their children rounded up and shipped off to schools hundreds and even thousands of miles from their homes, and compelled to associate with only members of their race, deprived of association and education with those with whom they must rub elbows, if they attempt to take their place in our society where there should be equal opportunity for all, with special privileges to none.

I repeat, to place any man or any group of people in such a category, is to brand him as a second-rate citizen, which is contrary to every principle of our American way of life.

Is the Reserve Callup Really Needed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an Illinois citizen who is subject to call as a member of the Reserves questions in the following letter the wisdom and justice in calling Reserves short of an acute emergency. Those of us not subject to call can hardly realize the disruptions in family life, job opportunities, and financial resources which can result from a sudden callup. I invite the attention of my colleagues to this letter as they ponder the Presidential request for standby authority to call up 150,000 Reserves:

Rarely do I write a Congressman. For one thing, I do not like to impose on the time of any busy person who has important things to do. For another, I realize the futility of trying to impress my view on a person who is ordinarily firmly committed to a point of view.

The matter which I write about, however, is important to me and I would hope to all of the people. Hence, this letter. It concerns the President's request, recently approved by the Senate, for authority to call up 150,000 reservists to meet an emergency which might arise between now and February 28.

The Senate was told, and the people were informed by the press that this authority was needed to "meet a possible emergency." We were told that there was no present intention to use it. Yesterday, however, the reliable Wall Street Journal reported as follows: "Reservists face some callups even without new blowups abroad. Defense officials expect they'll need sooner or later some of the 150,000 Congress will empower Kennedy to summon. First calls would likely go to communications, supply, transportation specialists. * * *"

This is a double fraud. It is a fraud upon the Congress of the United States and it is a fraud upon the members of the Ready Reserve. Unless an emergency exists, not a single reservist ought to be called up to active duty. The personal hardship involved in the callup of a reservist is almost beyond comprehension to any person not directly affected. This is a different and more severe hardship than being drafted or being held in service while still on active duty. This is expected. A reservist who is called up, however, is snatched up from his home, family and job with disastrous consequences.

In my own case, I have approximately 10½ months obligated Ready Reserve time remaining. For the past 4 years I have been endeavoring to build up a private law practice and have been successful at it. If I am called to active duty for a year, my law practice is finished. It will not take a year out of my life. It will take 5 years out of my life. Being self-employed, I don't have a job to go back to. I will get to start over again from scratch. How many others are similarly situated? Does anybody know or care?

If I am called up, it will be as a so-called specialist E-4. If ever a rank were misnamed, it is the rank of specialist. It is a ridiculous designation. The specialists are not specialists at anything. They are almost to a man, mere flunkies.

A friend of mine, also an attorney, was called up by the President a year ago as a private first class. He did nothing for 10 months but sit on his posterior and grit his teeth. He is back now. His life's savings are exhausted. He is starting over. How futile and unnecessary it all seems.

Would you be good enough to call this situation to the attention of the Congress?

Yours sincerely,

———— ————.

Third Annual Southeastern Fife, Drum, and Bugle Muster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, last month I had the honor and pleasure to participate in a parade in Arlington, Va., processing to the Third Annual Southeastern Fife, Drum and Bugle Muster, sponsored annually by the American Legion, Department of Virginia, in commemoration of V–J Week, August 12 through 18.

Arlington Post 139, sponsor of this year's muster, did a truly magnificent job of making it a success, and I sincerely believe all my colleagues, as well as many other patriotic citizens throughout our Nation may be interested, as I was, in this unusually beautiful way of remembering V–J Week. I am, therefore, pleased to include in this RECORD correspondence describing the affair in more detail:

THIRD ANNUAL FIFE, DRUM, AND BUGLE MUSTER, SPONSORED BY ARLINGTON POST NO. 139 AND THE DEPARTMENT OF VIRGINIA, THE AMERICAN LEGION, AUGUST 18, 1962

The Boston Tea Party aroused our forefathers, to seek freedom from the shackles of the King of England. The action at Lexington and Concord inspired our Revolutionary patriots. George Washington and his men pledged their lives and fortunes and made many sacrifices to attain a form of government, the like of which has never been duplicated.

Our effort to keep alive the "Spirit of '76," is with the hope that nothing will dampen the strains of our patriotic music or our American way of life.

Cosponsors: Arlington Chamber of Commerce; Arlington Fire Department; Clarendon Trust Co.; Ida's Reweaving Shop; Edmonds Motor Co.; honor guard, Arlington Post 139; Virginia Square Shopping Center; Northern Virginia Sun; Park Arlington county manager; Bob Peck Chevrolet; Tops Drive-Inn; S. Kanns Sons Co.; Yeonas Realty Co.; Southgate Motel; Safeway Stores; Arlington Trust Co.; Peoples Drug Stores; Drug Fair; Balderson's Grill; Virginia Venders, Inc.; Lansburgh & Bros.; Grand Union; Arlington Police Department; Bauserman's Service, Inc.; Colonial Village Bowling Center; L. C. Smith, Inc.; Motor City Chevron Service Station; Woodbridge Clay Products, Roger T. Moure & International Hospital Service; Old Dominion Bank; King James Furniture; Paddock Swimming Pool Co.; Frank Bowman's Restaurant; American Finance Co.; Arlington County Board.

We have brought to you a blending of the modern martial music of the Revolutionary type. We hope you have enjoyed yourselves during you stay with us. We hope you go away feeling proud that there still exist in this country groups of people, young and old, who will give of their time and energy to remind you of the wonderful country we live in, its traditions, mores and heritage.

Our sincere appreciation is extended to those businessmen of Arlington who have a patriotic interest in the community and the land.

May we see you at our annual muster next year.

ALBERT C. ELLISON,
Commander, Post No. 139.
HENRY L. LAM,
Department Commander.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF VIRGINIA, INC.
September 11, 1962.

Hon. JOEL T. BROYHILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: The Third Annual Southeastern Fife, Drum and Bugle Corps Muster held on August 18, 1962, was a grand success. Twenty-five corps competed for trophies in the junior and senior classes. There were over 30 contestants, respectively, vieing for medals, in junior and senior individual snare drum, bass drum, fife and bugle competition.

The parade of 1-hour duration and the exhibition by the 3d Infantry, Old Guard, from Fort Myer, was tremendously received by several thousand spectators. It was an awe inspiring afternoon.

We, of the American Legion, are justly proud of this annual spectacular program of patriotic pagentry.

Your interest and financial assistance has made this all possible for the people of Arlington and its environs, and we wish to convey to you our deep appreciation for your spirited cooperation.

We are also grateful to the corps which traveled from distant points to participate. They too, contributed to the success.

Sincerely,

ALBERT C. ELLISON,
Commander, Post 139.
HENRY L. LAM,
Department Commander.

Problems of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress—as you know—has been exceptionally long and the almost continuous activity of the Education and Labor Committee, of which I am a member, has made it impossible for me to return to the district as frequently as I did in previous years.

Last week I was able to address the residents of the 20th District by means of television, channel 4—WTAE—in Pittsburgh, and give them my views on the major issues confronting us on the national level.

With the thought that you may not have known of this program and had not heard it, I am taking this means of letting you know my position and my proposals on health care for the aged, retraining for our unemployed, and additional public works projects.

The address follows:

I am happy to have this opportunity to discuss with you what I believe to be the main issues of this election, especially in this section of our Nation.

The major problem for which we are trying to find a solution is the constant unemployment rate. Pennsylvania has the dubious honor of ranking second, among the States, for having the highest number of jobless workers—New York is first.

This condition has developed during the past 8 or 9 years—for it is a matter of record that with each recession—and we have had three of them—the ranks of the unemployed increased. It is also a matter of record that with each period of recovery, which followed the recession, less people were recalled to work and we slowly but surely developed what is now known as the hard-core unemployed or a group of workers whose jobs had been eliminated and whose skills were no longer needed, for machines had replaced them.

Automation in our mines, our mills, and our factories had made the production worker's job obsolete. Unless the worker learned another skill or trade, the future held nothing for him but to wait for his relief checks.

For quite a few years I tried to get a program started—on a national basis—but not until President Kennedy took office could I find anyone in the executive branch of Government who realized the seriousness of this situation and recognized action was needed if we hoped to stop the rising unemployment rate.

I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation and, after numerous public hearings—at which representatives of management, labor, education, and government testified, we secured proof that production in the United States had grown by leaps and bounds; but jobs for production workers were steadily being eliminated.

We found out that we would have approximately 2 million or more young men and women graduate from high school each year—hoping to enter the labor market and start to work. However, we also found that jobs, once available to this group were also disappearing as technological advancement had eliminated clerical jobs, sales jobs, and numerous other jobs in the service field. Computers were replacing people.

There would be employment opportunities in the technical field, but our young people are not trained for this work in our high schools. If these young unemployed people cannot secure additional education and training, their future will be bleak.

Actually, we found there was much to be done if we were to get our people back to work and keep our economy expanding.

We had to start somewhere, and 6 years after I first tried to get a program organized, I witnessed President Kennedy signing into law the Clark-Holland Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

This month we have seen the first courses started to retrain our unemployed and, during the first year which will end next July, the Department of Labor expects to be able to have 70,000 of our unemployed back in schools or in on-the-job training projects learning new skills. This will enable them to become an active member of our economy and secure work rather than remain stagnant and collect relief checks.

We know, of course, this program in its present form will not provide the full solution for our unemployment problem. It is the Nation's first major attempt at broad manpower planning and, as one of our prominent newspapers stated last Sunday, "it is regarded as probably the most significant piece of manpower legislation in the Nation's history." The paper went on to point out that this is just the beginning, for the time has passed when a man can reasonably expect to work at one occupation or craft all his life. It continued, "the swift advance of science and technology make it imperative to provide effective ways to retrain workers whose skills are no longer in demand."

I am glad that I persevered and fought for this prgoram over the last 6 years. However, the program must be continued, the coverage broadened, and the opportunities increased for our underemployed workers and our inadequately trained youth.

Another approach was made, during this session, to help those of our unemployed who cannot take advantage of the Clark-Holland Manpower Training Act. We passed the accelerated public works bill which will permit communities to initiate programs that are for the benefit of the people.

This act will permit the Federal Government to give up to 75 percent of the cost of a project if necessary; however, the State or local government requesting this aid must prove it does not have economic and financial capacity to assume the normal 50-percent share of the cost.

Since this act was passed primarily to ease the unemployment problem, those projects which will require the greatest amount of employment will be given priority. Our State of Pennsylvania will be eligible for $90 million in aid.

There are several other measures which have been introduced that would help our unemployed—but, as yet, they have not been reported to the floor by the Rules Committee.

Legislation providing funds for a program for adult education is one of these. This is necessary, for we have found that a high school diploma is a must today in order to get employment. Accelerated programs would be provided permitting adults to make up lost schooling and secure either their diploma or a certificate of accomplishment.

The Youth Opportunities Act is a similar program for those of our young people who dropped out of school before graduation and who cannot find employment because of insufficient education.

As I said earlier, the amount of information we secured from the hearings of my Subcommittee on Unemployment and Automation was both startling and somewhat frightening. We have so much to do to correct the present unemployment situation and prevent a recurrence in the future that it was difficult to find a way to start.

I can assure you a solution must be—and will be—found, and I firmly believe we are on the right road with the Clark-Holland Manpower Development and Training Act.

Now, another important issue should be discussed—that of proper health care for our elder citizens.

In the State of Pennsylvania over 10 percent of our population has reached or passed the age of 65. In the congressional district which I have the honor of representing, almost 15 percent of the residents are 65 years of age or older.

I am well aware, therefore, of the need of these older people for help with their health expenses.

I think we all will admit, the older you get—the greater is the need for health insurance. I might add, the harder it is to get—or keep—at a nominal fee.

Those of our older citizens, who have no income and own no property, can—if it is proven their sons or daughters cannot afford to pay—received both medical care and hospitalization under the much talked about Kerr-Mills bill. This program is conducted under the supervision of the Department of Welfare and, even before the Kerr-Mills Act was in effect, this care was provided for our people in Pennsylvania.

However, for our older citizens who are living on social security pensions or railroad pensions—very, very few can qualify for care under this program.

To get aid, they must pass a means test showing their income, their property, their insurance—then, if that should happen to meet the requirements they must show the incomes and expenses of their married sons and daughters to prove they cannot pay for the needed care of their parents. If this is proven, and care is given then the costs will be paid by the State. But a lien will be placed against the property our elder citizen owns, and either upon his death or his desire to sell his property, the State will collect the amount it had paid for the medical care and hospitalization our patient had received.

I know, as I am sure you do too, that the majority of our senior citizens, who are receiving pensions, are proud and have worked hard all their lives in order to be able to have dignity and respect during their retirement. They will do without care—no matter how greatly needed—before they will accept "relief" or even ask for it.

Under President Kennedy's health program for our senior citizens, the King-Anderson

bill as we know it, these senior citizens could receive hospital care, nursing home care, diagnostic services, and home nursing care and therapy when needed.

There would be a small charge of $10 a day for hospital care for the first 9 days, but they would then be eligible for 81 days at no charge.

In regard to the diagnostic services, an initial charge of $20 is required, but everything over and above that amount would be provided free.

Care in a nursing home would be provided for 180 days at no cost—and home nursing care and therapy treatments would be provided at no cost.

This is President Kennedy's program for our pensioners receiving social security benefits or railroad retirment benefits.

These older people now getting aid from the Department of Welfare will continue to receive this care under the Kerr-Mills bill as no mention has been made of discontinuing this service—and, as I pointed out previously, our people in Pennsylvania received this care before the Kerr-Mills Act went into effect.

There have been so many conflicting stories regarding the financing of this program, I should like to have you know the correct one.

Those now receiving pnsions will not be taxed in any way.

Those now employed and participating in the social security program will be asked to contribute an additional one-fourth percent, or approximately $1 a month—$12 a year. However, when you reach the age of retirement, you will have this care at no additional cost. It is a prepaid hospital insurance plan.

You know the familiar expressions, "Fly now—pay later," "buy now—pay later." Well, this is the reverse, actually—"Pay now—use later."

Not only will you benefit yourself eventually but the average young married couple, raising their own children and meeting their own expenses, will benefit now as their parents will be able to receive proper and necessary care without depriving their grandchildren of the necessities of life.

These are the important problems facing the Nation.

These problems deal with people.

With—how government, your Federal Government, can help people, with—what government, your Government, can do to help people, and, with—why government, our Government, should help people.

I am proud to be a member of the Kennedy administration in Washington, for this administration has dedicated itself to work for the best interests of the people of the Nation.

President Kennedy has said many times, "There are sufficient lobbyists here in Washington looking out for the interests of specialized groups, I feel, as did President Truman, that the office of the President must act as the lobbyist for the people of the country."

I agree with both—however, I will go even further and say this, too, is the duty of a Congressman.

The GI Bill for Junior—Suffer the Little Children and Let Their Needs Be Served

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the opponents of a fair share of aid for the children in nonpublic schools would practice discrimination where it is most obnoxious—among infants. These members within the NEA or nonequal aid group would deny assistance to those who exercise their constitutional right of freedom of choice. They are monocular where they should be visionary. Instead of looking on the whole spectrum of education with 20–20 perspective they prefer to cover one eye and see only the 85 percent in the public classrooms. This question can be swiftly resolved if primary consideration is given to the interests of the children excluding all extraneous factors. Paraphrasing the Biblical text: "We should suffer the little children to receive the benefits of our bounty and let their needs be served." This point was graphically made in an endorsement of the "GI Bill for Junior," H.R. 9803, by our distinguished colleague, Representative JAMES J. DELANEY, of Queens. I am proud to have sponsored this bill with him and I invite the attention of the Members to the article which appeared in the Tidings, August 24, 1962, Los Angeles, as follows:

AID BILLS NEED SCRUTINY

(By Msgr. Joseph F. Sharpe)

The sleeping giant of discriminatory legislation is quiet, but not dead. Congress has run into some economic and political problems that shelved activity on the Federal aid to education bills, but the American voter is not fooled into thinking that the lobbyists have hung up their tools and gone home.

The most powerful of the lobbying groups gathered its forces together early in summer in the beautiful city of Denver, and notably did not come forth with any startling program to teach Johnny to read or write or multiply, but did issue a resolution opposing only one kind of Federal aid to education—aid to nonpublic schools.

They begged the question, of course, but that was to confuse the public. The school does not need aid—in fact it does not even have to exist—if we are not concerned with the child.

But if the child needs financial aid to get a sound education, and he must get the aid from the Federal Government, then the Federal Government should help the American child. However, it would not sound very nice if the National Education Association issued a resolution opposing aid to the American child, would it?

ATTEMPT BLOCKED

Fortunately, the lobbyists are not the only ones who are determining policy in Washington. There are some forceful men in Congress who have made it quite clear that they will stand for no nonsense or tampering with the rights of Americans through discriminatory legislation.

For these, there is more at stake than the economic and political adjustments of the moment. They have a sense of the quality that makes statesmanship in not losing sight of the fact that political expediency must not eliminate justice.

At certain political risk, in fact, Congressman DELANEY blocked the last attempt to bring about Federal aid to schools and came up with a new bill labeled the "junior GI bill" which prevents discrimination in Federal expenditures for education.

At the same time, the bishops of the United States have been protecting the rights of non-public-school children by opposing any laws that would create an injustice for them.

Each of the many bishops throughout the land, taking apostolic authority seriously and trusting in the assistance of the Holy Spirit, has been a source of strength to the people in his charge.

CHILD HELPED

This was manifest in a startling manner a year ago when they met together and issued their unanimous statement which is a straightforward and unconfused declaration in favor of justice. They called attention to a virtue very much in their competence in matters of morals.

With the courage of Mr. DELANEY as an inspiration, and the statement of the bishops as a guide, the Committee on Education recently formed in the archdiocese of Los Angeles has asked the people of the area to give active support to the Delaney bill now before Congress.

Not only does this suggested legislation deny discrimination, it also avoids questions of constitutionality, of separation of church and state, of religion.

Through this bill, the individual child is helped equally with all other children if Federal aid is to be given to all. Of all attempts in Congress to deal with educational financing, DELANEY'S bill is the only one to coincide with the view of the American bishops.

If American is to avoid the secularism to which it seems to be tending and God is to be worshiped as the source of all truth and goodness, the Catholic school must continue as an instrument of the Catholic parent in a well-rounded education of his child.

It must not be forced out of existence by the device of taxation or of Federal control of education. Catholic children must not be forced into a school where prayer to God is forbidden by law or where religion is damned by silence.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N.C*
Alford, Dale, *Ark*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn* 4501 Conn. Ave.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Andrews, George W., *Ala* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N.Y*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N.J* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Barry, Robert R., *N.Y* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N.H*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont* 217 Slade Run Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Becker, Frank J., *N.Y*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Beermann, Ralph F., *Nebr*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Bennett, John B., *Mich* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala* The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*
Bromwell, James E., *Iowa*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* Alban Towers
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Bruce, Donald C., *Ind*
Buckley, Charles A., *N.Y*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio* 5540 Colfax Ave., Alexandria, Va.
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derounian, Steven B., *N.Y*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio* 800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* 2816 N. Jefferson, Arlington, Va.
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N.Y*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* 1719 New House Office Building
Durno, Edwin R., *Oreg*
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa* 3725 Macomb St.
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Finnegan, Edward R., *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* 1235 New House Office Building
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* The Congressional
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N.J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garland, Peter A., *Maine*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Glenn, Milton W., *N.J* Capitol Park Apts., 800 4th St. SW.
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* 3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George, *Ala* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Harding, Ralph R., *Idaho*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*
Harsha, William H., Jr., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N.Y*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S.C*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horan, Walt, *Wash*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa* 2120 16th St.
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johansen, August E., *Mich*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* 5906 Harwick Rd.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N.Y*
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex* 4807 Newport
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N.C*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Kyl, John, *Iowa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*

Appendix

Suspending Due Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there are many urgent problems confronting the people and the Government of the United States—problems such as Cuba, a $300 billion national debt that is still increasing, an economy that has failed to demonstrate the buoyancy that we desire. Each of these problems is of urgent concern and demands courage and foresight in their solution.

However, Mr. Speaker, I submit these problems are neither as compelling nor as urgent as a lesser noticed problem that confronts every American. I refer to the threat to our individual liberty that is growing as a consequence of our growing Government that seeks to pursue a government of men rather than a government of law. When these men see what they regard as the need for more power, they either unilaterally act to assume greater power without statutory authorization or they urge Congress to enact legislation under the guise of a national security need.

An instance of an attempt to have Congress unwisely act to provide virtually unrestrained power to certain Government officials occurred earlier this week—the same week in which we observed Constitution Day. Under this proposed legislation persons could have been labeled security risks and dismissed from their jobs without any semblance of due process and the basis of only the flimsiest pretext. It is significant to note that this far-reaching legislation was authorized for floor consideration by the House Democratic leadership under suspension of the rules which allowed only 40 minutes' debate. Fortunately, these measures failed of passage.

In the September 19 edition of the Washington Post there was a perceptive editorial comment on this precipitous endeavor to force unsound and dangerous legislation through the House without adequate consideration. I will include the editorial as a part of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would say that no American ever wants any subversive person to ever be in a position to injure our Nation, but at the same time, we must never forget the need to protect the liberty of our citizens against assault from oppressive government from without or within.

The editorial follows:

SUSPENDING DUE PROCESS

The House of Representatives observed Constitution Day on Monday by considering two bills which would permit American citizens to be dismissed from their jobs and disgraced without any semblance of the due process guaranteed by the Constitution. These bills, one concerning all employees of the National Security Agency, the other affecting the employees of all defense contractors, were sponsored by the Un-American Activities Committee and brought up under suspension of the rules. This means that debate on them was limited to 40 minutes, and amendments were precluded.

Because there was not so much as a quorum present on Monday to listen to the brief discussion of the bills, voting on them was postponed to today. A two-thirds vote will be required for passage; but most of the House knows little or nothing about these bills. They are far too important to be dealt with so cavalierly and carelessly. They involve fundamental rights for which Americans have fought and died.

It goes without saying that rigorous precautions should be taken in the selection of personnel for the National Security Agency and that the utmost care should be taken to safeguard military secrets in the possession of defense contractors. But these purposes do not require or call for denying employees a fair chance to defend themselves. Security does not have to be insensate.

Representative JOHN LINDSAY called attention to an implication of the industrial security bill which has been accorded little thought—and which is worth thinking about:

"I think all persons who are worried about the excessive power of a big central government ought to vote aaginst this bill, because for the first time—under the terms of this bill—you have the Central Government in a position where it can come between a man and his private employment arbitrarily and without the usual standards that are known as due process."

Why is Mr. WALTER in such a hurry about these bills? They are not likely to go through the Senate this session. Why should they not be considered under the normal, orderly procedure of the House with careful hearings by the Un-American Activities Committee, with full floor debate and with opportunity for perfecting amendments? A bipartisan group of Congressmen led by Representative TOM CURTIS has asked that the industrial security bill be recommitted for this purpose. Its sensible, reasoned plea should be heeded. It is more than its rules which the House has suspended. It has suspended its own powers of judgment; and it is being asked to suspend the Constitution for any defense worker who may be made the target of accusation.

A Constructive Suggestion on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, recently I have received one of the most thought-provoking letters concerning our foreign aid program ever to come to my attention. This letter, written from the heart, comes from a 77-year-old former resident of my State of South Dakota who has spent 50 years in agricultural research and education and participated in three foreign missions.

At this crucial time in our history when the Congress is again being asked to appropriate gigantic sums for foreign aid programs, the sentiments in this letter are especially thought-provoking. I call the attention of my colleagues to the information assembled by Congressman OTTO E. PASSMAN that on June 30 of 1962 there were $6,712 million of unexpended foreign aid funds on hand. I commend a careful reading and study of this letter to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. KARL MUNDT,
Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: I am writing you as a senior (77 years of age) American citizen who is much disturbed regarding our foreign aid program, as a former South Dakotan (Emery, Spencer, Brookings, and Newell), and as one with some 50 years experience in agricultural research and education, including three foreign missions. I am writing you because of your well-known interest in good government and in foreign aid.

There are, of course, many reasons for our less-than-spectacular success in our foreign aid programs, especially as related to the less developed countries. I propose to mention only two or three of the more important. One, I feel is that we have promised or seem to have promised too much too soon. This is especially evident in the Alliance for Progress for South America. It may easily fail before it really gets underway.

Another serious defect is our neglect of agriculture and, of agricultural research in the countries we desire to help. Agriculture is the basic industry in most of the less developed countries. In many of them 70 percent of the people live on the land or derive their livelihood directly from the land. Poverty, hunger, and malnutrition are widespread. It would seem obvious that the improvement of their agriculture so they can find themselves and develop their own economy should rate a high priority. Instead we build concrete roads which few will use, build factories whose products cannot be sold because of the lack of local purchasing power, build houses for middle income groups, schoolhouses for countries that cannot support an educational program, and do many other things that under different circumstances would be desirable. They might be advisable in the current situation if agriculture was also improved.

We have, it is true, attempted in a small way to improve the agriculture of some countries. But it has been based largely on the unrealistic assumption that all that is necessary is American dollars, American know-how and American varieties, breeds of livestock

and cultural practices. As every agriculturist knows, and as of course you know, improvement of agriculture is not that simple. Practices must be adapted to the climate, soil, and economic conditions of the countries where they are to be used. South Dakota farmers do not grow corn hybrids adapted for Iowa conditions, nor varieties of wheat, oats, and barley developed in Illinois, Kansas or Oklahoma. They are relatively successful because they and the experiment stations have developed varieties and practices that fit South Dakota conditions. The same must be done for the less-developed countries if we expect to be successful. It can be done only by research or by the more expensive cut-and-try method.

The United States, Canada, Australia, Japan, and many of the countries of Western Europe have conducted extensive agricultural research for many years. It would be claiming too much to attribute their present eminence solely to this fact. But certainly the plentiful supply of agricultural products obtainable at reasonable costs has been an important factor. Based on these many years of experience in many countries, it should be possible to improve the agriculture of the less-developed countries by relatively simple methods and at relatively little expense. It cannot, however, be done at once, and it will not be done if policies are determined by lawyers and economists in the State Department. Hence it seems to me that some reorganization is necessary; such, for example, as will assure that men with experience in agriculture, including agricultural research, have the responsibility for determining policies and carrying out any program that is initiated.

Sincerely yours,

The Battle of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following editorial, with which I thoroughly agree, published in this morning's New York Times:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Sept. 21, 1962]

THE BATTLE FOR FOREIGN AID

President Kennedy has properly declared that "it makes no sense at all" for Congressmen to oppose communism with oratory and then to approve crippling cuts in the foreign aid program, which is a central weapon in the fight to preserve freedom. But last night the House of Representatives ignored the President's good advice and approved the completely inadequate foreign aid funds recommended by its Appropriations Committee. Today Moscow is rejoicing; and we can only look to the Senate to prevent the damage which would result if this irresponsible action of the House were to be confirmed.

The chief argument advanced against the foreign aid program is usually some variant of the idea that we cannot afford it. The President's request for $4,752 million is, however, less than 1 percent of the country's total annual production. This is true even now when we have substantial unemployed human and material resources. The United States is spending more than 10 times as much money for military strength, and there has been congressional pressure for spending even more in this area than the administration believes is wise. President Kennedy pointed out last week that this year's space budget is $5,400 million, almost a billion dollars more than he asked for foreign aid.

But neither nuclear weapons nor space ships affect the proverty which is the chief source of world instability and the chief breeding ground of communism. It is incomprehensible that this Nation can afford what it is spending for arms and for space research purposes and cannot afford the modest foreign aid request. In respect to the alleged drain of the foreign aid program on our balance of payments, the fact is that almost 80 percent of economic aid funds are spent in this country. The great outflow of American tourists abroad each year is a far larger burden on the U.S. balance of payments position than is foreign aid.

The United States alone cannot meet the entire problem posed by the underdeveloped nations, nor should it. Bilateral aid is actually in many ways less desirable than multilateral aid, and certainly the newly prosperous nations of Western Europe and Japan can and should contribute more to meeting the need. But a drastic reduction in our contributions to this purpose is not the way to persuade these nations to be more generous on their own account.

The President's statement on the cuts by the House Appropriations Committee was so much to the point that we reproduce it here: "The drastic cut in foreign aid funds recommended by the House Appropriations Committee poses a threat to free world security.

"It makes no sense at all to make speeches against the spread of communism, to deplore unstability in Latin America and Asia, to call for an increase in American prestige and an initiative in Eastern Europe—and then vote to cut back the Alliance for Progress, to hamper the Peace Corps, to cut off surplus food shipments to hungry Poles, to repudiate our long-term commitments of last year and to undermine the efforts of those who are seeking to stave off chaos and communism in the most vital areas of the world. Foreign aid has increasingly meant trade, sales, and jobs in this country, and reform, progress, and new hope in the developing countries.

"The aid program is just as important as any military spending we do abroad. You cannot separate guns from roads and schools when it comes to resisting Communist subversion in underdeveloped countries. This is a lesson we have learned clearly in South Vietnam and elsewhere in southeast Asia. To mutilate the aid program in this massive fashion would be to damage the national security of the United States.

"I cannot believe that those in both parties who have consistently voted in the course of three administrations to fulfill this Nation's obligations of leadershhip will permit this irresponsibile action to go uncorrected."

Masaryk and European Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIBORNE PELL
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on September 18, I inserted in the RECORD a tribute to the 25th anniversary of the death of Thomas G. Masaryk. In my statement, I referred to the devotion of Dr. Peter Zenkel, the president of the executive committee of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia to the ideals of Masaryk.

As an additional gesture of recognition to the 25th anniversary of the passing of Thomas G. Masaryk, I ask unanimous consent that a translation of an article by Dr. Zenkel entitled "Masaryk and European Unification," which appeared in the September 1962 edition of the newspaper Ceske Slovo published in Munich, Germany, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASARYK AND EUROPEAN UNIFICATION

It is history, not friends or enemies, which bestows final recognition of the greatness of a man. Time verifies true greatness. It is an arbiter from whose sentence there is no appeal: a judge at once just and incorruptible. Twenty-five years represent a long span in our dynamic and hurried era in which events rush by at such a pace that what seemed correct yesterday, is no longer true today. If 25 years after a politician and statesman's death, the ideas for which he fought in his lifetime are being carried out, then proof of his greatness has unmistakably been established. Twenty-five years have elapsed since the death of T. G. Masaryk. Let me illustrate his greatness by discussing one single problem.

The heart of every freedom-loving man is filled with joy over the developments in Western Europe. In the wake of the economic success of the Common Market uniting France, Germany, Italy, and the Benelux countries, political unification is finally being negotiated as well. Moreover, Great Britain and other European nations seek admission to the Common Market.

Recently, in Reims, a city which has witnessed the crowning of French kings, the city of Joan of Arc, the capital of Champagne whose soil has been soaked with the blood of hundreds of thousands of soldiers, troops were reviewed by President de Gaulle and Chancellor Adenauer—troops that form the core of the army of future federated Europe.

Addressing the Governors of the United States, President Kennedy greeted the new Europe and outlined a new era of interdependency. On the other hand, Khrushchev correctly underscoring the import of these events, condemns a unified Europe which signifies the end of his plans for global domination.

It is most appropriate that acclaim be extended not only to those who have worked for European unification in recent years, but also to those statesmen-prophets who years ago, called for a federated Europe. Indeed, we see today a federated Europe rising like Phoenix, from the ashes of two World Wars which were, above all, horrible civil wars of Europe.

When one thinks of those who advocated a federated Europe, one recalls Briand, Coudenhove-Kalergi, and many others. Frequently neglected is the man whom Bernard Shaw wished to be the first president of a United States of Europe, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk.

Yet, anyone can read his "The New Europe," the book which he wrote during the First World War and which discusses his goals. Only those who are Masaryk's enemies; and those who were—and perhaps still are—opposed to a federated and unified Europe, have depicted Masaryk as destroyer of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Knowledgeable men—those who are acquainted with the history of the 19th, and of the beginning of the 20th century—are aware of the fact that Masaryk was a confirmed federalist in relation to central-European Austria-Hungary. It only was the shortsighted policy of the Hapsburgs, who had been captured

by German imperialism, which forced Masaryk to seek a unified Europe over the grave of the Austrian and Hungarian monarchy.

For Masaryk, European federation was not some opportunistic scheme of the moment, but an organic outgrowth of Czech policy, a policy which had striven to transform the Hapsburg monarchy into a federalized structure of free and self-governing peoples, a federation which could have been the model for all of Europe. Federalization of Austria had, after all, been the goal of lifelong efforts of Masaryk's teacher and great predecessor, Palacky, who as a politician and historian had analyzed the history of Europe, as seen from its very center, with a thoroughness few others possessed. And when Masaryk found himself within the focal area of European politics during the First World War, he—despite his longing for the liberation of Czechs and Slovaks from centuries-long oppression—did not forget "mother" Europe. He conceived of the liberation of his own people as a useful and necessary step on the road to a voluntary and free European unification. Masaryk's enemies reproach him for the "balkanization" of Europe. Yet, the Second World War did not originate in the liberated nations, but in dictatorial states. Masaryk wrote, on page 436 of the Czech edition of his "Svetova Revoluce" (world revolution), that "the United States of Europe ceases to be a utopia." He clearly defined in this book his faith in a unified Europe.

Masaryk did not believe that nationalism and internationalism excluded each other, but that they were complementary. In "The New Europe" he said: "Nations are the natural organs of humanity. Humanity is not supernational, it is the organization of individual nations. If, therefore, individual nations struggle for their independence and attempt to break up states of which they have heretofore been parts, that is not a fight against internationality and humanity, but a fight against aggressors, who misuse states for the purposes of leveling them and enforcing political uniformity. Humanity does not tend to uniformity, but to unity; it will be the liberation of nations which will make possible the organic association, the federation of nations, of Europe, and of all mankind." Let us take note of the contemporary appropriateness of those words. The present central-European struggle against oppressors is a fight for European federation. And the struggle against the phenomenon which Masaryk had termed "uniformity" is the fight against the concept of satellite Communist leveling.

In all his prewar works, Masaryk pointed to the twilight of sovereignty for small and large states alike and to the need for wider political entities and international organizations. However, Masaryk did not connect state sovereignty with power, with the might of individual states after Machiavelli's fashion. He related sovereignty to the state's internal structure, saying that it was only an absolutist state that could perhaps attain full sovereignty, never a democratic one. Masaryk knew that in the case of even a large state full sovereignty could not be practiced except at the cost of inhuman isolationism. When reading his works, one gets the feeling that he was forecasting the erection of the Iron Curtain and of the Berlin wall, which are nothing but inhuman and despicable means for the preservation of Soviet sovereignty and Soviet fear of a Europe that is going through the natural process of unification. For what is the fundamental basis of Masaryk's concept of a world revolution? It was the democratization of Europe and of the world. And, indeed, this democratization which, in the past, prevented European unification by force has in the 20th century, grown so strong that nothing but violence and brute force can stay the unifying process. Masaryk consistently fought against unification by violence and for an organization of free nations which would be led by freemen.

Masaryk wrote a work which, in its English version, was titled "The Spirit of Russia." I do not consider this translation especially fortuitous, as the original name reads Russia and Europe, and the work is devoted to an analysis of the interactions of Europe and Russia. We find, within the whole context of this word, that Masaryk did not consider Russia as a part of Europe. Better, he thought of her as a special sociological, ethnic, and historical unit. He obviously did not see the border dividing Russia and Europe as set upon the Elbe. The greatest tragedy of our time is that the peoples which Masaryk helped to liberate, so they could form an integral part of a unified Europe, are today subjected by Russia. It is a tragedy that 100 million inhabitants of central and eastern Europe are unable to join the 160 million or so of west Europeans. Europe, thus unified, would have a population exceeding the 200 million of the U.S.S.R., to mention just the demographic aspect.

Europe will never be truly unified so long as unification remains restricted to Western Europe. Military reasons alone demand that the 550,000 square miles of central and eastern, non-Russian, Europe be jointed with the 450,000 square miles of Western Europe; a Western Europe which is too shallow for countering the Soviet onslaught through its own means alone. In terms of geopolitics and history, central Europe is a part of Europe. This fact, which was so clear to Masaryk and which was so masterfully documented in his work, should not be forgotten today when we rejoice in the progress of the nascent federated Europe, lest our joy be short lived.

Twenty-five years have passed since Masaryk's death. It is not Masaryk's dreams which are becoming a reality—for Masaryk was no dreamer. It is rather that the seed which he planted is at last sprouting through the soils of the concealed history of Europe; a history which Masaryk understood so well. Even we may not be dreamers as we put our faith today in the certainty of his idea and as we cherish hopes that another seed, of even greater promise, is germinating below the surface of present-day political events, a seed which will yield a harvest more joyous still in the form of a Europe undivided, a Europe actually unified, a Europe free, and a Europe truly new.

To John W. Anderson, of Gary, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, my district, Lake County, of Indiana, has one of the Nation's outstanding creative citizens in John W. Anderson, the president of the Anderson Co., of Gary, makers of automotive equipment.

His long experience in distribution and his concern with the trend toward oppressive retail monopoly led Mr. Anderson to the pioneering of the movement on behalf of quality stabilization of trademarked products. I am proud to be the first of many sponsors of the quality stabilization bill in this Congress.

Mr. Anderson's determined leadership on behalf of the consumer, the small businessman, and all ethical resellers, was recently saluted by Sid McKay, himself a small businessman of Los Angeles and an owner of McKay's Prescription Pharmacy there. Of Mr. Anderson, the president of Quality Brands Associates of America, Mr. McKay wrote:

You have made a true, all-out effort and a "thank you" just doesn't fit here because it just could not be loud enough, or long enough, to be heard enough.

Your energy has emphasized the weakness and apathy of too many of us, and for that, I am truly sorry.

Mr. McKay's keen and incisive analysis of the quality stabilization bill, and his appeal to all Members of this Congress to enact it quickly, is most deserving of your close attention:

FOR SMALL BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT

As you are well aware, a great number of words have been written, perhaps even more have been spoken, on the merits of Senate Joint Resolution 159, the Quality Stabilization Act, also referred to as House Joint Resolution 636, the quality stabilization bill. It is possible that the opposition to this proposed legislation has been equally eloquent and emphatic. However, I am confident that decisions resulting in support, or in opposition, by the individual Members of Congress, are determined by the weighing of facts, rather than mail. Frankly, if our positions were reversed (and that shouldn't happen to you or to Congress) and I were deluged with letters and telegrams, I might say to myself, "To hell with all of this advice. I will use the judgment attributed to me, when I was elected to this office." Neither did you solicit my advice, nor will I offer it. The following comments are intended as an expression of opinions, based on the experience of one individual, owner and operator of one small business, a retail pharmacy. This enterprise does enjoy and share, one distinction. It is one of 50,000 independently owned and operated retail pharmacies throughout the entire United States, according to statistics supplied by the 1960 census.

This small business employs five full-time employees, other than the owners, and during the past fiscal year $49,000 was paid out in wages, from annual gross sales of $190,000 and, after deducting all costs of operation and all taxes, the net profit was $1,548.72. This profit was possible only because of a pricing policy based on so-called minimum fair trade retail prices. Any alternative method of pricing without stability, regardless of the wishful thinking of well intentioned economists, would result in the elimination of this business enterprise—and more important and more unfortunate—a large number of other businesses, in the same category or similar status.

According the manufacturer a legal right to exercise a protective control over the retail value of his product, as outlined by and in, the Quality Stabilization Act, should give reasonable and fair assurance of costs and profits to those concerned in the transition of the product, from the manufacturer to the consumer. This should also serve as encouragement and incentive for expansion in production, and attendant increased employment. In competitive business enterprise any abuse of this right, would be impractical and unprofitable. Sound business principles have never been associated with evil business practices, whether it be a huge shopping center or a small store on Main Street, United States of America.

Creativity, as applied to opportunity for the individual in business enterprise, as applied to the opportunity of creating employment for others, as applied to the opportunity to be self-employed and self-support-

ing, ranks equally in importance with the opportunity to paint a portrait, to author a book, or sculpture a statue. Permit me one quote attributed to philosopher-author Arnold Toynbee, "To give a fair chance to potential creativity is a matter of life and death for any society." Small business, without this fair chance to survive in our society, is facing death.

This, I believe—and because I believe, I ask for your most serious consideration of the Quality Stabilization Act. I am extremely hopeful that such consideration will result in your support.

Respectfully,

SID MCKAY.

Soviet Domination Reaches Into Every Phase of Cuban Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate—in its good judgment—adopted Senate Joint Resolution 230, expressing the determination of the United States with respect to Cuba.

Because of the significance of a Red foothold so close to our own Nation, it is important that we stay as well apprised as possible of the processes and progress of Communist domination over the Cuban people.

The Milwaukee Journal of September 16 published an article entitled "Soviet Domination Now Reaches Into Every Phase of Cuban Life."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET DOMINATION NOW REACHES INTO EVERY PHASE OF CUBAN LIFE—OBSERVER SEES LITTLE HOPE OF PRYING REDS FROM BASE EXCEPT BY ARMED INVASION

(By William L. Ryan)

Moscow today just about owns Cuba—lock, stock, barrel, and beard.

Inexorably, Soviet communism is closing its steel grip. Challenging the United States in the sensitive Caribbean and the Western Hemisphere, Moscow has given the world a lesson in imperialism.

When the Russians colonize, they colonize for good. Short of armed invasion, there seems little hope of prying the Communists out of a base 90 miles from U.S. shores.

The Soviet takeover will be complete when Fidel Castro is shoved aside, along with his 26th of July movement revolutionaries. This will be a slow and cautious process, but signs of party conflict are clear.

CASTRO LOSES SUPPORT

Daily, Castro appears more and more in the role of a bumbling and confused man, loudly demanding everything his own way, but bowing to what he now calls the "collective leadership." He has lost much popular support. Havana reports suggest only 20 percent of the people back him now. That is much more than the percentage backing the old guard Communists, but they do not need popular support. They have their tight, disciplined, spy ridden organization—and they have Moscow on their side.

The Communists are patient. They can wait until popular disillusion and economic chaos make Castro no longer important. They are letting him shoulder the blame for Cuba's internal woes. They are letting his entourage of "new Communists"—men like Ernesto Guevara; Fidel's brother, Raul Castro, and others of his Sierra Maestra revolution following—hang themselves with ropes fashioned of their own confusion. The time will come when Castro can safely be removed.

A close examination of just how tightly the Soviet Communist grip has seized the Pearl of the Antilles produces a sense of shock. From documents and official regime statements, and from reports of diplomatic travelers, this picture emerges of a Cuba as tightly bound to Moscow as is Bulgaria:

THE ARMED FORCES

The rag-tag 26th of July army of bearded romantics who marched into Havana January 2, 1959, is no more. In its place is a force of about 300,000, made up of more than 50,000 trained regulars and a heavily armed militia. The training is by Communist bloc officers. The equipment is modern. The discipline is strict and Soviet style. The facilities are installed and expanded by Russians and east Europeans.

Even now the army has political commissars, carbon copies of the politruk officers of east bloc armies, assigned to nail down party authority. One group of 750 revolutionary instructors was graduated this month from a special school and is being infused into the army. Castro says their mission is to "teach the class struggle character of the revolution" to the army.

THE ECONOMY

Moscow owns the economy. Fantastic numbers of trucks and other vehicles pour in from the Red bloc, each batch making Cuba more dependent upon Soviet petroleum shipments.

Imports for 1962 from the U.S.S.R. include: Wheat flour, cereal grains, edible oils, canned, frozen and cured meats, condensed milk, baby foods, rice, butter, lard, peas, canned fish, beans, potatoes, fertilizers, rayon and other textiles, superphosphates, trucks, jeeps, buses, tractors, a petroleum tanker, rice harvesters, machine tools, power shovels, graders, bulldozers, compressors, rolled steel, tinplate, steel pipes, cast iron, cardboard, raw materials for soap manufacture, cement, lubricants, ammonium nitrate and even containers for sugar.

Czechoslovakia is sending textile yearns, artificial leather, steel products, chemicals, glass, foodstuffs, newsprint, buses, tractors, trucks and tow trucks, machinery and tools, diesel motors, electronic units. Red China sends soybeans, rice, canned meat, medicines. Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Poland send food. The bloc also sends swarms of technical assistants.

Cuba's sugar goes to the bloc in part payment. The sugar industry, always the backbone of the Cuban economy, is dominated completely by the Soviet bloc. Bloc equipment runs the refineries.

AGRICULTURE

In a speech to farmers in May 1961, Castro ridiculed the idea that farms would be collectivized. He said: "The revolution would never do such a foolish thing * * *. Although this is a Socialist revolution, the land will not be socialized. * * * If a farmer prefers to keep his bit of land, then the revolution will never try to socialize it."

An agrarian reform law a year before had broken up big holdings for distribution. Peasants, in order to make any economic sense of their production, had to form cooperatives, especially in such fields as sugar, coffee, rice, and cattle raising. The number of cooperatives grew to 622.

As late as 2 months ago, Castro repeated the pledge against collectivization. Then he changed his mind—or it was changed for him.

As in other Communist lands, production quotas are laid down. Norms are set for cattle and livestock reproduction, and, as in the other lands, the big drawback is that the cattle cannot read instructions. The economy is prey to all the ills that afflict other Communist agriculture.

LABOR

Regimentation is on the Soviet model. The workingman is subject to production quotas. "Socialist emulation," the speedup device invented by Moscow, was formally introduced April 16. The speedup worker is known as "distinguished worker."

The Cuban workers' central directs 25 national unions and automatically approves what the regime orders. As in other Communist countries, it does not represent the labor force, but the state. Workers are subjected to lectures, work discipline, warning about such things as a "formal bureaucratic attitude." They are punished for lateness or absenteeism. Directors are punished for failing to make quotas or for distorting figures.

Cards were issued August 15 to all workers over 18. The information about each worker took up 15 pages. Fourteen pages went into regime files. The worker got the 15th as his card. He cannot work without it.

Before the Castro era, few women in Cuba did heavy labor. Now they—along with workers, students and even aged people—are dragooned into "Socialist Sundays." They are supposed to be volunteers to save sugar crops. Women also cut hay, pick coffee and cotton, and do other agricultural labor.

YOUTH

Cuba now has a Communist Youth Union, with the same cell structure which marks the Soviet Young Communist League (Komsomol). Its purpose, said Castro, is to "mold youth into a Communist attitude * * * war against intrigue * * * against gossip, against rumors behind the back * * * to correct errors of others."

There is an organization committee controlling all activities of students in both school and vacation time. It guards against absenteeism, watches student unions, mobilizes students for work in the field, provides monitors to watch teachers, presides over sports and all student activities.

INTERNAL ENEMIES

All the ills of an emerging Communist regime afflict Cuba: Shortages, hoarding, black marketing, clandestine slaughter of livestock. Those who complain are labeled enemies of the people.

In a Catholic country, the regime goes slowly about cracking down on religion. Castro proclaims religious freedom. But church activities are curtailed and confined inside church buildings.

The regime carries on a gigantic indoctrination campaign. Hundreds of thousands of Communist manuals are distributed. Communist Boss Blas Roca's "Fundamentals of Socialism in Cuba" was distributed in 700,000 copies—1 for each 10 or less persons.

THE OUTLOOK

On the surface, Castro still does not appear to have lost any of his authority but that is only a surface appearance. The old guard Reds weave their power web carefully, move slowly. The time is approaching for the final phase of envelopment. When Castro's presence is no longer necessary, when he has taken all the blame for Cuba's economic disaster, he can safely be put aside, and that will be managed by men responsible to Moscow.

Right now, Roca, Carlos Rodriguez, and other old guard Communists seem to be spending much of their time trying to outfox Castro. The Premier appears to flounder more and more in a morass of mixed-up

ideology. Is he being insidiously undermined by the old guard? There is much evidence to suggest that he is, and he seems resentful.

When Castro finally is shoved aside it will be small consolation for the United States. It will mean Moscow's domination is complete.

Castro sounded a little bitter about things in a recent speech.

"A revolution is not as easy thing," he said. "It is easy in books. It is difficult in reality."

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, September 20, 1962:

FAMILIAR STORY

The anguished cries which have greeted the $1.124 billion cut in foreign aid would be more impressive if they did not have such a familiar ring.

President Kennedy says this slash by the House Appropriations Committee, deepest of any year, is "irresponsible" and a "threat to free world security." Secretary of State Rusk says our foreign policy objectives will be "greatly endangered" unless Congress votes the full $4.752 billion requested by the President.

We are not so sure. For the record on foreign aid, and former statements made with respect to it, do not inspire unlimited confidence.

Last year, for example, the subcommittee handling this matter recommended $3.357 billion for the mutual security program. Secretaries Rusk and McNamara said a workable program could not be maintained under the cut proposed by the subcommittee. So Congress finally appropriated $3.9 billion. But only $3.198 billion was spent during the year—$716 million less than Congress appropriated and, believe it or not, $159 million less than the amount recommended by the subcommittee—the recommendation which brought the protest from Messrs. Rusk and McNamara.

All of this is taken from this year's report of the subcommittee headed by Representative PASSMAN, of Louisiana, and adopted by the full committee. As far as we know it is an accurate report. And it shows other things.

The President's budget requests for foreign aid are sent to Congress in January. Not until 2 months later are foreign aid officials ready to testify in support of their requests, and even then they cannot justify many items. Does this mean that the President's budget figures are mere guesses? During this year's hearings it was established that 101 of the 113 nations of the world have been, are or will be recipients of aid from the United States since the end of World War II. By any standard, that is covering a lot of territory. Finally, it is estimated that there was $6.712 billion in the foreign aid "pipeline" at the end of fiscal 1962. We realize that this money is committed. But the 1962 pipeline is almost $2 billion more than the 1960 figure. And this suggests to us that Congress has been appropriating money faster than it can be spent. It also raises doubts in our mind that Mr. PASSMAN, his critics to the contrary, really is bent on wrecking the foreign aid program.

Perhaps this year's cut is too deep—we do not know. If so, if this can be shown, some of the money should be restored. The restriction which would ban aid to Poland and Yugoslavia should be knocked out on a point of order. This matter was decided earlier in the session and, furthermore, it is legislation which has no place in an appropriation bill. On the whole, however, we think the committee did a creditable job. And we also believe its final action was an accurate reflection of the temper of the country.

Address by Vice Adm. H. A. Yeager, U.S. Navy, at the Christening and Launching Ceremonies of the U.S.S. "Vancouver"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, members of my family were honored to be present at the christening and launching of the U.S.S. *Vancouver* at the New York Naval Shipyard.

Adm. H. A. Yeager, commander amphibious force, U.S. Pacific Fleet, gave the major address at the ceremony. He discussed the role of the new class of ships—of which *Vancouver* is the second—and the role of our great amphibious forces in keeping the peace in all parts of the globe.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Admiral Yeager be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY VICE ADM. H. A. YEAGER, U.S. NAVY, COMMANDER, AMPHIBIOUS FORCE, U.S. PACIFIC FLEET, AT THE LAUNCHING OF U.S.S. "VANCOUVER" (LPD 2), NEW YORK NAVAL SHIPYARD, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1962

We meet here today to christen and launch a new ship of the U.S. Navy. This is a happy occasion for all of us. With this ceremony we take the first step in giving life to the creation of the skilled minds and hands of the planners, designers, and craftsmen. And with this ceremony, we assign a name to the ship and wish her good luck as she first enters her natural home—the waters of the great oceans of the world.

I know that as we gaze upon this ship we have our separate thoughts. The men who designed and built her look with pride and satisfaction on a job well done. Those who will serve in her, examine her lines and configuration with a professional eye to the tasks ahead. And those of us who see this ship as an important addition to the naval power of the United States, view her with patriotic pride as a symbol of the determination of the American people that, come what may, this Nation and this people shall remain forever free.

The name this ship is to bear is a most fitting one. The beautiful city of Vancouver in the great State of Washington is the oldest permanent settlement of our Pacific Northwest.

Vancouver was the center of the pioneering movement of our people into that area, and there were established the first industries and the first school in the Northwest.

It is also fitting that this ship bear the name Vancouver because in that city, more than a century ago, was built the first seagoing craft to be constructed in the Northwest. Vancouver was also the place where the first steamboat to enter the Pacific Ocean made her first trip under steam.

In naming the ship *Vancouver*, we also honor the great English navigator, whose historic survey of the northwest coast of the continent contributed so much to opening the area for development.

And so the name Vancouver represents many of the finest traditions of our Nation's history which should be, and will be, a part of this ship.

But today we look forward. This is a ship of the future. Those who conceived of this new design, those who drew her lines, and those who are building her, have had the future in mind.

She is the second ship of her type to be built. She follows the first of her class, U.S.S. *Raleigh*, which was commissioned here just a week ago.

These ships represent hard-earned experience in the field of amphibious warfare, but they represent also a vision of the future needs of the Navy. For this ship is to be part of the new Navy—a Navy being built in this shipyard and in shipyards throughout our great country—a new Navy which will give the United States the kind of naval power we shall need in the foreseeable future.

Some 20 years ago, the Navy's amphibious forces sprang into being almost overnight in response to the urgent requirements of the Second World War. Every major campaign of that war began with an amphibious invasion. Every one was successful.

But at the close of that war, some experts said that the advent of nuclear weapons meant the end of amphibious operations—that the Navy would no longer need an amphibious capability.

How wrong they have been. Within 6 years after the end of World War II, we made the large-scale amphibious landing at Inchon which effectively turned the tide in Korea. In the decade following that conflict, our amphibious forces were called on to act in connection with almost every occasion of international tension—at places like Suez, Vietnam, the Tachen Islands, Lebanon, and the Congo. Just a few weeks ago, ships of my Pacific Amphibious Force landed the Marines at Bangkok, Thailand.

The fact is that our ability to deter nuclear war has placed even greater emphasis on our ability also to deter or to resist limited aggression. The fact is that our great Navy-Marine Corps amphibious team is becoming increasingly important in view of the kind of nibbling aggressions to which our adversaries have turned.

Whenever such aggressions occur or are threatened, our amphibious forces can move promptly to the area across the free oceans, unhampered by diplomatic considerations, and supported by the full might of our mobile and powerful fleet.

Often, just being there, over the horizon, we can convince those who contemplate aggression that such an act would be unwise and perhaps self-destructive.

Or we can, at the request of a friendly government, promptly place our combat-ready marines ashore, and support them there indefinitely. We did so at Lebanon, and we kept the peace. We did so more recently in Thailand, and we helped to preserve the integrity of that country's borders.

This capability is, indeed, one of our country's important military assets, and it will continue to be important in the foreseeable future.

Vancouver, and the other new amphibious ships we are building today, will greatly en-

hance our Nation's limited-war deterrent power. But if an aggressor should be so unwise as to begin hostilities, these ships will enable us promptly to place American fighting men on the scene, together with their necessary weapons, equipment and supplies, and in such strength that they can effectively deal with the enemy.

Our new amphibious forces will be fast—able to move across a thousand miles of ocean within 48 hours. We will be able to land across the beach or, if the tactical situation dictates, we can strike through the air by helicopter-borne assault, hitting the enemy's flanks, surrounding his defense, interdicting his support, and successfully establishing our fighting marines ashore, following up the airborne assault with heavy logistic and combat support across such beaches as are available.

Vancouver, and her sister ship *Raleigh*, represent the means we need to carry out such operations. These ships combine the most useful characteristics of several other types of amphibious ships. Like the dock landing ships which they resemble, they can carry in their large well deck various types of landing craft. Like amphibious assault ships, their flight decks provide for the operation of troop and cargo-carrying helicopters. Like the attack transport and attack cargo ships, they can carry troops together with their combat equipment and the supplies necessary to support and sustain them ashore.

These ships provide the kind of versatility we need in our amphibious forces. Too many of our present amphibious ships, though still useful, are becoming obsolete in terms of present and future technology. Many of these ships, converted from merchant ships in the early days of World War II, were actually in service before most of the men who serve in them were born.

But ships like *Vancouver* and *Raleigh*, *Iwo Jima* and *Okinawa*, are taking their places. These new ships are a tribute to the wisdom and foresight of American people and of their representatives in the Congress. These ships are part of the American answer to those who promise to bury us.

God forbid that it should come to pass, but some Americans may indeed be buried before the great conflict of our times is ended. And if Americans should fall in defense of freedom, I know that history will say we buried our own, with honor, in heroes' graves, and that we did so as freemen.

These qualities of the American spirit—vision, determination, courage—these qualities are built into this ship.

And these are qualities which Captain Harbert and his officers and men will take into her when, a few months from now, the word is given, "Set the watch."

Let our adversaries take notice that we Americans are always on watch, that we recognize and fully assume our responsibilities to each other and to the great ideals which inspired our forefathers and which today inspire men struggling for freedom throughout the world.

Let those who despise and threaten freedom know that, with God's help, we Americans shall always defend and preserve our freedom, not matter what the cost.

Company Health Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is a news item reporting a speech by John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., which deserves both thought and action:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Sept. 19, 1962]

COMPANY HEALTH AID PLANS URGED FOR PENSIONERS

CHICAGO, September 19.—A business executive whose firm already has adopted the program urged other large companies yesterday to provide health insurance for their retired employees.

John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., a pharmaceutical concern, told the annual convention of the American Hospital Association: "If all major corporations and businesses across the country made similar provisions for retired employees * * * the nature of the national program which we face together might be totally changed."

Connor said that every unit of government which does not now do so should devise adequate plans for taking care of the health needs of its own retired employees. He said:

"It is a national scandal that those most in need of financial help during sickness in their declining years are often women and men who have served faithfully and well for many years on inadequate salaries as teachers, policemen, firemen, and civil servants of all kinds."

Connor said he shares the concern of many physicians that placing the health-care payments for any segment of the population under Federal control represents a dangerous precedent, but he said: "At the same time, I think opponents of the social security approach should ask themselves, in all candor, whether the so-called voluntary solution to the problem is as practical as they like to imagine."

He said that if most corporations and most local and State governments and the Federal Government provided voluntary and contributor insurance for their retired employees, the move "certainly would represent such an appreciable improvement that the remainder of the problem would be more manageable."

Connor said his firm has provided retired employees and their dependents with a hospital and surgical insurance program for the last 4 years, with the company bearing the entire cost.

Hartke Urges All Americans To Accept Personally the Vice President's Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on September 18, 1962, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON addressed the United Steelworkers convention in Miami, Fla. His remarks to the delegates and honored guests of the convention were more than inspirational. The Vice President offered a real challenge to America. Every American should accept this challenge personally.

I ask unanimous consent to have our Vice President's remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that all may have the opportunity to read and understand the wisdom of our distinguished and able Vice President, LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGE TO AMERICA

(Remarks by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, United Steelworkers Convention, Miami, Fla., Tuesday, September 18, 1962)

President McDonald, delegates, honored guests, being here today is something of a surprise for me. As you know, Arthur Goldberg was supposed to fill this place that I occupy. But at virtually the last minute, Secretary Goldberg found that he had another appointment. I had hardly stepped off the plane that brought me back from the Middle East, when I encountered the Goldberg charm and the Goldberg persistency.

So I find myself here in Miami trying to fill the shoes of a man with whom you have been intimately associated for many years and whom I consider one of the great public servants of our time.

Arthur Goldberg insisted that out of my experiences in the Middle East could come a message that would be meaningful to you. I told him that I did not think you had traveled all the way to Miami to listen to a travelog. But he said that this was not the point. He said, and I agree, that we are living in a world where all who love freedom—regardless of the race, creed, color, or section of origin—are bound together in common interest. In this, he is right, and about this I want to talk today.

SHEPHERDS AND KINGS

Less than 2 weeks ago, I was in a region of the world crucial to the future of freedom—the Middle East. I walked the teeming streets of Ankara and Izmir—and through the bazaars of Tehran and Istanbul. I talked with shepherds in Greece and roadworkers in Lebanon; with shipwrights in Naples and factory workers in Nicosia.

I had specific missions from the President. These required me to discuss points of common interest to the whole free world with presidents and prime ministers and with two kings.

But American foreign policy does not interest itself solely in diplomatic negotiations. We are deeply aware that the opinions of people are ultimately controlling. Therefore, I tried to learn from both the high and the low—from royalty in Greece and from a boy peddling watermelons in Beirut.

CRUCIAL REGION

It is difficult to find an area of the world of greater importance to the long-range interest of the United States and of freedom. The Middle East represents the cradle of Western civilization. The Middle East is where we first drew the line against communism after World War II—and that line has yet to be dented. The Middle East represents a vital flank of the NATO shield against aggression.

The major Middle Eastern nations that I visited have dedicated themselves to preserving their independence at any cost and have backed their determination with men and resources. No sensible man would pretend that he had become an expert on this area of the world in a visit that lasted less less than 3 weeks. Nevertheless, there are certain impressions that I wish to share with you—because they have a direct bearing upon our problems.

THE BRIGHT HOPE

First, the so-called ugly American has made very little impression upon the people of the world—if he exists at all.

The throngs that turned out by hundreds of thousands to greet me in virtually every country certainly did not turn out to see LYNDON JOHNSON. They did turn out because I was there representing the United States which remains the bright hope of hundreds of millions throughout the world.

Nothing in my travels has made me so proud as the deep reservoir of respect and affection for our country.

Second, communism has virtually no appeal to people in the Middle East or elsewhere in the world. The triumphs of communism do not arise out of Soviet success in capturing the hearts and the minds of men and women. Where the Communists have succeeded, they have done so only by taking advantage of confusion and division.

Third, and most important, the people of the world are no longer content to live in poverty, ignorance, and disease. They believe—quite rightly—that in the light of modern knowledge these ancient enemies no longer need be tolerated.

They are looking to our system to show them the way into the 20th century. And we must not fail because the alternative is anarchy and through anarchy the enemies of freedom will triumph.

This means that our system must work. We cannot hold ourselves forth as the hope of the world unless our own house is in order. The most important objective of our foreign policy is to maintain freedom as a way of life and a crucial element in achieving our goals is our own economic strength and our own prosperity.

A ROSY PICTURE

By selecting certain facts—and turning our backs upon others—it is possible to paint a rosy picture of America. I am afraid that some have succumbed to that temptation. Personal income has set new records. The average worker took home $85.53 a week last July, 3 percent higher than a year ago. Employment in August was at an alltime high and the unemployment rate dropped from nearly 7 percent of the labor force to 5.8 percent.

But this is not the whole picture. Despite the high rate of employment, 3.9 million people remained jobless and many of our finest plants are producing at rates well below capacity. In your own industry, steel production is at less than 60 percent of its potential.

These facts need not give cause for despair. We are not in a depression nor are we close to one. But these facts do present us with a challenge. Can we—a nation which prides itself upon our humanitarian philosophy and our economic efficiency—continue to permit this waste of human and physical resources?

A CLEAR ANSWER

President Kennedy has given the answer loud and clear. He has affirmed unemployment as the major domestic challenge of the sixties. And he has pointed out that this administration has no intention of learning to live with unemployment. We will not be content until this enemy is licked and American workers can live in the security to which they are entitled by their brains, their brawn, and their willingness to work.

The first need when this administration took office was to come to the relief of those who were suffering from the long months of dreary joblessness.

The President put into action the food stamp plan. Unemployment compensation was extended to those who had exhausted their benefits. The Area Redevelopment Act became a cornerstone of policies to cushion the impact of automation. The U.S. Employment Service was strengthened. The minimum wage was increased and its coverage extended for the first time in 22 years. A great new Housing Act was passed.

The President established the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity—and as Chairman of that Committee, I want to congratulate your leadership upon its unswerving devotion to the principles of that Executive order. These measures, however, represented only the beginning. Longer term programs must be put underway.

One of the most vital is the Manpower Development and Training Act. Already, 70 projects in 11 States have been approved. In a very short time, more than 8,000 people will be trained for 51 different jobs and this will soon grow into the hundreds of thousands.

Earlier this month, Congress passed the President's $900 million public works program. It also passed the tax credit bill, while the administration has developed new tax depreciation schedules.

Still before Congress is new employment insurance legislation; the youth employment opportunities bill; the college aid bill and the most significant trade measure since the early days of the New Deal.

I cannot predict the outcome of all of these measures. We live under government by consent—and we intend to keep it that way. But I can tell you that this administration will not rest until it has secured adequate measures to combat unemployment.

NOT A LONG JUMP

I started my remarks today by reminiscing on the streets of Ankara and the bazaars of Istanbul. This may seem like a long jump to a convention in Miami. But the jump is not as far as it seems.

Often during my visit to the Middle East, I was reminded of a statement by one of your great leaders—one of the greatest names in the American labor movement—Phil Murray. He said, in naming labor's objectives, that what the workingman wants is a rug on the floor, a picture on the wall, and music in the home. This is a modest statement of what we have achieved. But for millions of people it is literally what they aspire to. And their aspirations are tied—very directly—to the leadership that we can give the free world.

Leadership comes only from those who are strong—strong morally and strong physically.

TRIPARTITE DIVISION

We live in a world which is divided roughly into three parts. One-third is under Communist domination; one-third is committed to the institutions of freedom; one-third is groping its way toward the institutions of the 20th century.

These people of the latter third are hoping that they can achieve what we already have. We cannot afford to let them down. Our Nation, in its prime, must not falter or fail.

We shall not succeed, however, if we maintain an artificial division between our foreign and domestic policies. We must realize that our foreign policy is not a separate thing—to be held in the hands of a few skilled specialists and to be divorced from the total overall policies of our Nation.

The extent to which we ourselves are making full use of our productive resources has a direct bearing upon the example we offer the rest of the world. The extent to which we achieve physical stability is an immediate factor in our capacity to help others less fortunate to help themselves. Our capacity to govern ourselves through mutual agreement is the measure of our capacity to attract others to the institutions of freedom.

And in the last analysis, we must all remember that in everything we do—including labor-management relations—the public interest has become everyone's silent partner and the public interest calls upon us for the very highest form of responsibility.

TRENDS AT WORK

There are six trends at work in our land which calls for national unity of purpose as we have never had such national unity before. These trends are:

1. Our rate of economic growth has been inadequate to ward off long-term unemployment.

2. Since the end of the war we have experienced four recessions—and many of the jobs lost during those recessions have been lost for good.

3. Profound changes in our technology are leading ultimately to greater capacity and more abundance—but for the time being they are making obsolete the skills that formerly meant steady work for millions of American workers.

4. The geographical base of American industry is shifting—and thereby causing dislocations in our labor force.

5. The exhaustion of resources has economically isolated some towns and communities that once were prosperous and flourishing.

6. Our success in aiding foreign economies to recover after World War II has increased competition for world markets. We do not seek to eliminate competition but we do seek to meet it intelligently.

Never before in our economic history have the stakes been so great and the need for national unity so paramount. And it is to face the trends that I have cited already that this administration has presented its programs.

There is no one answer and no one solution. We must, as a nation, march forward in overall unity tackling our problems as a whole.

I would like to leave you today with a thought expressed by the man who was originally supposed to occupy this platform—Arthur Goldberg.

He said, "We all, in the end, have only one interest at heart, that this great and mighty Nation of ours continue in strength and vitality as the champion of human freedom."

I thank you.

The Senate Versus McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Senate Versus McCarthy," published in the Saturday Evening Post issue of August 25–September 1, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE VERSUS MCCARTHY

DEAR SIRS: Your article on the censure of Senator McCarthy ["The Final Irony of Joe McCarthy," by Edward Bennett Williams, June 9] demonstrates the forensic skill of his lawyer, Mr. Williams. But it doesn't help The Post's reputation for responsible treatment of history.

Mr. Williams says nothing critical of me, although the Senate's action on the McCarthy censure resolution of 1954 followed in train from my own resolution of 1951 asking for McCarthy's expulsion from the Senate. Wholly unjustly, Williams traduces the Senate of the United States and the fairness of its procedures—and you make no comment.

Senator McCarthy was censured largely on two counts: (1) His outrageously contemptuous treatment of the Gillette committee studying my resolution, and (2) his contemptuous treatment of the Watkins committee studying Senator Flanders' censure resolution. In my judgment, the Senate and the public saw these as parallels to the contempt McCarthy had shown for the rights of scores of Americans over the previous 5 years.

Mr. Williams claims that, had the Watkins committee or the Senate discovered that the Gillette committee had ordered a "mail cover" on McCarthy, "the outcome might have been different." Williams fails to report that the "mail cover" was discussed on the floor of the Senate before the final vote for censure. Senator HAYDEN, one of the Senate's most respected members, described the "mail cover" as legal (no mail was opened) and customary in investigations, said that it had become necessary in this case because of McCarthy's refusal to testify and gave its purpose as an attempt to learn the identity of McCarthy's brokers—for a followup on the charge that McCarthy used contributions to his "anti-Communist crusade" for personal investment.

Mr. Williams implies that McCarthy's contempt of the Gillette committee was accidental—that the telegram inviting McCarthy to testify arrived while he was on a hunting trip. Williams fails to report that in the weeks and months preceding this telegram the committee sent McCarthy seven different written requests to testify; McCarthy either ignored these or answered with derisive "open letters"; even the telegram delayed by the hunting trip evoked an insulting reply.

Williams suggests McCarthy wasn't in contempt because no subpena was issued—but he surely knows that the Senate doesn't subpena its own Members, and a request of this kind is a courteous kind of command.

Williams claims censure might have been avoided had McCarthy agreed to a compromise resolution. He fails to report that several proposed compromises were resoundingly defeated on the floor before the final crushing vote of 67 to 22.

Above all, Williams gives no inkling of the depths of McCarthy's abuse of Senators. One example: McCarthy warned Senator Hendrickson, the Republican who remained on the Gillette committee, to expect a blast if he signed the Gillette report. Hendrickson signed and was promptly dubbed by McCarthy, on the front pages, "a living miracle, with neither brains nor guts." Senator Watkins was termed a "coward" and his committee a "lynching bee." Senator Flanders was "senile—they ought to bring a man with a net."

There is a vital national lesson in the censure of Joseph McCarthy. Mr. Williams' article blurs and undermines that lesson. The lesson is that the U.S. Senate will put up only so long with the kind of tactics McCarthy made notorious.

WILLIAM BENTON,
Southport, Conn.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Former Senator Benton is now publisher and chairman of Encyclopaedia Britannica.)

Part I: Aid to Dependent Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, aid to dependent children has become one of the most controversial subjects in the country. Detroit News Reporter Jo Ann Hardee has done a serivice by writing a six-part series on the subject which I am pleased to insert in the RECORD:

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

(By Jo Ann Hardee)

Outside neighbor children amuse themselves by filling broken beer bottles from a pool of stagnant water and splashing the muddy contents onto littered pavement.

In the apartment a 24-year-old woman is being interviewed by a caseworker from the aid to dependent children (ADC) program.

Miss Adams' case is being reinstated a year after the birth of her third illegitimate child. Her home declared unsuitable, she was cut off aid to dependent children, had been supported by the Detroit Public Welfare Department.

MOTHER'S CASE IS TYPICAL

Miss Adams is as typical of the current aid to dependent children caseload in Wayne County as any one person could be.

Like 80 percent of the county's aid to dependent children mothers, she is a Negro.

She lives in the crowded, crime-ridden Petoskey Precinct. Her apartment is clean, though poorly furnished. Prominent in its small living room is an old television set, her last gift from a long-gone boy friend.

The building in which she lives is ill kept. Hallways are dirty, stairs in need of repair, corridors filled with stale cooking odors and swarms of flies.

LANDLORDS "MILK" PROPERTY

"Part of the fault lies with absentee landlords who milk their near-slum properties for all they are worth, letting them crumble while they live off the rents."

Rents are cheaper in city housing projects where nearly 1,400 aid to dependent children families live. Averaging $37 a month for public assistance cases, housing project rents are nearly $30 less than private housing and buildings are usually better maintained.

But there are waiting lists for public housing apartments with more than one bedroom.

Frustration pervades neighborhoods where large numbers of public assistance families live.

TEEN'S COMPLAINT: "NOBODY CARES"

One aid to dependent children-supported teen told a settlement house worker: "We're poor. Nobody cares about us. The teachers don't care, the police don't care, my friends don't care. And I don't much care either."

This feeling of neglect is heightened by the 40 percent annual turnover in aid to dependent children social workers who leave for higher paying jobs, more schooling, or marriage and families. This amounts to a new work staff every 2½ years.

The caseworker processing Miss Adams' application is the third to handle the 120-case zone in 3 years. "It takes several visits to reach a point where a client trusts you and accepts your advice," one aid to dependent children worker said.

"Sometimes you only see a client once. Another persons sees her the next time, another the next."

Every month 600 to 800 of the 16,394 Wayne County recipients move, complicating casework and disrupting children's school life.

Aid to dependent children officials and their critics both ask: What kind of an investigation and rehabilitation job can an agency do when it's up against such alarming mobility rates?

SURPRISE VISITS MADE TWICE A YEAR

Swamped with paperwork, aid to dependent children caseworkers are required to pay a surprise home call on their cases only twice a year. (The Detroit Welfare Department with roughly 12,000 clients—85 per worker—visits its caseload at least every 2 months.)

Problem families on aid to dependent children may receive more frequent home calls.

One worker told of a client who had had seven illegitimate children by seven men.

The woman had an intelligence rating of 60 (normal is 90–110) and had to be reminded nearly weekly that she was not to have children while unmarried.

When her worker returned from a 3-month sick leave the client disclosed she was pregnant. The woman's excuse: "But you weren't here and I didn't remember what I wasn't supposed to do."

Eventually all but one of this woman's children were taken from her. They are in foster homes or mental hospitals.

Within her limited capacities she is trying—almost pitifully—to make a good home for the remaining child.

Critics often characterize aid to dependent children recipients as lazy, neglectful chiselers who spend money meant for their children on booze and boy friends.

COUNTY ADOPTED PROGRAM IN 1940

Federal depression legislation, aid to dependent children was adopted in Wayne County in 1940 to supplant a mothers' pension fund. During 22 years, the program has remained essentially the same. Its recipients have changed.

Only 6 percent of the State's 32,000 recipients are widows; 7 percent are incapacitated fathers.

The rest of the caseload includes:

	Percent
Divorced or legally separated	24
Deserted	11
Separated without court decree	20
Unwed	26

In Wayne County percentages of those separated without court decree and unwed are considerably higher—28 percent and 35 percent respectively, of the caseload.

The dramatic change in aid to dependent children recipients is illustrated by one policeman's recollections. "When the program started you could visit gleaming clean homes and be offered a sociable cup of tea," she said.

Balance this against a current slum area caseworker's comment: "As for a straight-backed chair so you don't have to sit on any overstuffed furniture that might be pestinfested."

Miss Adams' home was clean as were her two older children, alert youngsters of 6 and 4.

They stood wide eyed while their mother explained to her caseworker that she received regular support payments of $10 weekly from each of their fathers.

Only 15 percent of the fathers of illegitimate children on Michigan aid to dependent children rolls support their children.

PRESS LEGAL HUNT FOR MISSING "HUSBAND"

Her last "husband" left the State before Miss Adams knew she was pregnant. Aid to dependent children will try to locate him through a social security check. If the agency finds him, paternity and support suits may be initiated in the State where he is living.

If, like many such men, he is infrequently employed, he may be hard to find.

Last year aid to dependent children referred 725 women to the friend of the court to establish paternity. This is a first step in getting aid to dependent children support.

If a woman is divorced or separated she goes to the friend of the court or recorder's court adjustment division to secure support payments, assigned directly to the agency.

Miss Adams is cooperative, unlike some mothers who try to protect their exhusbands or boy friends or are afraid to bring them to court.

In a screening interview 2 months earlier, a caseworker established that Miss Adams' parents cannot give her any support. Her mother and father are divorced. (Aid to dependent children recipients frequently come from broken homes.)

Her father is unemployed, her mother's whereabouts is unknown.

An assistance budget was also prepared, set at $223 monthly. Support payments will be credited to this budget and aid to dependent children will add $137 in Federal-

State funds. If the men fail to pay, Miss Adams will receive a maximum State grant of $160.

The top State grant is $240 monthly for a family of eight or more.

CITY, COUNTY CUT SUPPLEMENTAL AID

Until September 1 the city and county were supplementing these ceilings by from $1 to $45 per case.

In an economy move Mayor Cavanagh dropped city supplementation to 7,000 families. Cases of overage dependents and medical hardship may be accepted by the Detroit Welfare Department, but only after reinvestigation of need.

Wayne County, which followed Detroit's lead in dropping supplementation, will consider hardship cases on an individual basis.

Aid to dependent children mothers protest that the slashes will create great hardship and will increase crime among deprived teens.

Miss Adams is unemployed.

Only 4.5 percent of Wayne County's aid to dependent children mothers work while 17.1 percent of those out of State do.

According to W. J. Maxey, State head of the department of social welfare, this is because of limited job opportunities in the Detorit area and poor child-care facilities.

Unlike the city welfare department, aid to dependent children has no employment service attached to its office although it makes use of Michigan Employment Security Commission (MESC) facilities.

Under aid to dependent children rules a woman is encouraged to find employment only if her children are at least 2 years old and "an adequate child care program is available."

In 1961 more than 60 percent of nonworking aid to dependent children mothers in Wayne County said they were "needed in the home."

REFUSAL TO WORK MEANS LOSS OF AID

If a woman refuses to work when aid to dependent children says she is able, she is cut off the program. Last year 21 of 4,619 case closings in Wayne County were because a woman refused available work.

Another 572 were closed because of employment.

Miss Adams is qualified for low-paying jobs. Nearly 80 percent of the county's aid to dependent children mothers are classed as service workers (laundries, restaurants), domestics or unskilled labor.

There are nearly 80,000 unemployed in the tricounty area, one quarter of them women. A Michigan Employment Security Commission spokesman said one of the few fields where work is available is as a domestic.

He said some prospective employers were reluctant to have someone on public assistance in their homes.

"We've had special drives to place aid to dependent children recipients," he said. "But the big stumbling blocks have always been child care and lack of training."

TRAINING OFFERED DOMESTIC WORKERS

The Michigan Employment Security Commission offers a 7-week course for domestic workers, costing $3.75. There is a long waiting list for it.

Often caseworkers advise mothers to remain at home because of emotionally disturbed children or special medical problems.

How much emphasis is placed on getting jobs for fully employable women often depends on the caseworker's persistence.

Aid to dependent children mothers complain that any money they make is subtracted from their total grants. "When they take away what you earn, what reason is there to leave your children and go to work?" one aid to dependent children client asked.

Just before she leaves after an hour-long interview, the caseworker gives Miss Adams a lecture on maintaining a suitable home.

The three children are obviously happy. Clean and neatly dressed, they show signs of affectionate care. There is no concern about neglect.

Church-going is encouraged as is Parent-Teacher Association membership for mothers with school-age children, and block-club membership where such an organization exists.

Miss Adams is warned: No overnight visits from boy friends, no excessive drinking, no trouble with the police or courts.

The application will be approved and in perhaps 2 months the first check will arrive.

Once given monthly, the checks are now mailed twice a month "to minimize the temptation to spend foolishly and to help these women manage their grants better."

From years of experience, the caseworker predicts that Miss Adams will eventually be cut off the program again as she has been twice before because of an illegitimate birth.

SOCIAL PATTERNS PRETTY WELL SET

"You can spot the hopeless cases," the worker says tiredly. "She will make a good home for these children; she'll love them and care for them.

"When it comes to a choice between something for herself and something for them, she'll do without.

"But the odds are very good that she'll find another boy-friend and have another baby.

"By the time we see these women, their social patterns are pretty well set. We can work with the young ones, the kids who made one mistake and don't want to make another.

"Despite what people think, these are the majority.

"But with her record and her intelligence, it isn't too hopeful."

Of nearly 40,000 children on Wayne County's aid to dependent children rolls last year, 42.6 percent were illegitimate. This does not include children born to married women but not fathered by their husbands.

Outstate where the remaining half of the Michigan caseload is located, only 19.2 percent are illegitimate. This is compatible with the Wayne County—outstate legitimacy rate.

It is this factor in the fatherless family program that arouses public ire and plagues caseworkers.

With new Federal funds and community help, aid to dependent children officials hope to strike at the social factors which create illegitimacy and attempt to provide guidance for hopeful cases among unwed mothers.

Perhaps the other most often repeated criticism of aid dependent to children is that it is riddled with fraud, top heavy with ineligible clients. One critic even calls the day aid to dependent children checks arrive "Christmas for the chiselers."

The Textile Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of September 20, 1962:

THE TEXTILE SITUATION

Allegation is one thing. Fact is apt to be something very different.

This truism applies to the discussions, political and otherwise, regarding the situation faced by the textile industry.

Charges that President Kennedy could eliminate the conditions complained of by the manufacturers, if he only would, are completely misleading.

There are many other elements affecting the industry besides the importation of foreign goods and the two-price cotton system.

For instance, the cotton mills are facing competition that is increasing day by day from manmade fibers. That probably has something to do with sales of cotton textiles.

It is nothing less than foolish to say President Kennedy is "playing politics" with this question. How can Mr. Kennedy or the Democratic Party gain anything by hurting one of the country's biggest industries?

By far the greater number of people who work in cotton mills in the South, at least, are Democrats of lifelong standing.

Does anyone believe Mr. Kennedy is so dumb that he would let this industry, which provides so many of his supporters with their daily necessities, suffer if he could prevent it?

A Gaffney textile executive who has been in the business all of his life said:

"If I were given the authority and told to take whatever action was needed to eliminate the textile industry's woes, I would not know what to do."

This executive went further and conceded that President Kennedy has made greater efforts to help the industry than anything that was done during the 8 years of the Republicans under Eisenhower.

Independence Day of the Federal Republic of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Federal Republic of Germany, Dr. Heinrich Luebke; and His Excellency, the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany, Karl Heinrich Knaptstein, on the occasion of the 13th anniversary of the German Federal Republic's independence.

On September 21, 1949, the United States, Great Britain, and France recognized the establishment of the Federal Republic of Germany. During the summer of 1948 the three wartime Allies, acting as occupying powers, agreed that the French zone of occupation should join up with the British and American zones to form a single economic and political unit. A German Parliamentary Council, elected by the state parliaments, drew up a basic law—a provisional constitution to serve pending the unification of the divided country. The basic law was approved by the Allied Commanders in Chief, and the following August elections were held for the Bundestag, or Federal Assembly. Prof. Theodor Heuss was elected Federal President, a post which he held for 10 years, winning the respect and veneration of his own people and countless friends of Germany

abroad. Dr. Konrad Adenauer, leader of the Christian Democratic Union, the largest party in the Bundestag, was elected Federal Chancellor. Chancellor Adenauer has provided strong leadership for the second German democracy for a period which almost equals the entire life of its predecessor, the Weimar Republic.

September 21, 1949 did not mark the complete independence of the Federal Republic. But while the actual return of sovereignty took place in 1954, the establishment of the new state was a milestone on the road which the German people chose, the road to democratic government and full and equal partnership in the Western alliance. On the same day that the Federal Republic was established, an occupation statute went into force which defined the powers to be reserved to the occupation authorities as long as the occupation lasted. But this document proved to be a relic of the past rather than an omen of the future; from the date of its promulgation the wartime Allies reduced as rapidly as possible the reserve powers retained by them, giving the Federal Republic increasing control over its own affairs. Germany's integration into the Western World proceeded rapidly, as the Bonn Government joined the European Coal and Steel Community, the Council of Europe, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and then in 1957 shared in the creation of the European Common Market.

Events have moved so rapidly during these last 13 years that it is appropriate to recall how much has changed. Americans have admired the recovery of Germany, which has been aptly labeled an "economic miracle." We have watched with satisfaction as Germany resumed its place among the freedom-loving nations of the world, and demonstrated its convictions with a major contribution to Western defense. Americans have recognized that their own freedom is at stake in the freedom of Berlin. We share the anguish of Berliners over Herr Ulbricht's monstrous wall. We have ignored national boundaries in commiting our strength to the defense of Berlin, just as Germans have ignored national boundaries in espousing the cause of European unity. We salute the Federal Republic of Germany on the 13th anniversary of its establishment.

The Thayer Family: Great Benefactors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article written by the very able, eminent journalist of the Worcester Telegram Gazette, Mr. Frank Crotty, entitled "Birds, Birds, Birds."

This learned, well-documented, most interesting article was written concerning the Thayer Bird Museum of South Lancaster, Mass., in my district, established by the famous philanthropist, outstanding citizen, and great American, the late John Eliot Thayer.

Mr. Thayer was a scion of a very famous New England family whose members have been noted for many generations in the history of Massachusetts for outstanding leadership in many fields of human endeavor and whose astonishingly generous philanthropy and charity have been so noteworthy in the affairs of the beautiful town of Lancaster, in my district and our Commonwealth.

The Thayer family gives living expression to the precept that wealth, like ability and power, is impressed with moral and social responsibilities and should be wisely utilized to promote the public benefit as well as private interest.

It would be quite impossible to enumerate the benefactions of John Eliot Thayer and the Thayer family. It will suffice to say that many very good causes have been greatly indebted to the members of this family, and many individuals, the town of Lancaster and other communities, Harvard College, other institutions of learning and numerous charities and public bodies, have been rich beneficiaries over a long period of time of their most generous gifts.

The Bird Museum, so well described in the article, is but one of many cultural, charitable, educational, and social benefits conferred upon community, State, and Nation, and literally upon an army of individual people, by the Thayer family.

For the most part, not only broad, worthwhile, charitable, and religious works were supported by this great family, but cultural, civic, and educational objectives were systematically pursued. Many artists, singers, musicians, painters, scientists, talented people of many callings were patronized, educated or immeasurably assisted through the bounty of the Thayer family without fanfare or ostentation. Churches, public buildings, libraries, schools, museums, monuments, hospitals, agricultural fairs, bazaars and band concerts, public entertainments, and a host of personal charitable objects were most generously endowed.

I would not venture to estimate the longrun, total sum of these benefactions, but even today the figures would be staggering.

There is a great lesson in the generosity, philanthropy, and good works of the Thayer family that Americans today might well ponder as we view the receding springs of private philanthropy and the growth of materialistic philosophies.

Our modern tax systems, local, State, and National, are taking such a large share of income and principal of our well-to-do citizens these days that they have much less for charitable, cultural, civic, religious, and public contributions.

Modern philanthropy is, in truth, large-scale production and is based to no inconsiderable degree upon objectives of tax avoidance rather than the true spirit of philanthropy which comes from the heart.

I am exceedingly proud of the contributions of the Thayer family, past and present. Lancaster, Clinton, and other communities that I am honored to represent in the Congress, my State and our Nation can be thankful for the nobility of purpose, the generosity, the high mindedness, and the deep, human concern which the Thayer family has demonstrated through the years.

If America had more families like the Thayers working for human betterment and the elevation of human standards, giving unselfishly and generously of their means to promote good causes, holding out the hand of succor and assistance to the weak, the poor, the helpless, and the lowly, we would have a better nation.

If we could replace current day materialism and its naked disregard of human values with more thoughtful, compassionate regard for human beings, the Nation and the world would be much the better for it.

The article follows:

BIRDS, BIRDS, BIRDS

(By Frank Crotty)

This year marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of John Eliot Thayer, noted philanthropist and founder of the Thayer Bird Musemum at South Lancaster.

The date, which is being observed both at Harvard University and Lancaster, has focused new attention on the museum and is drawing more and more visitors to it.

Erected and opened to the public in 1904, the museum attracted more than 10,000 visitors during its first 6 years. Since than no tally has been kept and many people today do not even know of its existence.

At the time of the founder's death in 1933 the museum housed the finest privately owned collection of ornithological specimens in the world. There were some 3,500 mounted birds, plus 30,000 bird skins, rare eggs, and bird paintings by John James Audubon, Alexander Wilson, John Singer Sargeant, and others. All these he bequeathed to Harvard University with a provision for a continuing exhibition on loan at the museum in Lancaster of specimens not needed at Cambridge.

Most of the collection—including some 2,000 birds—is at Harvard's Museum of Comparative Zoology in Cambridge today and is set up in a special room as "the Thayer Collection of North American Birds."

Currently in the Lancaster Museum are about 1,500 birds, including a passenger pigeon and great auk babies, both species extinct, and a whooping crane, almost extinct. Eleven great auk eggs—one-sixth of all that are known to exist—were carefully transported from Lancaster to Harvard University shortly after Thayer's death.

The Thayer Bird Museum—16 miles from Worcester and 35 from Boston—is open to the public from May to October on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Saturdays from 1 to 5 p.m. There is a 25 cents admission charge, with children under 12 being admitted for 10 cents. John Thayer Hemenway, of Milton, a grandson of the founder, is president of the directors and Herbert H. Hosmer, president of the Lancaster Historical Society, is honorary curator.

The building is of Georgian architecture and is located right in the center of the Atlantic Union College buildings. The college campus was once part of the vast Thayer family property in the town.

In Lancaster, Thayer is a revered name. The first of the family to reside in the town was Rev. Nathaniel Thayer, D.D., who was

called there as its minister in 1793. He was born in Hampton, N.H., in 1769 and, after serving as Lancaster's clergyman for 47 years, died in 1840. He was graduated from Harvard in 1789.

He had five children who lived to maturity, including John E. Thayer (1803–57) and Nathaniel Thayer (1808–83) who were outstandingly successful as bankers and brokers in Boston. Their firm—called John E. Thayer & Bro.—amassed much wealth in railroads, Chicago real estate, Kansas City stockyards, and the general expansion of the country. After John's passing Nathaniel ran the business alone and when the latter died he left the largest fortune ever accumulated up to that time in Massachusetts, according to Historian George E. Ellis. The concern later became Kidder, Peabody & Co.

In 1846 Nathaniel married Cornelia Van Rensselaer of Albany, N.Y. She was a daughter of Gen. Stephen van Rensselaer, the last patroon. This designation was applied to proprietors with certain large tracts of land with manorial and other rights, granted under the old Dutch government of New York and New Jersey.

One of their seven children was the ornithologist—John E. Thayer—who was named after his uncle. He was born in Boston, April 3, 1862, a twin son. The other twin was named Bayard. Both spent most of their lives in Lancaster. Bayard died in 1921.

Over the years the Thayer family has engaged in extensive philanthropies, many of them benefiting Harvard University and Lancaster. Nathaniel, the twins' father (there were several Nathaniel Thayers), gave a dormitory—Thayer Hall—to Harvard and financed expeditions of its noted naturalist, Prof. J. Louis R. Agassiz. The Lancaster Town Library was erected in 1868 at a cost of $30,000 of which he paid two-thirds and gave an endowment of $5,000 for the purchase of books. Other family gifts include the present library, built in 1908, and its children's room—a subsequent addition—which the late Mrs. Bayard Thayer gave in memory of her son, Nathaniel Thayer 2d. She also gave a Bayard Thayer book fund of $10,000.

Another Thayer gift to Lancaster was the townhall, built in 1907 in memory of Nathaniel Thayer, the banker-broker, by his sons. The family has also given generously to the Unitarian Church. Its building, designed by Charles Bulfinch and considered one of the best of its type in the country, was constructed in 1816–17 as the town meeting house when Dr. Nathaniel Thayer was minister. It's a combination of beauty, dignity, and utility. Its minister today is Rev. Alexander St. Ivanyi.

These buildings—the townhall, library, and church—surround the town green in the center of Lancaster. Other buildings there are elementary schools.

Ancestors of the Thayer family came to this country from England and settled in Braintree about 1630. The family produced many clergymen, all ministers except one who was the priest of the first regularly organized Roman Catholic Church in Boston. This was Rev. John Thayer, who was a brother of the great-great-grandfather of the ornithologist. The priest was born in Boston in 1758, trained for the Congregational ministry, and served for a time as chaplain to Gov. John Hancock. He became pastor in Boston in 1790 and died in Limerick, Ireland, in 1813.

John Eliot Thayer was educated at Hopkinson's School in Boston and Harvard, having graduated from the latter in 1885. He played baseball and football at both schools. At Harvard he was also captain of the crew for 2 years and class president in his senior year.

After commencement he took an around-the-world voyage and within a year married Eveyln Duncan Forbes, daughter of Franklin Forbes, a Clinton manufacturer. They had 47 years of married life and were the parents of two sons and three daughters.

The children were: John E. Thayer, Jr., who married Katherine Warren; Evelyn, who married I. Tucker Burr; Nora, who married F. Abbott Goodhue; Natalie, who married Lawrence Hemenway; and Duncan Forbes Thayer, who married Priscilla McHenry.

The children living today are John E. Thayer, Jr., of Milton, a Boston broker, and Mrs. Goodhue of Hewlett, N.Y., who has a summer home in Bolton.

The only members of the family residing in Lancaster now are Mrs. Duncan F. Thayer, two of her four daughters—Miss Priscilla Stewart Thayer and Mrs. Pauline Revere Sears—and the latter's 3-year-old son, Thayer David Sears. The other daughters are Cornelia, wife of Samuel Adams, a Boston lawyer, and Miss Juliana M. Thayer, also of Boston. Mrs. Thayer has three other grandchildren, all Adamses.

The Thayer home today is the one built by the ornithologist on George Hill Road, South Lancaster, in 1897. On property adjacent to it was Bayard's home, which for the last decade or so has been a convent and women's retreat house of the Sisters of the Cenacle.

Mrs. Duncan F. Thayer, a native of Green Spring Valley, Md., is a great-great granddaughter of James McHenry, who was Secretary of War in Washington's and John Adams' Cabinets and for whom Fort McHenry, located near Baltimore and of Star Spangled Banner fame, was named. She is also a descendant of Thomas Jefferson's family. The third President of the United States was her great-great-great-uncle. As a young bride she lived in New York for 3 years before settling in Lancaster 30 years ago.

"When I first came to Lancaster," she says, "there were six other Mrs. Thayers here. People used to refer to us by our husband's first names * * * such as Mrs. John, Mrs. Bayard, Mrs. Duncan, etc."

In those days John E. Thayer had 10 or a dozen servants, most of them working on the grounds. He had his own nine-hole golf course on the estate. It was the second privately owned one in the country, the first having been installed by Hunnewells in Wellesley. Thayer brought a golf course expert here from Scotland to do the job.

While a student at Harvard he helped finance the education of needy friends and at the time of his graduation gave $15,000 to the school to start a Harvard Journal of Economics.

He called his Lancaster estate his "farm." Raising Baldwin apples was his major agricultural object. His orchards were successful. He kept careful accounting of the capital investment and all costs * * * and made a satisfactory profit.

He was Massachusetts delegate to the American Apple Congress at Denver in 1911, a founder of the Worcester East Agricultural Society, and a trustee of the Massachusetts Society for Promoting Agriculture.

Animals always interested him and he first turned to fine breeds of dogs, and then of horses. He was outstandingly successful at dog and horse shows and on trotting parks over a large part of the Eastern States. His twin brother Bayard was interested with him in these activities. Their Hillside Kennels became famous for their bulldogs, Scotch terriers, and Scotch deerhounds, winning many prizes and establishing popularity for these breeds.

As a horseman he was president of the New England Trotting Horse Breeders Association, and Boston Horse Show Association; vice president of the Grand Circuit of Trotting Horses, and the Gentlemen's Driving Club; director of the Metropolitan Driving Club, and the American Horse Breeders Publishing Co.; and a founder of the Myopia Hunt Club.

The pleasure he derived in these interests—apples, dogs and horses—was small, however, compared with the satisfactions he enjoyed and the distinctions he won in the field of ornithology. He was absorbed in this branch of zoology the last 30 years of his life and it was during this time that he put together his signal collection. He sent expeditions to Mexico, Alaska, Northern Siberia, Queen Charlotte Island, and lower California, seeking bird specimens. The late Dick Harlow, Harvard football coach, was a member of one of the expeditions.

It was to house his collection adequately that he built the museum. Over its main entrance is the word "Aves" (Latin for birds) and near the roof are these names of outstanding ornithologists: Audubon, Wilson, Bonaparte, Nuttall, Richardson, and Townsend.

Thayer's gull was named for him in 1915 by Ornithologist W. Sprague Brooks, of Orleans, who spent many years collecting specimens for the Museum of Comparative Zoology.

"It is an arctic bird, a subspecies of our herring gull," Brooks says.

Thayer was vice-president of the National Audubon Society; vice-president of the American Ornithologists Union, and clerk of the Nuttall Ornithologists; also a member of the Boston Zoology Society; the faculty of the Harvard Museum of Comparative Zoology; Boston Society of Natural History; American Academy of Arts and Science; Associated Committee for Wild Life Conservation; and the New England Turkey Breeders Association.

As a result of a fully developed appreciation for trees, he was instrumental in having the office of tree warden created in Lancaster, was elected to fill the position and held it for many years. He contributed funds for tree planting and sought protection and preservation of trees.

Other Lancaster offices he held were: chairman of selectmen, road, water and building commissioner, school committeeman, member of charity board, cemetery and other committees. He was a library trustee for 45 years and for 27 years of that time was chairman of the board.

He took great pride in the Bulfinch Church which was built during his grandfather's ministry. He financed complete restoration of the interior, made the outside safe, enlarged and beautified the grounds attached to it, and in his will set up a substantial fund for its permanent support.

He was a member of the standing committee of the church and also a director of the American Unitarian Association. He was also a standing committeeman of the First Church of Boston, which he attended when spending winters in that city.

He was a trustee and member of the finance committee of the Clinton Hospital. He was president of the First National Bank of Clinton—now the Clinton Trust Co.—for more than 10 years and president of the Clinton Savings Bank for 19 years. He was a trustee of the latter for 45 years.

He was also vice president of the New England Forest, Fish & Game Association, president of the Sportsmen's Show of Boston, and on the executive committee of the Massachusetts Fish & Game Association.

John E. Thayer was proud of his grandchildren, of which there were 20. Today there are around 40 great-grandchildren and 4 great-greats. Of all these there are only two males named Thayer—his son, John E., Jr., and grandson, John E. III, of Tokyo, Japan.

In order to promote a constructive and coordinated public interest in civic affairs, he organized and served as president of the Lancastriana, a club composed of the leading men of the town. He headed it for 25 years.

Other groups with which he was affiliated were numerous, including the Somerset Club, Harvard Club, Algonquin Club, Prescott Club, Country Club of Brookline, Bunker Hill Monument Association, New England Historic Genealogical Society, Society of Descendants of the Colonial Clergy, and Colonial Society of Massachusetts.

Death came to him July 22, 1933, and his funeral, simple in character, took place in the Bulfinch church. A large congregation, including a considerable number of his Harvard class, attended. He was interred in the Thayer Burying Ground, adjacent to the Old Settlers Burying Ground in Lancaster. It is a beautiful tree-shaded spot.

In addition to President Hemenway, the directors of the museum are: Mrs. I. Tucker Burr of Needham, Mrs. Sylvia T. Ferry of Montpelier, Vt., Mrs. F. Abbott Goodhue of Hewlett, N.Y., Mrs. Lawernce Hemenway, and John E. Thayer, Jr., both of Milton.

Winchell Columns Still Being Censored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, I called the attention of this body to the censorship which was imposed on the columns written by Walter Winchell because of his criticism of the New Frontier. It has been brought to my attention that portions of his columns dealing with this subject are still being deleted. He still receives letters from readers who complain that their local newspapers frequently drop Winchell columns—because they have obviously become too hard hitting.

Despite the fact that the full content of his columns may not always see the light of day, I am pleased to say that this crusading writer has not softened his remarks, that he has not bowed to the pressure to lay off the New Frontier.

Mr. Winchell is not the only newspaper man of long standing who has felt the "heat" because he has had the courage to say what he thought.

Recently, Reporter Clark Mollenhoff, author of "Washington Coverup," a book which attacks administration efforts to suppress information unfavorable to it, was personally lectured by the President for some critical passages in the book about Mr. Kennedy. Knowing this gentleman of the press, I am sure the incident will not intimidate him.

I have nothing but admiration for these journalists who print the truth despite official pressure to do otherwise. Although I would not suggest that they cannot take care of themselves, or that they ask anyone's sympathy, I think a few examples of the kind of material that has been cut from Winchell's columns will help to show what is going on here in this land of freedom.

Referring to comments that the Kennedys play a hard political game, Winchell wrote: "Definitions of hard political game: Bribery, blackjacking and blackmail." This was stricken from his column.

Unfavorable references to Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., frequently are cut out.

The following by Winchell also was stricken:

Unemployment is a growing problem. Business failures and mortgage foreclosures are increasing. And the cost of living is at an all-time high.

In the next sentence: "The economy is not healthy," the word "healthy" was changed to read "robust."

Mr. Speaker, why in heaven's name would anyone censor such a passage when the same facts have been published on the financial pages of every newspaper time and again? Members of this Congress have said the same things many times. The statements are backed by statistical data from the Government itself.

I will say again that newspaper people can take care of themselves. They do not ask for any help. But the issue here is not the problems of individuals in the newspaper profession. It is, of course, freedom of the press, free speech, and other guarantees that were in the Bill of Rights the last time I looked.

Has someone repealed them?

Part II: Aid to Dependent Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, aid to dependent children has become one of the most controversial subjects in the country. Detroit News Reporter Jo Ann Hardee has done a service by writing a six-part series on this subject which I am pleased to insert in the RECORD:

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

(By Jo Ann Hardee)

At 2 a.m. there is a knock at Mrs. Clark's door.

A special investigation team from the aid to dependent children (ADC) program is checking on charges that Mrs. Clark's supposedly estranged husband is living at home while his wife collects $180 monthly in aid to dependent children grants.

After several minutes, a rumpled Mrs. Clark appears. Although she stalls for a few minutes, the team discovers that a man is trying to escape through a back window.

Mrs. Clark is cut off the program, as were 826 Wayne County recipients caught defrauding aid to dependent children last year. Since Clark is rarely employed it would do no good to prosecute Mrs. Clark to recover aid to dependent children funds.

DEPRESSION MOVE

Depression legislation, aid to dependent children was adopted in Michigan in 1940 as a substitute for widows' pensions.

In 22 years the depression baby has grown to a giant which devours $40 million annually in Michigan. It is frequently the target of public criticism.

Mrs. Clark's case is the type that critics use to support charges that aid to dependent children is a fraud-riddled haven for the lazy.

More ammunition was given aid to dependent children's detractors recently when an investigation of the Washington, D.C. program disclosed widespread cheating. Out of 280 families selected for investigation, 184 were ineligible for the aid to dependent children payments they were receiving, a national magazine reported.

Cases that alarmed taxpayers included:

An unmarried mother receiving $154 monthly was living with the father of the youngest two of her four children. He posed as her brother, earned $85 a week.

In 102 homes there were 136 telephones. In 155 homes, there were 167 television sets.

Supposedly deserted by both her husband and her boy friend, a 24-year-old mother of four was receiving $117 a month from aid to dependent children. Investigators discovered that her husband was living in her home and that the boy friend was paying $43 a month to support his child.

OFFICIALS SHOCKED

The Washington disclosures shocked the head of the District's Welfare Department, who said: "everything on paper showed we were doing a good job."

Michigan's welfare chief W. J. Maxey was shocked, too.

"I thought every State had better controls against fraud than they seem to have had in Washington.

"The kind of antifraud program that the Federal Government is now demanding as a result of the Washington investigation has been operating in Michigan at least 5 years.

"We know that 5 percent of the clients attempt to defraud us every year, because we catch them. Perhaps there's another 5 percent putting one over on us. How can we estimate?"

CHARGE LAXITY

"If we knew where there was fraud, we would find it and close the case."

Critics say that aid to dependent children fraud is like an iceberg—the visible portion is just a hint of what is hidden beneath the surface.

They say the aid program is lax in screening applicants and in allowing ineligible ones to be enrolled and that it is haphazard in investgation.

Privately, aid to dependent children officials note that Maxey has often been criticized by Federal officials for being "too tough" on fraud cases.

In the wake of 1959 fraud charges, the late Circuit Judge Frank FitzGerald requested the friend of the court to investigate aid to dependent children's handling of cases being supplemented by Wayne County. Five special investigators screened 319 cases.

CUT OFF ROLLS

They found 85 "suspicious cases." Of these only 14 were dropped from aid to dependent children rolls, 71 being cleared during the 2-month investigation. After a check of records, the agency found that 10 of the dropped cases were in process of being dropped when the investigation uncovered them.

Investigators reported:

"In any program as large as that conducted by the aid to dependent children, there always are a few so-called chiselers. It becomes a Herculean task to find those that could be charged with fraud or failure to abide by the rules and regulations.

"Only a small percentage of the recipients were conducting their lives in a manner offensive to the State and Federal statutes. Any sensational case is a rarity."

SUBMITS REPORT

Judge FitzGerald transmitted the report to R. Bernard Houston, head of the bureau of social aid, which administers Wayne County's aid to dependent children program. The judge wrote.

"Perusal of the report has given me pleasure to learn that well over 99 percent of the recipients are using the funds for the proper purpose.

"I feel it is a pity that better than 99 percent should be humiliated and embarrassed by the publicity received from the misuse of the funds by the very few recipients guilty of fraud.

"The report also points up quite emphatically that social workers and investigators administering the funds are overworked and underpaid.

HITS WORKLOAD

Houston said a resounding "amen" to this last statement.

He said his agency could do a better job of investigating and counseling if each worker had a caseload of 75 instead of 120.

"To have complete control over fraud," he said, "you would have to have one worker on each case and he would have to live with the family."

Asked how he could cut down the 40 percent annual turnover in his staff, Maxey said: "Pay them enough so that a man can support a family. And don't hire women."

He said women were good workers but many leave to marry. Workers in aid to dependent children earn $5,000 to $6,150. But Maxey said many social workers with master's degrees do not want to work in public assistance programs.

He said he hopes that Federal money will create an improved in-service training program and permit development of a special service unit to follow "problem cases."

DANGEROUS JOB

Officials say it would be helpful to have a larger staff of special investigators. There are now eight investigators and a supervisor in Wayne County, the only Michigan county with such a unit.

Maxey said he isn't sure he could find more if funds were available. He calls their job "dangerous."

Armed with a flashlight and a glib line these former caseworkers are assigned to ferret out fraud.

Where there is fraud, they are hardly welcome.

Maxey does not think special investigation is a cure-all.

"Some people want us to be a police force, not a social agency," he said. "These clients have as much right to be trusted as anyone."

POLICEMEN CRITICAL

Policemen—often severe critics of the program, because they feel it robs them of better wages, admit that sifting rumors about aid to dependent children fraud from reality is difficult.

"It is the same as any kind of investigation," one detective said. "You get a beef—maybe somebody's mad because Miss Jones stole her boy friend. So all the sudden Miss Jones is running numbers or a still.

"You check it out—90 percent of it is not true. It takes time to find that 10 percent."

In the search for that 10 percent, the truth sometimes is a surprise.

BROUGHT TO COURT

One case involved a woman called into court for violating the building code on a home that she and her estranged husband owned. She lived less than a block from him, leading to suspicions that it was a phony separation.

After months of special investigation, including several surprise night calls, aid to dependent children concluded that the separation was real. But the investigation revealed undeclared income from a son in the Army.

Last year a bill was introduced in the legislature to limit special investigation activities which the bill's sponsors believe, infringe upon personal rights.

Now aid to dependent children must notify a recipient that she is under special investigation although they do not warn her when they will call.

Although she does not have to admit investigators to her home, she faces being dropped from aid to dependent children if she does not.

The bill was intended to safeguard recipients against what some critics call "gestapo tactics."

GET COMPLAINTS

Special investigation is initiated on complaints, usually from neighbors, landlords, or caseworkers. Sometimes citizen complaints aren't too helpful.

A case in point was contained in a letter written during the 1959 aid to dependent children investigation.

The letter said:

"Right now at the minute, I know of 14 married women on aid to dependent children—husbands working every day and still staying with their wives.

"I know of a club with nothing but aid to dependent children ladies in it that holds a Mother's Day card party every first of the month, over a thousand dollars being won or lost.

"I know cause I have won over $600 two or three times. One girl lost her whole check of $189."

UNSIGNED LETTER

"I know of a lady on aid to dependent children who gets a check every month, has three roomers in her house that brings her $30 a week—$120 a month plus other income of $50 a week plus what the children's daddy drops by and gives her."

The writer omitted her name and any indication of where such activities were occurring or who was involved. Even if the charges were true, the agency would have no way of checking them.

Critics of aid to dependent children like to compare its investigation record unfavorably with that of the Detroit Welfare Department.

In 1961, welfare workers found 863 fraud cases, aid to dependent children found 826. This is only one-fifth of the total aid to dependent children and welfare closures.

FINDS MISSING 490

One welfare investigator assigned specifically to finding missing husbands, located 490 last year.

The aid to dependent children has no special investigator to locate such men. According to Houston, the aid to dependent children feels that this is the job of agencies like the friend of the court and recorder's court adjustment division.

This is not a view shared by the head of the adjustment division, Mrs. Miriam Hewlett, who has frequently feuded with aid to dependent children over laxity in pursuing men who are delinquents in support payments.

Periodically, someone calls for an investigation of aid to dependent children procedures. Houston and Maxey both say they would welcome one to clear the air—if it were conducted by a "competent agency."

With the city and county no longer contributing to aid to dependent children grants, this would have to be a State or Federal agency.

Some experts on public assistance have charged that the nature of the fatherless family program encourages broken homes and phony separations. Designed to keep families together, aid is granted only when the father is absent or, in a small percentage of cases, incapacitated.

One critic said:

"A man may not leave his wife just so that she can get on aid to dependent children, but if she is getting that check every month to spend as she please, who cares if he comes back?

"Some of these husbands are pretty hard to live with. Who needs 'papa' if you have aid to dependent children?"

HOME WRECKING

The 1959 friend of the court report bore out this view. The report said: "There was a complete lack of interest in locating the missing spouse. Many of the women said they were living under better conditions than when the spouse was at home."

This "home-wrecking" aspect of aid to dependent children was criticized in a speech by Alvin L. Schorr of the health, education, and welfare department. He commented:

"That aid to dependent children is available only if a parent is absent or incapacitated operates precisely counter to any cohesive forces in the family.

"When rent money is a week-to-week issue, the inclination of parents to reconciliation, or to live together again, or to marry tends to be deterred by the fact that even if need continues aid to dependent children will end."

Hanford Powerplant: Several Questions Must Be Cleared Up Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, September 14, the House approved the conference report on H.R. 11974 which included a section relative to the Hanford proposal. Under the act as passed, the Atomic Energy Commission is required to make certain determinations and report to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy before it can execute a contract for sale of steam from the new production reactor at Hanford.

I am convinced that under this act AEC must make a complete reanalysis of the matter taking into consideration all the factors brought out in the discussion on this legislation. In this regard I insert a letter I have sent to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and one which I sent to the Bonneville Power Administrator.

If the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy keeps faith with its assurances to the House it will take no action on this matter until complete and honest reappraisal is made of the Hanford proposal.

Following letters speak for themselves:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 20, 1962.

Dr. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: The action of the House in approving the conference report on H.R. 11974—the AEC Authorization Act for fiscal year 1963—places a responsibility on the Atomic Energy Commission to make certain determinations and reports before it enters into any contract for the sale of steam from the new production reactor at Hanford.

In my opinion the legislative history is such as to require that these determinations are to be new ones, based on a complete re-

analysis of the entire matter. This is as it should be, as the record is quite clear that prior AEC determinations and statements on the economics of power generation at Hanford and on the payments to be made to the Federal Treasury for use of steam and/or lease of the new production reactor were based on highly questionable assumptions and methods of analysis.

In order that I may have up-to-date information on the Hanford matter, I hereby request that you furnish me with a copy of the data called for in section 112(g) of the act in question, as soon as such data has been completed and concurrent with its presentation to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

It is to be noted that the legislative history on the requirement set forth in section 112(e) is somewhat conflicting. In certain instances in the hearings and on the floor of the House reference is made to offering 50 percent participation to "private utilities;" in other instances and in section 112(e) as written, the offer is to be made to "private organizations." I now ask whether in your interpretation of this section of the act you will rule that the requirement has been met, if Washington Public Power Supply System makes an offer of 50-percent participation to one or more private industrial organizations who then refuse such offer.

The requirement in section 112(b)(2) is that the Commission shall make a determination that "The sale of byproduct energy could provide a substantial financial return to the U.S. Treasury for the benefit of the taxpayers." The joker placed in this requirement by the Hanford proponents is the use of the word "could" instead of the word "shall." As I interpret the proposed Hanford contract as now written, Washington Public Power Supply System total payments into the Federal Treasury for the use of byproduct steam from Hanford could be a maximum of $100,000 if the plant were operated dual-purpose for 1 year only and for power only the balance of the 30-year contract. Is this not so? Do you consider that such a total payment for byproduct energy meets the "substantial financial return" criteria, when interest costs would be over $2 million annually on the convertibility features alone and nearly $8 million annually on the new production reactor as a whole?

Is it not also true that even under dual-purpose operation until 1970 (which is one of the dates previously given in some of the hearings as the probable end of dual-purpose operation) and power only thereafter, the total payments for steam from Hanford would be only $1,200,000? Would this $1,200,000 potential maximum payment, in your opinion, meet the "substantial financial return" criteria?

My point is that the taxpayers of the Nation through their representatives in Congress were sold a bill of goods by Hanford proponents that by making the new production reactor convertible, material savings would be made in the cost of producing plutonium as compared to the cost from a single-purpose production reactor. We now know, of course, that this is not the case, even in the unlikely event of continued dual-purpose operation over the entire 30-year contract period. Even then the present Hanford proposal would not return the capital and interest on the actual convertibility cost, let alone reduce the cost of plutonium. The taxpayers are entitled to receive a substantial financial return on their investment, and if the present proposal will not assure such a return this proposal should be abandoned.

It is to be noted that an AEC official during hearings on the matter admitted that during power-only periods "* * * there would be no substantial financial return to the Atomic Energy Commission."

It is my understanding that the Department of Defense is not willing to certify that there is any need for additional plutonium over and above that presently on hand or capable of being produced from existing facilities. In view of this, what is your opinion as to whether there will be any requirement for dual-purpose operation of the new production reactor after its completion? In other words, what is the probable extent of dual-purpose operation of Hanford, based on the need for plutonium over and above that which can be produced at existing production facilities?

It is noted that during power-only periods of operation a nominal $10 annual charge is to be made for the lease of a Federal project costing nearly $200 million. If this Hanford powerplant is as economically justified as AEC and other proponents would have us believe, why should there not be a more realistic annual charge for use of the new production reactor during power-only operation? What is your justification for this minimal charge?

It seems to me that the proposed contract between Washington Public Power Supply System and AEC as now written will not assure substantial financial return to the Federal Treasury. If your reanalysis of the matter substantiates this opinion, which it must do if the taxpayers' interest is given the proper consideration it deserves and all costs properly chargeable to Hanford power are included, will you then refuse to execute the presently proposed contract and propose substantial changes in the contract which will assure a proper return to the taxpayers?

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington D.C., September 21, 1962.

Hon. CHARLES F. LUCE,
Bonneville Power Administrator,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. LUCE: The passage by the Congress of H.R. 11974—the AEC authorization act for fiscal year 1963—giving provisional approval of the use of steam from the new production reactor at Hanford raises certain questions relative to Bonneville's participation in such use.

I believe the legislative history is such that a complete reanalysis of the Hanford proposal is mandatory in order for AEC to report on and justify the determinations required by the act prior to any action on the proposed contracts. Such a reevaluation must of necessity include a review of Bonneville's action and the effect thereof on the returns to the Federal Treasury.

I assume Bonneville intends to make a new study of future power supply and requirement conditions in the Pacific Northwest, together with a new economic evaluation of the Hanford proposal and a comparison with other potential sources of power such as new coal burning steam plants. Such a new study appears mandatory in view of the delay in the completion and operation date for the Hanford powerplant and in view of the various questions raised by opponents of the Hanford proposal. I for one am more convinced than ever that the Hanford proposal is completely uneconomic and that Bonneville's participation can not be justified. Any other conclusions can only be based on a failure to include all the proper charges against Hanford power and on highly questionable assumptions and methods of analysis.

During the hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy you were asked about a Bonneville staff report which purportedly showed that without Hanford there would be a $40 million or $50 million surplus at the end of 50 years, and that with Hanford you would show around a $200 million or more deficit for the same period. Your answers appeared less than candid. I request that you supply me with a copy of the report in question.

I have a number of other questions relative to this Hanford matter which I believe need clearing up before final action is taken on the Hanford contract. I ask that you furnish complete and detailed answers at your earliest convenience. The questions follow:

1. What is Bonneville Power Administration's present average annual transmission cost per kilowatt of Bonneville Power Administration's power, using a 4-percent interest charge?

2. Will Washington Public Power Supply System be charged for transmitting the Hanford power at this rate? If not, why not?

3. What is the average annual cost per kilowatt of Federal hydro capacity on the Bonneville system?

4. At what point in the regional load growth of the Pacific Northwest will all existing Federal hydro, together with that under construction, become dependable on the load? At that time, would not this Federal hydro capacity have its greatest value in serving the peak of the load, while at the same time all potential energy production could be fully utilized for firm load and steam replacement?

5. In order to firm up Hanford power where 26 or more outages annually are expected, will not Bonneville Power Administration have to maintain 800,000 kilowatts of ready reserve? Is this not particularly so when Federal peaking capacity rather than energy production becomes the dominant value?

6. Will Washington Public Power Supply System be charged for reserve capacity at a unit rate equal to the cost shown in answer to question No. 3?

In your testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, you stated that installation or generating capacity at Hanford would involve no structure in the river and its only effect on fish would be beneficial.

7. Is it not true that condenser intakes and discharges structure will have to be constructed in or adjacent to the river?

8. Is it not also true that over 80 percent of the heat generated by Hanford will be transmitted to the Columbia River during dual-purpose generation? And that 100 percent of the Hanford heat will have to be dissipated into the Columbia River whenever the Hanford generating units are out of service, which can happen at any time?

9. Inasmuch as you have testified that "The only effect of this plant on fish would be beneficial," I assume you are conversant with present conditions on the river. What is the present temperature of the Columbia River during the various stream flow periods with the existing Hanford plant in full operation, and what increase in such temperature would result from the heat transmitted to the river by the new production reactor and the Hanford generating plant during dual-purpose operation? During power-only periods?

The question was raised in hearings earlier this year relative to the excess energy which Bonneville must now waste during periods of high stream flow and the effect thereon if the Hanford generating plant was constructed. The answers given were not very clear. I now ask you these questions relative to the matter:

10. Is it not true that during periods of excess energy such as Bonneville estimated would occur under median water conditions in 1966 and 1971, with or without Canadian storage, there would be from 5 to 7 months of the year when no Hanford steam power could be utilized without wasting an additional amount of hydropower equivalent to the Hanford power production?

11. If Hanford power is used and an equivalent amount of potential hydroelectric generation is wasted, will this wasted hydroenergy be charged against the Hanford project?

In the House discussion on the conference report on H.R. 11974 we were assured that if Bonneville sustains any losses from the Hanford proposal that immediately this act would have to be brought into play and rates increased. In this regard I ask:

12. Could you, as Bonneville Administrator, act immediately to increase rates without regard to the present 5-year review requirement of present contracts?

13. If, as it appears extremely likely, only a minor part of Bonneville's customers will be involved in the Hanford deal, do you believe it is proper and just to raise the rates on all Bonneville customers in order to bail out losses on an exchange contract involving only a few of Bonneville customers?

In conclusion I again reiterate my belief that this Hanford proposal is completely uneconomic under the conditions that could and probably would occur and should be turned down under your assurance that you would do so if it was found to be uneconomical. In any event, a new study appears mandatory, which, if made on an honest and factual basis will surely disclose this lack of economic justification.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

Foreign Aid Foolishness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues editorials from the Cleveland Plain Dealer and the Cleveland Press with regard to the foreign aid appropriations bill:

[From the Plain Dealer, Sept. 19, 1962]

FOREIGN AID FOOLISHNESS

Congress apparently is getting fed up with the ineffectiveness of foreign aid, and it comes as no surprise that the House Appropriations Committee yesterday recommended a slash of about 19 percent—$1,278,177,000—in new funds for the foreign aid program.

The program for the present year proposes economic assistance for 73 nations, 7 foreign territories and possessions and military aid for 58 countries. In this last category, according to the committee, one nation has been given enough rifles and carbines to provide two weapons for every one of its soldiers.

Certainly, every American taxpayer who has to help foot the bill has every reason to be vitally interested in the subject of foreign aid, which is described extensively in U.S. News & World Report of September 24. These are some of the things which were brought out:

Between 1955 and 1961 the Communist bloc spent $4.37 billion in "aid" to 27 countries. In the same period the United States spent $9.45 billion aiding the same 27 countries, plus many billions more to other parts of the world unaided by the Reds. But Russia, in delivering the money, makes loans or barter deals with a reasonable or high rate of interest. The United States makes outright gifts or longtime loans at low interest or no interest at all.

Certain of our foreign-aid dollars have come in for bitter criticism, particularly those spent in these ways:

The $3.1 million spent for an air-conditioned ship for Ethiopia, presumably to be used as a flagship for Ethiopia's coastal patrol, but actually a "luxury floating palace for Haile Selassie * * * furnished by the overburdened American taxpayer."

The $15 million loan to Ethiopia to buy two jet airliners, which caused Representative SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican, of Massachusetts, to say: "They needed those two jets like I need a hole in the head."

The $10 million palace being built for President Tubman of Liberia, while Liberia is still accepting aid from the United States, and despite the fact that "there is misery, poverty, and sickness all over the country."

The $12 million loan made to Mali by Ghana, a nation which is receiving aid from the United States. If Ghana can afford to make $12 million loans, why does she need help from us?

The $400,000 for 1,000 television sets to bring educational TV to remote jungle villages which have no electricity; the sets to be powered (in addition to generators) by windmills and children's merry-go-rounds—"about the screwiest proposition I ever heard of," in the opinion of Representative PORTER HARDY, JR., Democrat, of Virginia.

Anyone likes to get value for the money he spends; a nation should be no different. And from the looks of things, the American taxpayer is not getting his money's worth.

[From the Cleveland Press, Sept. 19, 1962]

CUTBACKS IN FOREIGN AID

Foreign aid appropriations have been reduced $1,300 million by the House Appropriations Committee. This slash is described as the deepest ever by this committee, which annually has pared administration requests.

The taxpayers, of course, haven't been relieved of this much spending yet. By the time the bill gets through Congress a large part of the reduction may be restored.

But the severity of the House committee's cut reflects the growing public skepticism over the foreign program, which frequently has been found to be wasteful and sometimes scandal ridden.

Ivan Allen, Sr., Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, each year Dixie Business magazine published at Decatur, Ga., by Hon. Hubert F. Lee, honors an outstanding southerner with its "Man of the South" award. The distinction for the year 1961 has gone to the Honorable Ivan Allen, Sr., respected Atlanta businessman and prominent leader in the business, civic, educational, governmental, and religious life of the State of Georgia for more than half a century.

There is hardly a facet of Georgia life in which Mr. Allen's influence and leadership have not been felt. And now his son, the Honorable Ivan Allen, Jr., is carrying on the family tradition of public service as the city of Atlanta's distinguished new mayor.

The junior Senator from Georgia is pleased to join Dixie Business magazine in paying tribute to the Honorable Ivan Allen, Sr., and his many significant contributions to the advancement of the State of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Lee's article, "Man of the South for 1961," as it appears in Dixie Business magazine be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN OF THE SOUTH FOR 1961

(By Hubert F. Lee)

"Here is a man whose spirit breathes in the hearts and minds of people identified with good works and fair play in business and profession * * * in boys' work, in fraternal society and community and State and Nation.

"Here is a man who has given Atlanta a son for its mayor, whose position and attainments certainly and inevitably will advance this great city of the Southeast into achievements far beyond its early dreams," wrote Frank E. Spain.

Frank E. Spain is past president of Rotary International and his tribute to the founder in 1913 of the Atlanta Rotary club is typical of the esteem all Rotarians have for Ivan Allen.

Mr. Spain was master of ceremonies when Frank P. Samford was honored as "Man of the South" for 1958 at the Birmingham Country Club and I was his guest the following noon for Rotary. I saw the way his friends esteemed him. He was honored with the Chevalier Legion of Honor. He and Mrs. Spain gave $50,000 to make possible the Medical Center. He is one of the great lawyers of our time and as I walked the length of a floor of the First National Bank Building which houses his law library I saw the reason for his legal reputation.

The late Thomas C. Law, who was the president of Atlanta Rotary club when I got out of the old Army Air Service in 1921 and got a job as cub reporter, wrote:

"Ivan has been one of the finest citizens Atlanta has ever had and he still keeps busy doing things for the city and its environs. I heartily endorse him for this honor."

One of my prize souvenirs is an old clipping from the August 12, 1921, issue of the Atlanta Constitution, written by Parks Rusk, now editorial page editor of the Miami Beach Daily Sun, who received the "Outstanding Citizen's Award" from the Taxpayers' Association last January. The 1921 clipping:

"Thousands of successful businessmen were questioned last year regarding the age at which the crisis of their life came; the unanimous reply was 'between 14 and 18.' Therefore teach teamwork and fair play to youths of that age and they will practice it years later," declared Tom Law, Rotary president.

In 1950, when Mr. Allen was named to the "South's Hall of Fame for the Living," the honor group now limited to 200 living leaders, which the "Man of the South" is elected each year, I was trying to syndicate a newspaper column. Here is the column for July 20, 1950:

"BUSINESS IN DIXIE

"(By Hubert F. Lee, editor of Dixie Business)

"Ivan Allen, named by Dixie Business as one of the South's foremost leaders, has played a leading role in the building of Atlanta for half a century. We remember his work for the Boy Scouts before and during World War I, when we were patrol leader of the Devil Fish Patrol of old Troop 31. And as a cub reporter on the Atlanta Constitution in 1921; a member of the Atlanta Junior Chamber of Commerce in 1922; and in 1931 reprinted in Dixie Business parts of his book 'Atlanta From the Ashes.'

"It took 273 pages for Eleanor Williams to record the highlights of Ivan Allen's achievements in the book, 'Ivan Allen, A Resource-

ful Citizen,' Chapter I of which we quote in part:

" 'Spent half his time on public work—and the other half in making a fortune.

" 'One of the founders of a new, nationwide merchandising industry—office outfitters.

" 'Bought a mountain—and gave it to the State for a park.

" 'A resourceful citizen—salesman, merchant, manufacturer, banker, politician, builder.

" 'The romance of a country boy, come to town.'

"Ivan Allen has had a hand in the building of most every organization and helping every movement for the betterment of Atlanta and Georgia for half a century."

"I think this is a wonderful choice," Dan J. Haughton, president, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.

"Certainly I approve," Dr. Jas. A. Jones, president, Union Theological Seminary.

Alvin B. Cates, one of the men who made Atlanta a great city who heads the Adams-Cates Co., wrote: "He, in every way, measures up to the type of man that makes Atlanta an outstanding city and, in my judgment, is entitled to the honor."

Reuben B. Robertson, the "Man of the South" for 1950, honorary chairman of Champion Papers Inc., and one of the great men of our time, wrote:

"Ivan Allen, Sr., is an outstanding gentleman who will honor the title of "Man of the South" for 1961 and of course I approve of his selection.

"Won't you extend to him my hearty congratulations and cordial welcome to the ranks of the 'Man of the South.'

"I am glad to gain 'Distinction by Association' through Mr. Allen's inclusion in the 'Man of the South' group.

"His career in the business world and in public affairs has been outstanding and is something the whole South may take pride in."

TEAM OF LEADERS

Senator Ivan Allen, Sr., is one of the finest examples of the old "Atlanta spirit" as personified by a host of civic leaders I have known for 40 years.

He is a real Horatio Alger hero and a legend in his own lifetime.

He came to Atlanta from Dalton in 1895 to sell typewriters—a new machine that sold for $100 and he stayed to found the Ivan Allen Co. which now does more than $8 million business a year and is the third largest in the Nation.

Ivan Allen learned merchandising as a boy working in his cousin's grocery store in Dalton, Ga.

His big heart prompted him to give too full measure to the poor. So he resolved never to go into any kind of business in which a lump would come into his throat in making a sale at a profit.

His dream of a preferred business dealing with firms who had money to spend for equipment, rather than to individuals, came in 1900.

With money furnished by his widowed mother * * * his dream of a departmentalized office outfitters store, where businessmen could buy all their needs in one place, was realized when Fielder & Allen was formed.

Atlanta's merchants were his customers.

They, like Ivan Allen, saw visions of a growing Atlanta and they did something about it.

Each new enterprise that came to Atlanta was a customer day-after-day and year-after-year.

It would take books to record all the things good Ivan Allen has done.

He founded Rotary in Atlanta.

Helped start the Atlanta Retail Merchants Association. The Southeastern Fair; was president of the National Stationery & Office Equipment Association.

His fund raising ability was responsible for the refounding in 1913 of Oglethorpe University.

Dr. Donald C. Agnew, president of Oglethorpe University, wrote, "Ivan Allen is indeed worthy of this title.

"Of course we believe that the refounding of Oglethorpe University was a notable contribution * * *. This is certainly not the least of Senator Allen's accomplishments for the South."

J. Leonard Reinsch, who helped honor Norman Cocke, the "Man of the South" for 1959 at the Charlotte Club, wrote: "This is a top-notch selection that will meet with universal approval. The selection of Ivan Allen, Sr., should be one of the most popular in the history of the South's Hall of Fame."

"Who's Who in America," in the volume 24 had this sketch:

"Allen, Ivan (Earnest), business executive; born in Dalton, Ga., March 1, 1877; son of Daniel Earnest and Susan Reese (Harris) Allen; education public schools, Dalton; Dr. Public Service (honorary) Oglethorpe University; married Irene Beaumont, 1908; one son, Ivan, Jr. In business at Atlanta, 1895; chairman Ivan Allen-Marshall Co., Ivan Allen Building, Atlanta Blank Book Manufacturing Co., Brookhaven Estates; past chairman Federal Home Loan Bank Board; director Trust Co. of Georgia. Director War Savings of Georgia, World War I. Member Georgia State Senate, 1919–21; chairman Governor's communication on simplification and coordination of administrative departments of State government, 1929. Chairman Board Southeastern Fair Association, chairman Industrial Bureau, Democratic Campaign Commission, 1940, 1944; past president Atlanta Con. Bur., Atlanta Merchants Association, National Stationers Association; trustee Oglethorpe University, High Museum of Art. Vice chairman County Welfare Board. Lieutenant colonel on military staffs of 3 governors. Awarded certificate of distinguished service, city of Atlanta and Chamber of Commerce 1926. Gave to State of Georgia, Fort Mountain, now one of State parks. Democrat, Presbyterian, Mason (K.T., Shriner) K.P., Elk. Clubs: Rotary: Capital City, Atlanta Athletic, Piedmont Driving. Author: "Atlanta from the Ashes," Rotary in Atlanta, consolidation of Georgia, 159 counties. Home: 2600 Peachtree Road. Office: 27–31 North Pryor Street, Atlanta, Ga."

As Ivan Allen, Jr., is now the mayor of Atlanta and his dad is prouder of him than his own vast achievements—here is the sketch from the 1952–53 issue of "Who's Who in America":

"Allen, Ivan, Jr., merchant; born, Atlanta, March 15, 1911; son of Ivan and Irene (Beaumont) Allen; graduate Georgia Institute of Technology, 1933; married Louise Richardson, January 1, 1936; children—Ivan III, Inman Beaumont. With Ivan Allen Co., Atlanta, 1933—, president, 1946–57, vice chairman of the board, 1957—; director, Georgia International Life Insurance Co., Rich's, Inc., Southern Airways (Atlanta). Scout, scoutmaster, area president, regional committeeman, member national executive board. Boy Scouts of America awarded Silver Beaver, Silver Antelope, Silver Buffalo; chairman, Greater Atlanta Community Chest, 1949. Lieutenant colonel Governor's staff, 1936; treasurer, Georgia State Hospital Authority, 1936; secretary, executive department, State of Georgia, 1945–46. Trustee, Georgia Foundation. Served as major, infantry, AUS, World War II. Recipient Armin Maier award, Atlanta Rotary Club, 1952. Member, Georgia Technical Alumni Association (president, 1953–54), Georgia Chamber of Commerce, president, 1956–57, director), Atlanta Chamber of Commerce (director), National Stationery & Office Equipment Association (district governor 1938–40, president 1955–56); Sigma Alpha Epsilon, Rotarian. Home: 3700 Northside Drive. Office: 29 Pryor Street NE., Atlanta."

"I heartily approve of Ivan Allen." Dr. Rufus C. Harris, president of Mercer University, Macon, Ga.

Each year the election of the "Man of the South" is ratified by a group which includes those on the ballot, the past "Man of the South" honorees and others. Do you approve? is asked.

"I am happy to cast my vote for Ivan Allen, Sr. I know he is a grand, good man," Bishop Arthur Moore.

"He is a fine citizen and worthy of the award," Frank P. Samford.

"The choices through other years have been well approved, indicating your system is dependable and gets right results. The Senator has had a sense of leadership in civic and community life * * * Ivan Allen, Sr. is the man of this year." Dr. J. Ross McCain, president-emeritus Agness Scott College.

"Mr. Allen is certainly entitled to all the honors that can be heaped upon him, and he would certainly be my first choice," John A. Sibley.

"Mr. Allen has a wonderful record and I am glad to concur in your suggestion that he be honored," Thomas W. Martin.

R. M. Wilson, M.D., who founded the R. M. Wilson Leprosy Colony in Korea in 1909, "A Great American for 1961" wrote from Richmond, Va.:

"I wish to cast my vote for Mr. Ivan Allen, Sr. Also wish to thank you for past honors and kindness and congratulate you on this good service you are rendering.

"I get good reports from Dr. Stanley Topple and think he is fitting well into the picture out there. (Leprosy Colony in Korea). The colony work progresses well and Dr. Boyer has just purchased land to set up a home for cured and burnt-out cases. My good friend Frank Brown, formerly of China, had leprosy but is cured and now attends various church meetings and well received back into society. He now resides in Norfolk.

"May God richly bless your good work."

"I know something of Mr. Allen's very fine background. I concur in the selection and commend you for your continued civic efforts. Senator Allen's joining the ranks of past "Men of the South" will bring further stature to all past members," Joseph T. Lykes, "Man of the South for 1960."

"Yes, I approve and congratulations to you for this worthy project."

SCOUTING IN ATLANTA

The Ivan Allens have been leaders in scouting from the beginning—Ivan, Sr., fundraising, executive committee; Junior as scout, vice president of council, board director, among many.

Phillip Weltner recommended Bayne Gibson for Scout commissioner, a post Noble Gibson held until 1917.

In 1916, a campaign in 3 days raised $12,000 and Allen A. Jameson was engaged as the first Scout executive in Atlanta. He was coauthor of the first "National Handbook for Boys." I remember Mr. Jameson well as I was a charter member of old Troop 32 and patrol leader of the old Devil Fish Patrol and later assistant scoutmaster. We made a 650-mile hike in 1918 selling war savings stamps through Tennessee and Alabama, with a trip down the Tennessee River.

ROTARY IN ATLANTA

Ivan Allen, with others, founded the Atlanta Rotary Club in 1913 and has been one of its loyal leaders since.

As members of the Atlanta Ad Club, he, along with Henry W. Grady, Jr., Joel Chandler Harris, and Howard Geldert, were delegates to a convention in Baltimore. There Ivan Allen attended Rotary and on the way back discussed the idea of a Rotary Club with his fellow delegates.

Back in Atlanta, Mr. Allen got busy and soon had plans formulated. He got together with his Ad Club delegates in his office—

the room Woodrow Wilson used as a law office—and the three handpicked a list of 32 businessmen and sent out invitations to a meeting on July 2, 1913, in the chamber of commerce.

Mr. Allen wrote to Chas. R. Perry, secretary, and Glenn C. Mead, president, of Rotary International. These men named Ivan Allen as the organizer for Rotary in Atlanta. He received the charter on August 1, 1913—No. 79—which hung in Mr. Allen's office until a paid secretary was employed and an office established years later.

SOUTHEASTERN FAIR

The boll weevil had crossed the Mississippi River, heading east about 50 miles a year, in 1914, when the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce appointed a committee to promote a fair. The chamber of commerce had sponsored the Boys Corn Club since it was started in 1910 by Harry G. Hastings and others.

The committee included Walter G. Cooper, chamber secretary, Preston Arkwright, V. H. Kreigshaber, Harry G. Hastings, Brooks Morgan, S. B. Turman, Chas. Whiteford Smith, C. H. Kelly, Beaumont Davidson, Mell R. Wilkinson and Ivan Allen.

Ivan Allen headed the committee that sold $75,000 stock to match the same amount from the city of Atlanta and 75,000 in money, labor and materials from Fulton County.

CONVENTION BUREAU

Ivan Allen was first president of the Atlanta Convention Bureau, which opened for business April 2, 1913, when Wilmer L. Moore was president of the chamber of commerce. Col. F. J. Paxon was vice president; J. K. Ottley, treasurer; Fred Houser, executive secretary. Among others who are due credit: J. R. A. Hobson, J. Lee Barnes, H. N. Dutton, D. C. Knight, and St. Elmo Massengale, civic leaders.

JURY OF PEERS

"I am delighted that you are giving the 'Man of the South' Award for 1961 to Ivan Allen, Sr. That could also go for Ivan Allen, Jr.," Hugh Comer, one of the South's finest men and brother of Donald Comer, "Man of the South" 1947.

"I am pleased to note that Ivan Allen, Sr. is the 'Man of the South' for 1961," Carl D. Brorein, who was master of ceremonies when Mr. Joe Lykes was honored as "Man of the South, 1960" in Tampa.

"I am glad to concur in your selection," J. Oliver Emmerlich, publisher, McComb (Miss.) Enterprise-Journal, a brother of Charles O. Emmerich, of the De Kalb County Board of Commissioners, Decatur, Ga.

"Ivan Allen deserves the plaudits of all Atlantians for his great civic interest and pride in his city," Donald Hastings, son of Harry G. Hastings, one of the great leaders who was on the team of leaders that included Ivan Allen—who made Atlanta a great city.

Part III: Aid to Dependent Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, aid to dependent children has become one of the most controversial subjects in the country. Detroit News reporter Jo Ann Hardee has done a service by writing a six-part series on this subject which I am pleased to insert in the RECORD:

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

(By Jo Ann Hardee)

It was graduation day at a suburban high school and the proudest one in the class was a 24-year-old mother who was rearing seven children on aid to dependent children (ADC) grants.

With a hard-won diploma in hand and a good job in prospect, Mrs. Grant knew she soon would be off aid to dependent children and selfsupporting.

Two years before, with her youngest children in the care of her mother, she had wanted to get a job. Her caseworker talked her out of it.

With only 2 years of high school education and no work experience, could she get a permanent job, one adequate to support eight people?

EXAMPLE FOR TIMID

How long would it be before she was back on aid to dependent children again?

The caseworker persuaded a reluctant school principal to let the woman enroll in day school classes, cutting years off the time it would take her to graduate in night school. As junior and senior years continued, the caseworker offered encouragement and the agency continued monthly checks of $240.

"Sometimes it's hard to convince a taxpayer that this kind of money is an investment," the caseworker said. "This woman now is totally selfsupporting in a job that offers security and advancement.

"She won't be on public assistance again, nor will her children.

"And she's an example to more timid women that it can be done.

"This is the difference between real rehabilitation and the phony kind. So you get somebody a temporary job and cut her off the program. What good does it do if she is back again 6 months later?"

Rehabilitation is the new look in the aid-to-dependent-children program—22 years after it was adopted in Michigan as a substitute for widows' pensions. With Federal-State costs topping the 1 billion mark, Congress finally recognized that "money isn't enough."

Critics have long been screaming for rehabilitation—even a limited sort. "If all you do is impress on some of these mamas that they have the responsibility to get the children off to school in the morning, that's a start," one caseworker said.

Conscientious caseworkers have been doing a rehabilitation job whenever possible. But as caseloads have grown and the character of aid-to-dependent-children recipients changed, rehabilitation has become more complicated.

AGENCIES SWAMPED

Mountains of paperwork bogged down a staff already too small to do an effective job. Turnover in personnel made any rapport between worker and client difficult. Clients moved at an incredible rate (600 to 800 of a 16,394 caseload move each month).

Efforts were concentrated on establishing and maintaining continuing checks on eligibility. Critics complained this function was not being performed at top efficiency.

In addition, rehabilitative resources in the community were, like most social agencies, swamped.

An independent research firm surveyed Chicago's aid-to-dependent-children program in 1960 and criticized its limited scope:

"While the aid-to-dependent-children program has done much to preserve family unity and strengthen family life, its primary emphasis has been to provide to those who qualify the barest necessities of life."

SOCIAL SAVINGS

"It has been essentially a program of financial assistance only.

"Little attention has been given to the underlying problems which create the need for aid to dependent children and little has been done to help the families solve these problems."

Congress this year passed a new welfare bill which is designed to change the orientation of aid to dependent children from relief to rehabilitation. It will increase Federal expenditures by about $300 million a year in the immediate future.

Its architect is Dr. Wilbur J. Cohen, former University of Michigan professor now Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He predicts social savings in human resources will eventually result in fiscal savings through lessened welfare bills.

"People who have been on relief for many years cannot be rehabilitated quickly by shortcuts or gimmicks," he said. "But we do believe that this law gives us the basic tools for an effective, long-term approach to the problem of chronic dependency."

States will be encouraged by 75 percent Federal financial participation to provide new services. Federal standards will be worked out at a September 26 Washington meeting.

POINTS IN "NEW LOOK"

Tentatively, the aid to dependent children's "new look" is this: Job training for adults to combat the low rate of employment among aid to dependent children mothers (4.5 percent in Wayne County, 17.1 percent out of State).

In the Federal law there is provision for work relief programs similar to those utilized by the welfare department to permit able-bodied recipients to work out a percentage of their grants. No such program is currently planned for Wayne County.

Contributions for child welfare services will be doubled to provide day care centers for working mothers and expanded adoption agencies and foster home care for children of unfit parents. The State's children's division has already been moved from its separate office and is now under the direction of R. Bernard Houston, who also directs the Wayne County Bureau of Social Aid, aid to dependent children's parent organization.

Incentives for working mothers include enabling them to set earned money aside for future identifiable needs of children, particularly education and medical expenses. Currently earned income is deducted from budgeted needs after an allowance is made for job-related expenses such as transportation.

Special projects aimed at preventing recurrence of illegitimate pregnancies.

"Protective payments," made to responsible persons when a grantee is found incapable of managing her money in the best interests of her children.

Staff upgrading which includes inservice training and improved supervision. Being studied is a special staff to follow up "problem cases" or those in which prospects of rehabilitation are good. This unit would try to counteract the problem of staff turnover and client movement.

CHANGING GOALS

Currently aid to dependent children is reviewing its caseload, dividing it into types of problems and perfecting rehabilitative techniques.

Houston outlined the new program's objectives:

"We have to change the opinion of those who consider public assistance an inevitable way of life. We must destroy the chain of dependency. This means concentrating on the children, changing their goals, their aspirations, their attitudes.

"Often nothing can be done for an adult once she is on aid to dependent children, the roots of dependency are in her family life. The factors that create a public as-

sistance case are broken homes, limited education, limited job skills, limited employment opportunities. This is not original, but it's true.

PLEA FOR HELP

"Rehabilitation is the community's job, but it is most incumbent upon us as a public assistance agency to attack as many of these social problems as we can.

"Any dent we can make in the chain of dependency is worthwhile. It's wrong not to make an effort just because results are small.

"But aid to dependent children cannot be the only keeper of the public conscience. We need community help."

His superior in Lansing, W. J. Maxey, echoed Houston: "The saving to the taxpayer in a rehabilitation program is hard for him to visualize. You can sell people on crash programs that mean an immediate caseload drop."

LACK OF SKILLS

"But if you merely transfer these cases to welfare, what have you accomplished?"

Maxey decried what he views as a let-Washington-do-it attitude.

"Citizens in the local community must realize that serious social problems such as illegitemacy, unemployment, lack of job skills and low standards are not solely the property of aid to dependent children.

"For too long citizens have shunted their social problems off to the highest level of government. These must be fought at the grassroots." He cited the great cities project which spots potential problem children and the job upgrading program for school dropouts as examples of community attacks upon social problems."

DIFFERENT APPROACH

Msgr. Clement Kern, whose Holy Trinity parish is heavily populated with public assistance cases underscored Maxey's comments:

"We tend to tuck away the poor.

"We take the attitude, ain't it a shame that visitors must look at the panhandlers on Michigan Avenue as they are driving to the Sheraton-Cadillac? Maybe it's time we all looked at the poor.

"They are hidden and ignored—except when they cost us money. Then they are reviled."

A different approach is taken by Mrs. Miriam Hewlett, head of recorder's court adjustment division, the agency which attempts to get support payments from estranged husbands.

PUBLIC IS PAYING

"It's a social cancer that these women lack a sense of responsibility. That's rehabilitation too—teaching them that they can't come and go as they please when the public is paying the bill.

"Within the limits of their capacities—and for some that's not very great—they should be taught that with public money goes responsibility."

Observers remark that rehabilitation could be aided with more assistance from the Negro community since 80 percent of aid to dependent children recipients in Wayne County are Negro.

CITES ENVIRONMENT

From many sources comes the image of the middle-class Negro as someone reluctant to be associated with public assistance clients of his own race. One civic leader rapped the "lack of responsibility shown by the Negro community toward its own members."

A settlement house worker said: "When Negroes move to middle-class standards, they tend to become more punitive and rejecting toward lower class people of their own race. They want to dissociate themselves from that stereotype."

The same social worker spoke of effective rehabilitation:

"You can domesticate these teenagers, but that isn't enough. They will check their knives at the door, play games fairly, be polite. But all that vanishes when they get back into an environment where such values aren't respected.

PROBLEM OF POVERTY

"You have to show them there is another life—and they can have that life."

Francis A. Kornegay, of the Urban League, agrees that changing the values of children reared on public assistance is a keystone of the fight against chronic dependency. His organization sponsored a program for teens designed to do this.

"We cannot sit by and say this is not our job—leave it to aid to dependent children," he said.

"Currently aid to dependent children is not doing the casework and giving the counseling necessary," he continued. "It has an inadequate budget to provide rehabilitative services. Taxpayers are paying a tremendous social price, which will become a welfare burden, for this pet economy.

"A person can't lift himself by his bootstraps when he is surrounded by a ghetto of poverty and frustration."

Conflict Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues in the Congress, I am pleased to insert the fourth article in a series on "Conflict Management" by Edward Scannell Butler, of New Orleans, La., in which the writer shows how American businessmen can take the initiative and the offensive to help defeat communism around the world. In this last article in Challenge, the publication of the Young Men's Business Club of Jefferson Parish, Mr. Butler outlines those ways to win over communism, which our country's businessmen can and should adopt for an effective campaign against the Red conflict managers.

This fourth article entitled "Part IV: Ways To Win," follows:

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT: PART IV—WAYS TO WIN

(By Edward Scannell Butler)

"If we back the attack and begin to win the cold war, won't we tempt the Communists to launch an annihilating atomic attack?" This unspoken fear—"Is political warfare worth winning?"—lurks in minds of many thoughtful Americans.

To find the answer, we must glance backward into recent history.

CONFLICT QUOTATIONS

In 1956 an American wrote: "Throughout the Soviet Union there are about 6,000 special schools maintained by the party and devoted exclusively to training professional propagandists. These have an enrollment at any one time of 185,000 students. Above these schools are 177 regional propaganda colleges to train 135,000 alumni of the local schools. And above the regional schools are a dozen higher institutions giving graduate training to several thousand advanced students. Propaganda is by far the biggest industry in the U.S.S.R."

In 1961 a Communist said: "Comrades. There is only America. And this country can be compared to a wornout runner. He had the prize—but others have been born, trained, and are now running.

"The United States is now running on its past reputation but at the finish line the young, fresh, strong runner will break the tape and our Socialist country—young, strong, organized, mobilized—is snapping at the heels of America—not silently, but saying, 'Look, we are in the race. Hurry up or we will overtake you.'"

The first statement was made after a study of the subject by William Benton, former adman and U.S. Senator, who now publishes the Encyclopedia Brittanica.

The second statement was shouted by Nikita S. Khrushchev, at a party rally in Alma Ata Kazakstan. Khrushchev also said that American experts were reporting to President Kennedy that the Soviet Union would overtake the United States by 1970 and added: "This is our date."

These statements go together like a man in a missile. For although Khrushchev's speech was reported in the United States as an economic challenge, neither reporters nor the American public was aware (as every Communist is) that the biggest business in the Soviet economy is propaganda. To the initiated Communist courtiers Khrushchev was promising, not economic parity, but propaganda warfare victory by 1970. Be certain he meant it.

Point 1: Cold war is real war.

THE GRAPH OF POWER

Business statisticians distrust the unstable line that shoots to the pinacle of the chart, then often topples on a whisper of suspicion. The Red line has soared from 25 men under Lenin in 1903, to over 36 million under Khrushchev today. It has accounted for the extermination of millions of human beings and the enslavement of a billion.

And yet communism, based as it is on "a pseudoscientific residue of the 19th century," trembles violently whenever an organized nudge is given one of its weak spots. Its hysterical attacks on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberation are one example, another is the frenzied fear of U.N. debate on Hungary, a third is the massive guilt hysteria surrounding the Berlin wall.

Point 2: The Reds can lose, if we help them.

THE NEW TREND

Once American business begins buying private insurance for freedom, dramatic changes could occur quickly.

Abroad, an adequate private investment in cold war offense could mean the gradual reopening of Iron-Curtained markets, and the free development of underdeveloped nations.

At home, a whole new career field in conflict management will develop. Our concern about the necessity of creating 13 million new jobs by 1970 may become meaningless, when American youth begins to discover the rewards of professional involvement in the greatest challenge of the century. However, if the present trend continues, it is equally possible that no private enterprise jobs will exist by 1970, as Khrushchev shouted in Alma Ata.

Point three: We can win, if we will.

DEFEAT BY DEFAULT

Unfortunately, there are some few Americans who still advocate throwing sops to Cerberus in the forms of the lives, liberty, and property of millions of once-free Allies. They are willing to sacrifice peripheral interests to buy time and seek accommodation with a milder Soviet dictatorship of the future. Aside from any moral considerations, a strategy of nonoffense in cold war can result in continual nibbling at the perimeter and ultimately in a "citadel America," a lonely armed island in a sea of enemies, free to choose only between thermonuclear war, or surrender.

No sane citizen wants nuclear war, and no liberty-loving American wants Red domination. Fortunately there is a third, rational path between detonation and domination: i.e., to maintain obviously superior weapons, civil defense, and will-power which will keep Soviet challenges beneath the hot war level (Herman Kahn suggests specific, and practical ways and means in his excellent RAND study "On Thermonuclear War," for the Center of International Studies at Princeton). Having capped the nuclear volcano, we must also develop offensive strategies to win the cold war, a goal which Life magazine has suggested should become our primary national purpose.

VICTORY THROUGH VITALITY

Far from endangering peace, a positive public-private effort for cold war victory will insure it.

There is every reason to believe the Reds are as concerned as we are about avoiding thermonuclear war, unless they can make it risk-proof through the psychopolitical methods of conflict management. Red strategists denounce "military adventurism" (meaning any high-risk move that endangers "Mother Russia"). Moreover, the Reds seem to believe their own myth of invincibility. They appear certain that Communist conquest is "historically determined"—hence only a question of time. Understandably therefore, the Reds will always prefer a Leninist "step backward," to avoid doomsday warfare, unless the odds are conclusively in their favor.

The basic question then is: Will Red dictators be more belligerent when we are strong, or when we are weak? When we are winning or losing?

Events of the past 16 years, and the whole philosophy of communism from Lebanon to Laos, have proven that against the Reds—power means peace; weakness, war.

Point four: We can win without losing.

CAPTAINS OF CONFLICT

As technology advances and democracy seems to decline, it has been said that the modern world faces an alternative between a new Renaissance and new Dark Age. Required today are Renaissance men, for the destruction of Red imperialism and the expansion of a system of liberty under law to all the peoples of the earth.

Mentors like Drs. Robert Strausz Hupe, and William R. Kintner of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, Frank Barnett of the Institute for American Strategy, Gerhart Neimeyer of Notre Dame, Phillip Selznick of the University of California, and Stefan Possony of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford, are unfamiliar names to the average businessman. But the future of freedom may well depend on these little-known experts, and the lights are on the ivory towers.

TASKS FOR TODAY

Most businessmen cannot personally manage conflict, but all should support those who can. A nation which contributes nearly $8 billion a year to orthodox charity can certainly allocate a small margin of its resource to insure its own survival. It surely will, when we eliminate the "let Uncle Sam do it alone" mental block. But since a philosophy of private investment for survival doesn't yet exist, the few free world conflict managers are forced into pauperism (if they practice) or prosaic "peacetime" pursuits (if they don't). Lacking either monetary or mental incentive, new talent is not attracted to the field. But once even modest pay becomes possible, an academic discipline will develop, and professionalism will proceed. However, business must begin the cycle. Money is mandatory, but often the job can be done with a tax-deductible dollar.

WAYS TO WIN

Someday soon perhaps United Freedom Funds will operate in every community in the Nation, to finance the work of free conflict corporations throughout the world. One top civic leader per community could rally the support of his city for such a United Freedom Fund, and strike thousands of blows at Red weak spots.

Until then, top management should: (1) Hire qualified conflict consultants to defend and guide their business in cold war combat, (2) endow a conflict course or college to train top-flight talent, (3) select a free conflict corporation and support it with regular corporate contributions.

Junior executives should work to initiate corporate contributions through their companies. Every means, from the trusty suggestion box and bulletin boards, to small group discussions, assemblies and the house organ, should be used to inform fellow workers and/or employees of the grave responsibility they bear.

If the American businessman will make conflict management his business, if he will fulfill the great unfulfilled need of our time, America can win. Conflict management is the way.

"Research and Development as a Factor in Defense Procurement," Address by Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell L. Gilpatric, South Bend, Ind., September 5, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, last July several of my colleagues from the Midwest and I met with Defense Secretary Robert McNamara at the Pentagon to discuss a Defense Department report which documented the awarding of an increasing share of defense contracts to the West and East coast and Mountain States at the expense of the Midwest.

Secretary McNamara emphasized that part of the report which indicated that production contracts tend to be awarded in areas where research and development work on the items in question has been performed. The evidence in the report suggested strongly that areas most successful in winning defense work are those in which there is close cooperation between industry and universities on basic and applied research.

In response to a request of mine at the meeting, Secretary McNamara authorized Defense officials to meet with representatives of industry, universities and local government to discuss ways in which the Midwest can improve its capabilities in competing for Government contracts.

I am glad to say that such a meeting in South Bend in my congressional district on August 11 proved very useful.

Interest in this problem was further evidenced by the Management Club of the Bendix Corp., South Bend, whose officers asked me to invite the distinguished Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell L. Gilpatric to discuss the tie between research and defense procurement at a meeting attended by business and university leaders in our area.

The able Deputy Secretary was kind enough to attend this meeting September 5 and to deliver this excellent speech on this most important subject:

REMARKS BY DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROSWELL L. GILPATRIC BEFORE A DINNER MEETING OF MIDWEST INDUSTRY AND UNIVERSITY REPRESENTATIVES, SOUTH BEND, IND., SEPTEMBER 5, 1962

The opportunity to discuss the subject of research and development as a factor in defense procurement here in South Bend, in the heart of the Middle West, is most welcome for several reasons.

First, this is the section of the United States which has been most adversely affected by changes over the past decade in the patterns of defense procurement, and the people of this area deserve a straightforward explanation of the factors involved in these changes.

Second, this is the home of JOHN BRADEMAS who has taken a most active, and I may say a most enlightened, interest in the events which have taken place, and who is engaging in a vigorous search for solutions of the resulting problems.

Third, there is an exceptional awareness in this community of the basic nature of these problems, as witnessed by the conference held here on August 11, with university, industry, and civic leaders meeting with Mr. BRADEMAS and representatives from the Department of Defense in a candid discussion of the issues.

Fourth, South Bend is the site of one of our great American universities, a university which has made major contributions of quality manpower to our Nation, and which has even greater potential significance for industrial and economic growth for the future. Father Hesburgh and I served together on the Rockefeller Study Group 4 years ago, and I well remember his keen understanding of national security problems.

Finally, South Bend is the home of some of the great names in American enterprise, Bendix, Dodge, Studebaker, U.S. Rubber, Wheelabrator, and is therefore a vital part of the world's greatest and most productive industrial complex—this vast region bounded by the Great Lakes on the north, the Ohio River and its tributaries to the east, and the Mississippi and its tributaries to the west.

DISCUSSION OF CHANGES

During recent months there has been a great deal of discussion in the Congress, in the press, and among the general public, over the loss of defense contracts in this area, and it is appropriate that I treat with that state of affairs quite frankly and in some detail.

In the first place, it is significant that these discussions are occurring now, in 1962, rather than in 1954, 1955, or 1956, when the major changes actually occurred. The fact is that the geographic distribution of military prime contract awards between the midwestern area and the rest of the Nation has been relatively stable over the past 3 years.

The recent trend is upward. In fiscal 1962, total prime military contract awards for the 5 States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin were $3.1 billion, up 20 percent from the $2.6 billion of fiscal 1961, and up 32 percent from the $2.4 billion of fiscal 1960. Each of the 5 States participated in these gains; Indiana, however, had the greatest increase of all. Awards for fiscal 1962 were $635 million, compared with $350 million in fiscal 1961, and with only $310 million in fiscal 1960. This doubling of defense contracts in only 2 years should be most welcome to the industries, universities, and the citizenry of this State.

Why then, should there be such evidence of concern over this area's share of total defense procurement? It appears to be a belated reaction to something that happened

between the close of the Korean hostilities and the year 1960. It is true that the midwestern share of defense contract awards dropped sharply during those years. The 5 States of Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, and Wisconsin had over 27 percent of total prime contract awards during the Korean hostilities. By fiscal 1960 this percentage had fallen to less than 12 percent. This was a loss of $6 billion per year in prime contract awards and one that can be translated, literally, into hundreds of thousands of jobs. The excellent recovery of fiscal 1962 restored only half a billion of this $6 billion loss, or less than 10 percent.

Why this momentous change could have taken place with so little attention at the time is hard to understand, or to explain. Perhaps it may have been due to the fact that there was a huge pent-up demand for civilian goods at the end of the Korean hostilities—for automobiles, for television sets, for many of the other "big ticket" merchandise items which could not be produced in adequate quantity during Korea. You will recall that 1955 saw 8 million passenger automobiles produced in the United States, a figure never equaled before or since. It was also at that time that mass markets in television opened up; and there were profitable opportunities in abundance for the highly efficient mass production efforts typical of industry in this section of the Nation. In other words, this area achieved a successful conversion from a warfare economy to the civilian markets characteristic of the time since Korea.

In contrast, the economies of the east and west coasts were much harder hit during the conversion years of 1954 and 1955. These areas naturally intensified their efforts to expand their share of defense procurement and to adapt themselves to the new requirements of the armed services. This is where the great increase of emphasis on research and development had a major role.

During Korea, for example, missile contract awards were only one-half of 1 percent of all Defense contracts; by fiscal 1961 these were 33½ percent of the total. Electronics awards accounted for only 11 percent during the Korean war; but these rose to 18 percent in fiscal 1961. These increases came chiefly through the severe reduction in tank-automotive items, weapons, ammunition, and other heavy equipment, which accounted for 50 percent of the total during Korea and only 12 percent in fiscal 1961. The Middle West area supplied a large part of these wheeled vehicles and ammunition items, but it has enjoyed a much smaller and less significant share in the production of new and highly sophisticated weapon systems.

WEAPONS IN SPACE

Speaking of sophisticated weapons, there has been, as you all know, a good deal of public discussion recently about our military space program. If I may interrupt for a few moments my main theme, I should like to say something to you about this program.

On December 20, 1961, the United States sponsored the unanimous adoption of U.N. General Assembly Resolution 1721. This resolution, which recognized the common interest of mankind in furthering the peaceful uses of outer space and which expressed the belief that space should be used only for the betterment of mankind, established the principle that outer space and celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all states in conformity with international law and the charter of the U.N., and are not subject to national appropriation. We see no reason to change our position about this resolution.

The United States believes that it is highly desirable for its own security and for the security of the world that the arms race should not be extended into outer space, and we are seeking in every feasible way to achieve that purpose. Today there is no doubt that either the United States or the Soviet Union could place thermonuclear weapons in orbit, but such an action is just not a rational military strategy for either side for the foreseeable future.

We have no program to place any weapons of mass destruction into orbit. An arms race in space will not contribute to our security. I can think of no greater stimulus for a Soviet thermonuclear arms effort in space than a U.S. commitment to such a program. This we will not do.

At the same time that we are pursuing cooperative scientific efforts in space through the United Nations and otherwise, we will of course take such steps as are necessary to defend ourselves and our allies, if the Soviet Union forces us to do so. This is in accordance with the inalienable right of self-defense confirmed in the United Nations Charter.

We now have an active and extensive military space program, addressed to two objectives:

First, as part of our overall defense effort, we have continuing programs to insure that the United States will be able to cope with any military challenge in outer space. Our programs in this area are under constant review, and this review indicates that our present rate of effort is entirely adequate.

Second, as a part of our national space program, we in the Defense Department, along with NASA, are actively exploring the potentialities of outer space as a useful part of our expanding universe. We are developing through activities in space and observations from space our ability to improve our capabilities in fields such as communications, navigation, meteorology, mapping, and geodesy. Many branches of industry are contributing to this endeavor by improving propulsion, electronic, photographic, communications and other components of systems for space research and utilization. These programs have great significance not only for our military forces but for the economic and scientific advance of the United States and of the whole world. The progress that they represent, like all scientific advances, is neutral in its political and moral content. We all recognize that the atom can provide energy for peace or for war. A navigational satellite in outer space can guide a submarine as well as a merchant ship.

We are conducting our national missile and space program with the maximum openness consistent with national security. We register with the United Nations each space launching. I only wish the Soviets would be as open about all their military activities as we are about ours.

IMPLICATIONS FOR INDUSTRY

Returning to my principal topic, the refusal of the United States to launch a thermonuclear arms race in outer space clearly has implications for industrial planning. Too many contractors may be attempting to crowd into the space spotlight, while other important but less highlighted defense problems do not receive the attention which they deserve. For example, research and development accounted for 58 percent of all defense awards for space technology and missiles in fiscal 1961 while R. & D. accounted for only 2½ percent of the contracts let for military vehicles.

Yet our need for improved vehicles has increased, not decreased. In Vietnam the problem of rapid surface transportation across rice paddies and swamps has yet to be solved. Over 20 years ago the Army, faced by the problem of rapid movement in snow, turned to South Bend and the Studebaker Co. for an answer. The solution, the M-29 Weasel, designed and developed by Mr. Harold Churchill, was a distinct and vital contribution to our victory in Europe. I am certain that there are other imaginative Hoosiers who can assist the Defense Department with new and more effective solutions to Defense Department problems. If they are to do so, strong, vigorous university and industrial research and development programs are essential.

This year Defense Department research and development awards are expected to exceed $7 billion. The research and development budget for the whole Federal Government will be approximately $12.5 billion, which is three times the amount spent 7 years ago. This is a most important trend, with profound significance for our whole economy. States such as California and Massachusetts have up to now been the principal beneficiaries of this trend. States which lag behind in this field can hardly expect long-term growth in defense contracts.

The vast importance of research, development, test, and evaluation contracts derives from the fact that they are often forerunners of future production activity. The placement of these contracts is even more closely concentrated in a few States than is true of the remaining three-fourths of defense procurement. In 1961 the West Coast and Mountain States had 54½ percent of the total; the New England and Middle Atlantic States 27½ percent; and the East-North Central States had only about 6½ percent.

These indicators are of major importance because a company which has conducted or managed the research, design, development, and test work on a new weapon system—or a major component—may thereby acquire a scientific, engineering, and technical staff highly skilled in advanced technology. Such a concern is obviously in a strong position not only to compete for follow-on production contracts but also for new design and developmental contracts. It is logical, then, that production contracts for modern weapons and equipment which will figure heavily in future procurement, may tend to be placed in areas where research, development, test, and evaluation effort has been centered. A region that gains a long headstart in a new and expanding field of procurement is bound to enjoy an enduring advantage, especially when research and development is a primary element.

Factors influencing the location of prime contracts and subcontracts include availability of highly specialized scientific, engineering and technical manpower, specialized facilities, labor skills, production experience, and know-how, together with competence and familiarity in presentation of bid proposals. All these factors tend to be associated with research and development capability, and their presence fosters the climate in which long-range research and development may flourish.

Although the dollars devoted to basic research amount to only 2½ percent of the total defense research, development, test, and evaluation program, its long-range importance far exceeds its dollar allocation. National security in the 1970's, and military procurement patterns in that decade, may well depend upon the creativity of our basic reasearch community, whether conducted within Government laboratories or contracted out.

AWARDS NOT PROPORTIONED

Most basic research contracts are awarded to universities and other nonprofit organizations. In fiscal year 1961 the total of prime awards to educational and nonprofit institutions, including many which would not qualify as basic research, was $431 million. The fact that half these dollar amounts went to Massachusetts and California, while only 14 percent went to the entire Midwest, has attracted considerable attention as an example of the clustering of industry around centers of learning. Yet, the Midwest, with its great university resources and its large annual output of Ph. D's and other profes-

sionals, did not in 1961 obtain a share of defense prime contract awards, for production, for general research, development, test, and evaluation, or for nonprofit research, which was proportional to its share of the Nation's scientific and technical skills.

A special problem faced by the Midwest in this connection lies in its heavy export balance in trained and talented manpower. Two or three facts may serve to establish the point. Of 200 physicists and electrical engineers receiving graduate degrees in the Chicago area over a 6-year period, who were then employed by industry, only 3 remained in that area. Of 100 aeronautical engineers graduated by the University of Michigan last year, none was employed by Michigan. There were some 950 Ph. D's granted in the five States of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan and Wisconsin in 1959; but only about 500 Ph. D's obtained employment there, and many of these were from other areas. This situation is even worse than it seems, because about half of our annual Ph. D product goes into university teaching—which means that few Ph.D's are going into Midwestern industry. They are trained here—in your excellent schools—but they find employment elsewhere. The recruiters—the headhunters—find this a happy hunting ground.

At least one conclusion can be drawn from these facts. Certain institutions, certain companies and certain communities have been far more successful in their quest for Defense research, development, test, and evaluation contracts than have others. The primary objective of the Military Establishment has been to find and to use the strongest capabilities for each essential requirement, whether for research and development or for production. It is a matter of concern to the Defense Department that we make full use of all research resources available to us, nationwide, in ways suited to their capabilities in each case. It would be good for Defense, and for the economy of the Midwest, if these capabilities were found here more often than they now are.

Defense policy rightly stresses awards on merit. Local initiative seeking Defense business must, therefore, direct itself to the creation of capability responsive to the exacting needs of modern warfare. Communities which fail to recognize this fact, and which fail to energize and mobilize their institutions to adjust to it, cannot reasonably anticipate a major role in future Defense procurement.

If it be true, as I believe, that our research program does indeed foreshadow future patterns of Defense procurement, it is apparent that the national interest requires a solid understanding of the implications of this fact. Last month, Secretary McNamara and I requested the development of a study plan for an analysis in depth of the fundamental issues in these industry-academic-defense relationships. We need answers to a number of significant questions.

SEARCH FOR ANSWERS

We want to know why the concentration of defense research and development has developed over the past decade, and especially what, if any, connection there is between this concentration and the concentration of university and other nonprofit research efforts. We would like to learn both the advantages and disadvantages from the defense viewpoint of such concentration. It would also be interesting to find out to what extent defense research activity spills over into the civilian economy to encourage local growth and the development of business enterprise. The Department of Defense has a special interest in finding out whether there are, in the United States, research and development capabilities and potentials not being fully utilized for the optimum advantage of the Nation.

It will not be easy to get precise answers to questions involving so many complex elements, but we intend to make as much progress as possible.

The points I have been making tend to emphasize the relationship of national defense to jobs, prosperity and industrial expansion. But it would be a distortion of our basic problem to ignore the fact that 91 percent of our overall national production lies in the civilian sector; only 9 percent is accounted for by Defense procurement. Civilian markets will always attract exploitation and development, and most industries will seek some part of such markets for their products.

It is possible, in other words, to exaggerate the importance of the Defense contract award pattern in relation to the whole of our economy. Nevertheless, there is some spillover from the research and development efforts associated with defense, whether in industry or in universities, or in nonprofit research establishment, into the civilian sphere. New products, new processes, new techniques, open up new opportunities for improvement in our standard of living through expansion in the production and distribution of civilian goods. That is why it may well be highly desirable for this Middle Western region to give earnest attention to strengthening its research and development capabilities, expanding its pools of top research talent, as well as to maintaining its productive efficiency.

What are the practical means available to these industries that deserve consideration even in advance of the conclusion of the studies now in process? Tentatively, I would offer these possibilities.

First, every possible encouragement might be given to those industries and those companies which already maintain successful research and development activities. There are in this region companies with a progressive, positive attitude toward research. It is easier to build on existing strength than to create wholly new capability.

Second, I would emphasize the need for a close relationship between industry and university resources. This relationship has developed to a high degree around Boston, Mass., involving MIT and dozens of companies large and small with factories in the vicinity. The same kind of close relationship exists around Palo Alto, Calif., involving Leland Stanford University, Stanford Research Institute, and, again, dozens of corporate organizations with plants near by. And, of course, there is the Los Angeles area, with the giant industrial organizations maintaining close relationship with the university resources of that area.

PRAISE FOR BENDIX

What Bendix has been doing in this field deserves mention. Bendix personnel, I am informed, have worked closely with the University of Michigan faculty, sharing the use of the university's nuclear reactor in significant research. The Bendix Systems Division, the university, and the Federal Government have been associated in joint meteorological programs in field tests. Bendix has employed consultants from the university faculty; Bendix technicians have given part time service as faculty members; and Bendix personnel are encouraged to take advanced courses and to secure degrees from the university—with 30 percent of all the company engineers having taken some courses. I am pleased, also, to learn that Bendix maintains contact with other great educational institutions in this area, including Michigan State University, Wayne State University, and South Bend's own Notre Dame. These activities may help explain why Bendix received $172 million of prime military contract awards in fiscal 1961 and an even larger total in fiscal 1962.

An outstanding example of university leadership in this field is found in the industrial research park now established and functioning at Purdue University. That project, together with the Department of Defense (ARPA) grant for a material research center there should go far to guarantee the continuing excellence of Purdue, while benefiting industry in the area and the community at large.

Secretary McNamara has said, and I here repeat, that the Department of Defense would welcome a broadening of the base of research and development work in this midwestern area, and a greater utilization of the capabilities of universities and industry in this area. At the same time, we stand firmly upon the policy enacted by the Congress, with full concurrence from the executive branch, that defense contract awards are to rest upon merit. In the case of research and development awards, this means capability and, because national security is at stake, we must seek out the best and use it.

In the long run, the solution for the midwestern problem of defense contracting cannot be manufactured in Washington, however sympathetic those of us there may be. We can, however, respond to the kind of local initiative, local energy, and local cooperation which is being fostered right here in this community, under the leadership of men like Congressman Brademas, Father Hesburgh, Franklin Schurz of the South Bend Tribune, Sherwood Egbert of Studebaker, and Arthur Omberg of Bendix. Here lies the strength of American society, and our future as a nation rests in strong hands like these in every industrial city of the land.

In conclusion, let me stress once more the values which each community and each State will certainly derive from a searching review of its own resources and capabilities. By this means greater opportunity will be found both for contributions to the defense effort and for enjoyment of a rightful share in the vast economic growth and development which has characterized our history as a nation.

Part IV: Aid to Dependent Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, aid to dependent children has become one of the most controversial subjects in the country. Detroit News Reporter Jo Ann Hardee has done a service by writing a six-part series on this subject which I am pleased to insert in the RECORD:

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

(By Jo Ann Hardee)

The employer was livid.

A clerk in his store had quit her full-time job, paying $200 monthly, and was now receiving aid-to-dependent-children (ADC) payments for herself and four children. Grudgingly he kept her on as a helper for 2 days a week.

He did not blame the woman, he was angry with aid to dependent children.

"Wouldn't anybody quit a job if he could make more sitting at nome, sipping beer? Here I work day and night so that I can pay taxes—just so she can live in the lap of luxury like those other lazy loafers."

This is the image many taxpayers have of the aid-to-dependent-children program. Launched in the depression years as a substitute for widows' pensions, it has grown into a $40 million annual program in Michigan.

PUBLIC ATTACK

It has drawn a barrage of charges that it is a cushion to the lazy, the chiseler, the unwed mother.

The irate employer is correct in that "Mrs. Grierson" as she will be called here, is getting nearly as much money staying at home as she would at work. Her monthly grant is $180.

She pays no taxes on this. Free or minimally priced medical care is available to her. She can purchase food stamps, getting $3 worth for every $2 spent. Her agency-established food budget is set at $125 a month. She is permitted to purchase $96 worth of food with stamps, for which she pays $64.

(Until September 1, only 20 percent of aid-to-dependent-children clients qualified for food stamps; 87 percent of these used them. Under new rules, all aid-to-dependent-children recipients now qualify for the 3 to 2 advantage.)

CHILDREN'S PROGRAM

The employer's ire seemed justified. Why should a woman be permitted to quit a job to earn nearly the same on public assistance?

"People forget that this is a children's program," said W. J. Maxey, State head of the bureau of social welfare, aid-to-dependent-children's parent organization.

"What concerns us is the kind of youngsters we are turning out. If the mother is needed in the home, she should be in the home.

"We have an agency policy that women are expected to work if there is an adequate child care program available; the emphasis is on adequate."

In Wayne County last year, only 4.5 percent of aid to dependent children's 16,000 recipients were employed. Outstate, with the other half of the caseload, 17.1 percent were working. In Wayne County, 60 percent of nonworking mothers said they were needed in the home.

GRANDMOTHER AILING

Mrs. Grierson had been leaving her children, aged 8 to 14, with her mother. Her employer did not know it but the grandmother, suffering from arthritis, was close to a nervous breakdown.

Her emotional breakup was a result of trying to cope with four difficult youngsters, especially the 14-year-old daughter.

Deserted by her father when she was 6 and left alone while her mother worked, the child was seeking affection. She found it with a number of older men, and finally came to the attention of the juvenile court.

Counseling by court officers and getting the mother back into the home seemed to be the best therapy.

WHY PART TIME?

"Granted she is needed in the home," the employer said, "Why not every day? Why do they let her work 2 days a week?"

Mrs. Grierson's caseworker said that, figured on assistance standards, the mother and her children need $246 monthly. The State ceiling on a family of five is $180.

From her part-time job she earns $68.80 and is allowed $20.16 as work expense. The remaining $48.64 is deducted from her budgeted needs, still leaving her $17.36 of unmet need.

If Mrs. Grierson earns more, or obtains support from her husband, the amount will be subtracted and grant lessened accordingly.

LACK INCENTIVE

Some aid-to-dependent-children mothers have complained that this system creates little incentive to work. A new Federal law, to encourage employment, allows additional exemptions from income for "future identifiable needs" of children, particularly education.

"Unmet need," snorted the employer. "I have unmet needs too, I'd like a new car, my wife would like a mink coat."

His view is often expressed by irritated taxpayers who believe that aid-to-dependent-children recipients get fabulous sums on public assistance and that they are lazy, shunning jobs.

Agency officials say there have been instances of women "putting one over" on them. But they also say the bulk of the women on the program are honestly needed at home.

LAP OF LUXURY

Whenever the program is discussed, certain statements about aid to dependent children almost inevitably appear. One of these is that grantees live in the "lap of luxury."

The average Wayne County aid-to-dependent-children grant in 1961 was $149.72 per month for the average family of mother and 2.7 children. Outstate, the grant was $126.23. This was before Detroit and Wayne County dropped supplementation of $1 to $45 a case above State ceilings.

Ceilings on aid-to-dependent-children cases begin at $120 a case for mother and one child and range upward at $20 for each additional person to the top State grant of $240. This covers a family of eight or larger and, according to aid-to-dependent-children standards, is at least $120 short of its needs.

START OUT WELL

A 1959 investigation of aid to dependent children by the friend of the court did show that recipients "in a good percentage of the cases were living better and had more nonessentials than neighboring working taxpayers during the first part of the month."

R. Bernard Houston, head of the Wayne County Bureau of Social Aid, said this might be true, but he added: "We found the cupboard pretty bare, however, by the end of the month. That is why we have changed from issuing monthly checks to bimonthly ones. We think the women can budget better now."

Investigators were also disturbed when they found private telephone or high fidelity sets and television-phonograph combinations in some of the 319 homes they visited.

But they observed that, under Federal law, then operating, the cash grant could be spent according to the recipient's discretion, as long as children were not neglected.

GRANTS PROTECTED

A new law permits the agency to make "protective payments" in 5 percent of its 32,000 Michigan cases. Grants go to a responsible person who would spend for an irresponsible grantee.

Is it true that the day the checks arrive is known as "Mother's day," or "gin day," taxpayers ask?

"Sure it's true," a liquor store owner said. "They come in here on the first of the month. I won't cash the checks, no sir. But I know they're on aid to dependent children or the welfare.

"I'm a taxpayer and it makes me sick," he said and then shrugged. "Business is business."

JUDGE ANGRY

A recorder's court judge was furious when a man being sentenced for being drunk and disorderly said: "We was just havin' an A, D and C'ing party. You know, judge, that's for the day the ladies get their checks."

The inspector of a heavily welfare-loaded precinct commented:

"There's a flurry of family fights about the time the checks come in—kids and boy friends wanting their share. When we break up a wild drinking party, we can't really prove whose money bought the liquor."

UP TO AGENCY

He said any suspicions that policemen have about improper use of public aid are passed through Deputy Superintendent James Berg's office for agency investigation.

"Years ago, I reported what I thought was a fraud to aid to dependent children," the inspector said. "I was told in effect, 'mind your own business.' It pretty well discouraged me. But in 1959 (after revelations by the Detroit News of aid to dependent children fraud) they set up this report system.

"Evidently the men aren't skeptical now about the agency following through. They make the reports."

WORST CASES

Officials of aid to dependent children concede that not all recipients spend their money for the benefit of their children. They question the public image however that many aid to dependent mothers are in this category.

Houston said: "People forget that the courts, the police, the liquor store owners and bartenders see just our worst cases. They see the women who fail to live up to this program.

"If they will tell us about such cases, we will clean them up.

"I see just the worst cases too, and sometimes it's hard to remember there are 16,394 in Wayne County, with the great majority doing a fine management job."

CLOSE WATCH

This view was supported by the owner of a neighborhood grocery:

"These women come in here shopping," he said. "I'm a taxpayer, so I watch them close. They do a good job—95 percent of them. They're careful shoppers, they shop for bargains.

"Then there are the rest. I try to talk them out of buying beer or fancy foods. I tell them, 'think of the kids.' You can't seem to do much with them."

Mismanagement has led some critics of aid to dependent children to demand the agency give relief-in-kind such as the welfare department does.

Welfare pays rents, gives food stamps, provides clothing orders for designated stores, provides coal and utilities.

Maxey chides people who expect the agency to exercise complete control over aid funds.

GET COMPLAINTS

"There are people who complain about drinking, smoking, even of wearing nail polish, when a woman is on public assistance. You aren't going to change people overnight because they are on welfare.

"Bimonthly checks and protective payments will tend to cut out misspending. But you can't expect these people to do a better management job than we would."

A charge sometimes leveled at aid to dependent children is that caseworkers do not ferret out fraud or ineligibles because they would lose their jobs if caseloads dropped significantly.

CRITICIZES LOAD

Maxey laughed at this and said: "There isn't a month when we don't have an uncovered caseload of 120. This is where we lose money—through lack of supervision."

Houston agreed. He said: "Our ideal caseload would be 75 a worker, 45 less than we now have. At that rate we would have to drop 6,435 cases, more than a third of the county load, one-sixth of the State cases, before we would have an ideal working relationship.

"We would have to drop still more before we would need to fire one worker."

Recipients of aid to dependent children have their rumors, too. One is that there are aid to dependent children committees in each neighborhood to spy on them.

HEAR OF BONUSES

"They get $50 every time they get something on us and the aid cuts us off," one wide-eyed aid to dependent children mother said solemnly.

Another rumor is that social workers get a $50 bonus for each case dropped. The

Christmas season is viewed as a time when caseworkers become particularly zealous about reducing caseloads.

A persistent comment among aid to dependent children critics is that mothers have children just to increase their grants.

"No one can convince me a woman has a baby just to get $20 a month more," Kathryn van Zoren, local aid to dependent children director said.

COMMUNITY PROBLEM

"There are social factors which create a high illegitimacy rate (42.6 percent of Wayne County aid to dependent children are born to unwed mothers). These factors must be corrected.

"I would like to see the agency do some casework with young unwed mothers to prevent recurrence of the pattern.

"But this is a problem that confronts the whole community in raising standards."

An independent research report on Chicago's aid to dependent children program concluded: "Mothers do not have illegitimate children to get aid to dependent children benefits, because most of the illegitimate pregnancies are unwanted."

MANY ON ROLLS

"However, since a mother who has an illegitimate child has little chance of support from the father, a large number of illegitimate children are found on aid to dependent children rolls.

"This is particularly true if the child is Negro."

Juvenile Judge James A. Lincoln said that Negroes have no tradition of adoption.

He commented: "When an unwed Negro girl has a child, she keeps it. Whites tend to conceal the birth and release the child for adoption."

When the Detroit News published a series on adoption it discovered moreover, that foster homes were extremely hard to find for Negro children.

The Chicago study found that 90 percent of the unwed mothers did not want to have the child, but accepted it and loved it once it was born.

The same study concluded, however, that the existence of a program which placed a premium on the absence of the father might contribute to family breakups or prevent marriage.

ASKED TO LEAVE

"A number of mothers reported that they did not marry the father because he could not support the family," the report said.

"In some cases where the mother and father were married, the mother reported that she had asked the father to leave because he could not earn enough to support the family.

"Only if all families with needy children were given assistance, regardless of the status of parents, would this reason for family breakup be averted."

In this session of Congress—such a program—aid to dependent children of unemployed fathers (ADC–U)—was launched.

Objective Look at Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, those of us who attempt to take an objective look at the farm problem in the interest of our farmer constituents and the taxpayer and the consumer are quite disturbed over the fixation which evidently prevails at policy levels of the Department of Agriculture with the idea that the only rational solution to the farm problem for almost all commodities is an incentive level of price support with the multiplication of controls, which such a program requires. A concomitant proposition is that farmers should be forced to choose between this course or no programs at all because there is no other tenable alternative. On these premises opponents of the recent farm bill were depicted either as enemies of the farmer or friends of the farmer, who were uninterested in reducing the cost of farm programs.

This charge is simply not true because there is a third alternative—a solution to the farm mess which involves less cost, less regimentation of farmers, and the preservation of a necessary remainder of the traditional laws of economics in farm commodity production and marketing. I refer to the establishment of lower support levels, which will require only occasional or otherwise reduced regimentation, which will permit some areas of business judgment to farmers, and which will allow the operation of economic principles in the allocation of farm resources.

The best comment I have read on the high price-support proposals and their inevitable rigid controls was that of the editorial writer of the Christian Science Monitor, who likened it to driving a car by applying braking and acceleration to the car simultaneously. Such a mode of operation might serve the purpose of transportation for a short distance but the wear and tear on both the car and the driver would cause a rapid breakdown of both.

The basic premise back of this full-acceleration full-breaking philosophy is that the effort should be made to establish commodity prices at such levels as will insure every farmer and every acre a profitable production. The sad effect of this premise in operation has produced additions to the policy of raising price levels by Government action, to-wit, paying farmers for not producing or so-called direct payment plans of paying them more for a given commodity unit while keeping market prices relatively low. The unfortunate fact is that, however the plans are varied, the premise destroys them or creates unfortunate side effects for large numbers of farmers which should make us pause in endorsing them. These programs cannot be long sustained and for so long as they are in operation they profit a minority of farmers not only at the expense of the taxpayer but also at the expense of other farmers. These programs guarantee uneconomic production by a class of distress farmers and make millionaires at the corporate farming end of the farm community to the detriment of the middle-class farmers who are squeezed by quotas into uneconomic production activities by the product of the pigmies and the giants.

The fact is that our farm programs should be primarily directed at the welfare of these same middle-class farmers who are the custodians of the farm values, both economic and sociological, of which we boast. Unfortunately, concern for them has not been the primary concern of past farm programs.

It is my judgment that the American Farm Bureau Federation is the farm organization which has best presented the viewpoint of this deserving class of farmers on the subject of agricultural policy.

The high price-support philosophy has traditionally been operated through the device of support loans and the mechanism has fallen into such disfavor that there is talk of revising the mechanism by adding another gimmick to it, to wit, adding a direct-payment principle which would maintain the principle while permitting somewhat lower support levels and lower commodity prices. This addition carries with it new evils, some of which are stated with respect to cotton in the following letter:

DELTA COUNCIL,
Stoneville, Miss., August 3, 1961.

Mr. JOHN S. MACRAE,
Chairman, National Affairs Committee, Atlantic Cotton Association, Greensboro, N.C.

DEAR MR. MACRAE. This is with further reference to your letter of July 17, which I promised to answer in detail just as soon as time would permit.

You asked specifically if the Delta Council favored in principle a compensatory payment type of program for cotton. We do not. We think the principle involved here is wrong for cotton, wrong for agriculture, and wrong for the country.

In the first place, the direct-payment principle is directly opposed to, and would destroy, the normal function of price in the American economy. Some of the advocates of payments claim that this approach would allow price to function, but the exact opposite is true.

With our American economic system, price is the essential mechanism which guides resources into, and out of, various kinds of production. The only other alternative to price, as a means of keeping our economy organized, is Government dictatorship over how our resources are to be used. In essence, for agriculture, that is the alternative represented by compensatory payments. Such an approach would destroy the whole meaning of price. Cotton mills would pay one price, and cotton producers would get something higher, with the Government taking care of the difference. Government, rather than the consumer, would dictate the farmer's return. We don't think this could lead anywhere except to a further loss of freedom and complete reliance on Government.

Payments also are wrong in principle because they assume that farmers must forever rely on Government subsidies for their income. While it is true that at the present time we are vitally dependent on an export subsidy, we believe that, for the long pull, cotton farmers should look and work toward standing on their own two feet, with the help of a loan program as an orderly marketing tool, in meeting competition and making decent profits. Furthermore, we think there are enormous potentials for doing this through research to reduce production costs and improve cotton quality, and through domestic and international sales promotion. In fact, cotton farmers currently are in the midst of launching a movement aimed at raising many millions of additional dollars for cotton research and promotion. This movement promises to be highly successful, and could very well become a tremendous force for improving cotton's competitive position. It is a concrete indication, I think, of

the cotton farmer's determination to move toward greater reliance on himself, and less reliance on Government. If cotton farmers were prepared to resign themselves to the payment approach—and the inevitable Government regimentation that would come with it—they certainly would be ill advised to plow millions into research and promotion in an effort to build their markets and competitive strength. Why invest in progress if your welfare is going to depend first and foremost on the size of, and the limitations on, the payments you get from the Government?

And make no mistake about it, there would be sharp limitations. You indicate that there might be some way to avoid limitations especially if the industry is unified against them. My answer is that there is no conceivable way to be sure about something like this. With the farm vote small and getting smaller, and politics being what they are, we couldn't be sure about anything except the eventual certainty of limitations. The record on this appears very clear. For instance, in 1959 between January and April 28, there were 14 speeches made on the floor of Congress in support of limitations of one kind or another. During this same period, 15 bills were introduced calling for limitations.

Historically, the story of payments is the story of limitations. For example, the ACP maximum has been reduced from $10,000 down to $1,500. And how can we forget that the Administration's farm bill authorizing compensatory payments also required that they be limited. This certainly indicates the direction in which the USDA leadership is thinking. Having already gone on record for a limitation, do you thing that Congress would take a USDA endorsement of an unlimited payment program seriously?

From the standpoint of cost alone, it is simply wishful thinking to hope that there can be a large-scale payment program without limitations. You indicate that the taxpayer might accept the payment approach because the "reduced cost of textiles would be tremendous." Anyone familiar with the facts knows that this won't hold water. Since a $5 shirt contains less than a pound of cotton, a price reduction of even 10 cents a pound couldn't possibly have more than a very small effect on the price the ultimate consumer pays. Domestic mills obtained cotton at reduced prices during the period of the "choice program." We failed to note any reduction in across-the-counter prices for cotton apparel items. The fact is that it almost surely wouldn't have any effect at all. This is typical of many textile products.

This is not to say that price is not a vital factor affecting cotton consumption, for it most certainly is. But where price is vitally important is at the door of the spinning mill. This is the crucial point at which American cotton, as a raw material, must meet the test of price competition from synthetics and other materials. By the time an end product gets to the retail counter, the cost of the raw cotton that went into it has usually become a very small part of the price paid by the consumer. So it is just a myth that lower cotton prices, through payments to farmers, would bring substantial savings for end-product consumers of textiles.

You also indicate that the cost of the payment approach would be no more than under the present program, and I wish you would explain the mathematics of this to me.

Under the present program, only the export share of our total market is being subsidized—currently at 8½ cents a pound. Under an unlimited payment program, with the price for all cotton dropping to the world level, the Government would be directly subsidizing the entire crop, instead of just the part that goes overseas. So how can the Government have a payment program, with all cotton selling at the world price, without more than doubling its direct subsidy costs? The inevitable answer is limitation of payments based on a farmer's size. And this would be disastrous for the medium and larger farmers who produce the great bulk of American cotton.

Now you might ask, as others have, if there isn't just as much danger of limitations on loans as on payments. Perhaps so. In one recent year, we had a limitation on the loan. There is clearly a danger that the farmer's ability to use the loan will be restricted again in the future.

But there is all the difference in the world between living with a limitation on loans and a limitation on payments.

Even if the loan is limited, enough of the crop would be covered so that ordinarily the farmer producing in excess of the limitation could still sell his cotton in the market at something approaching the loan level.

But with a payment program which envisions all cotton selling at the world price, the medium or larger producer would be forced to sell most of his cotton at less than it currently costs him to grow it.

What this means is that the farmers who grow most of our cotton would certainly be hurt by a loan limitation, but they would still be able to avoid bankruptcy. A payment limitation which forced them to sell at world prices would not just hurt; it would put them out of business.

In essence, these are our views on the compensatory payment approach. We have studied this approach just as carefully and objectively as we can. We know that quite a few sincere cotton people are strongly for it. But we do not believe it represents a sound approach to the price or income problems of the American cotton farmer.

I hope you will send me a consensus of the replies you have received to your letter.

Cordially,

B. F. SMITH,
Executive Vice President.

The Continuing Fight for American Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to receive the following correspondence relating to the continuing fight for American jobs.

It seems strange that we have reached the stage in the American economy where we pass out awards for those apparently few Americans who still believe Americans can produce goods and services equal to or better than any other nationals.

I commend the producers of "The Greatest Story Ever Told" and the IATSE for promoting the American economy by producing in America:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1962.

Representative JOHN H. DENT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DENT: It occurred to me that you might be interested in the enclosed release reporting the official commendation received by George Stevens at the IATSE convention in Las Vegas.

I know of your efforts to combat so-called runaway motion-picture production, and it seemed to us that you would find interest in the effort of Mr. George Stevens to attack runaway production in the only way he knows how—by producing "The Greatest Story Ever Told," entirely in the United States.

Should you desire further information about this very significant motion picture, I would be happy to supply it to you at your request.

With all best good wishes.

Sincerely,

MAXWELL HAMILTON,
Coordinator, Publicity and Promotion.

RESOLUTION

Whereas George Stevens, the eminent producer and director, is about to embark upon a magnificent motion picture production entitled "The Greatest Story Ever Told," which will be made in its entirety in the United States; and

Whereas George Stevens used his untiring efforts and influence to produce this motion picture in the United States to prove to the world and particularly to the American people that great motion pictures can be made in the United States despite the fact that other producers of motion pictures have elected to make films in other lands; and

Whereas George Stevens in making this inspiring story into a motion picture in this country will be giving employment to hundreds of citizens of the city of Los Angeles and also aiding the merchants and people who service the motion picture industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention go on record commending George Stevens for his patriotic and loyal spirit and also extending to him its deepest appreciation for his everlasting efforts in behalf of all Americans; and be it further

Resolved, That each local of the IATSE be requested to read this resolution at a regular meeting and urge its members and their families to support this great film by making plans to attend the showing of this film when it is released; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the following:

1. The President and the Vice President of the United States.
2. The Cabinet members of the U.S. Government.
3. All of the U.S. Senators and all of the Members of the House of Representatives.
4. The Governors of the 50 States of the United States and the mayors of Los Angeles and New York City.
5. All of the presidents of the international and national federations of the AFL–CIO.
6. All of the State federations of labor, AFL–CIO, in the United States.
7. All of the county central labor councils in the various States of the United States of America.

TELLING "THE GREATEST STORY EVER TOLD"

"The Greatest Story Ever Told," the culmination of George Stevens' 40-year career as a motion-picture producer and director, will attempt to present with reverence and all possible fidelity the sublimely mystical story of Jesus, in terms of striking, vivid theater.

Mr. Stevens, one of the film industry's most respected professionals, already has two Academy Awards to his credit. He is not at all interested in making another Biblical spectacular. His avowed purpose is "to take a very new look at a very old story, and to make a valid and lasting picture, one that will lose no part of that validity even four decades from now, when the second millenium of the birth of Jesus Christ will be celebrated."

It will take 6 months of actual production to get "The Greatest Story Ever Told" onto film, from September of 1962 to March of 1963, but Mr. Stevens' research actually

began many years earlier, in 1958. For those 4 years he and his associates have been diligently combing the 50,000 volumes that have been written on the subject of Jesus and Christianity, and they have examined some 30 different editions of the Holy Bible. The six major translations of every word spoken by Jesus during His lifetime have been subjected to intensive comparative study, and religious leaders of every faith—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Islamic, Hindu, and Buddhist—were consulted during the preparation of the script, which is a collaboration between Mr. Stevens himself, the Pulitzer-prizewinning Carl Sandburg, Ivan Moffat, and James Lee Barrett.

Although Mr. Stevens inevitably shies from superlatives, and is even more reticent than usual because of the very nature of "The Greatest Story Ever Told," it may still be pointed out that this will be the biggest motion picture to be produced entirely in Hollywood and its surrounding area in more than 20 years. The physical ravages of 20 centuries and the steel and concrete overlay of modern civilization have exacted such a toll from the Holy Land that it proved out of the question to attempt to shoot the picture in its natural settings. Thus members of Mr. Stevens' staff spent many months traveling through the American West in a painstaking search for locales that would best approximate the sacred sights identified with Christ's mission on earth—Nazareth, Bethlehem, the Sea of Galilee, the Jordan River where He was baptized, the holy mountain from which He delivered the Beatitudes, the Via Dolorosa, Golgotha. The result was the selection of three huge location sites, in Utah's Monument Valley, at Pyramid Lake in Nevada, and in California's Death Valley. These locations will be small, self-sufficient cities, each with its own theaters, hotels, restaurants, post offices, playing fields and churches. The balance of the film will be shot at the Desilu-Culver Studios in Culver City, where a half-dozen sound stages will be utilized for the many necessary interiors, and where the ancient city of Jerusalem will rise again on a 26-acre lot.

In the vitally important casting of Christ, Mr. Stevens' worldwide, years-long search ended in the selection of Max von Sydow, a distinguished Swedish actor known in this country for his leading roles in a succession of Ingemar Bergman films. Charlton Heston will appear in the key role of John the Baptist, and other Hollywood stars have already accepted roles much smaller than those to which they are normally accustomed, purely for the sake of being involved with Mr. Stevens in a project of such far-reaching proportions and implications. John Wayne, for example, will play the centurion who guards the Cross; Sidney Poitier will be seen in the small but vital role of Simon the zealot.

"The Greatest Story Every Told" will be distributed by United Artists, and will be ready for release during Easter week of 1964, or possibly sooner.

While research of the most intensive kind will guarantee the authenticity of all of the physical appurtenances of "The Greatest Story Ever Told"—replicas of fishing boats of the period will sail over the blue Sea of Galilee, Roman soldiers will swagger through teeming Jerusalem in fighting garb that will be correct down to the last scuffed sandal—it is the giant idea of Christ, and its presentation in as dramatically valid a manner as possible, that has always been uppermost in Mr. Stevens' heart and brain. In a troubled, confused world, man has always sought for hope, and peace of mind; and whatever his formal belief, no reasonable man doubts the love of Jesus for mankind.

Carl Sandburg had this to say in "The Woodcarver": "The Christ head, the Christ face, what man will ever paint, chisel, or carve it? When finished it would float and gleam, cry and laugh, with every other face born human. And how can you crowd all the tragic and comic faces of mankind into one face?"

How can you, indeed? But Mr. Stevens is determined to try. That try will be the most honorable one of which he is capable.

Film Producer George Stevens yesterday won unprecedented official commendation from the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees (IATSE) for his announced plans to photograph "The Greatest Story Ever Told" entirely within the United States at a time when runaway production overseas has sorely sapped American employment.

Eleven hundred delegates in biennial convention at Las Vegas unanimously passed a resolution putting the unions on record commending the veteran filmmaker for proving that "great motion pictures can be made in the United States despite the fact that other producers of motion pictures have elected to make films in other lands" and for "giving employment to hundreds of citizens of Los Angeles" and aiding subcontractors and suppliers who service the industry.

Introduced by Herb Aller, business agent of the cameramen's union (local 659), the resolution further commended Stevens for his "patriotic and loyal spirit" and extended the convention's "deepest appreciation for his everlasting efforts in behalf of all Americans."

"The Greatest Story Ever Told" is the life story of Jesus Christ, inspired by Fulton Oursler's book of that name.

Passage of the resolution underscored the intention of the IATSE alliance of theatrical unions in Canada and the United States of America to fight the trend to foreign shooting of American pictures by organized support of important features made here. Each of the members of IATSE and the more than 13 million AFL–CIO members nationally will be involved in a grassroots campaign to support "The Greatest Story Ever Told," when it is released late next year.

The Stevens film for release by United Artists will be studio-filmed in Los Angeles with Holy Land locales duplicated in Nevada, California, Arizona, and Utah at a cost of many millions. Los Angeles area construction trades alone will benefit by over 35,000 man-days of labor and well over 100 speaking roles will be supplemented by an estimated 30,000 man-days of employment for extras and bit players. This comes as manna at a time when film industry payroll rosters are at a critically low ebb. Preproduction work has covered over 3 years to date with actual photography to start in the near future.

It is the hope both of Stevens and the AFL–CIO guilds that successful completion of this mammoth undertaking here will stir other film makers to return their operations to this country from overseas. Many of the film guilds have clarified their contracts to facilitate filming of "The Greatest Story Ever Told" here, mitigating what Stevens in the past has scored as unfair penalization of large-scale production in this country.

Encouragement of Trade With Communist Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, over the years those of us who have the interests of our merchant marine at heart have had a continued struggle to assure that our 50–50 law, which requires the transportation of at least 50 percent of Government-aid cargoes in American ships, is observed by our executive agencies. Now we find that the remainder is being allocated to vessels active in trading to Communist countries. To add injury to insult, the following item from the Baltimore Sun tells of a Yugoslav ship on its way from supplying Cuba with Russian material, which is being chartered by our Government to carry foreign aid cargo abroad. The ability to secure cargoes on this side of the Atlantic for carriage to Europe and Asia enables these ships to quote lower rates on a return voyage to Cuba:

UNIT SAYS SHIPS TAKE CARGO TO CUBA, THEN U.S. AID EAST

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

NEW YORK, September 18.—Ships carrying cargoes—some presumably carrying military supplies and perhaps troops—to Cuba are in turn picking up aid cargoes in the United States and returning to Europe and Africa, the American Maritime Association asserted today.

Specifically, the shipping group asked President Kennedy to withdraw the approval of the Department of Agriculture in the chartering of a Yugoslavian ship to load flour at Houston late this month after discharging cargo in Cuba.

REQUEST SENT LAST WEEK

This vessel—the MV *Drzic*—has picked up other aid cargoes—all of which are financed by the U.S. Government—after discharging in Cuba.

The request to the President regarding the *Drzic* was sent last week, but made public only today.

A cursory check of Lloyd's weekly shipping index, which records the ports of call and destinations of more than 10,000 ships engaged in world trade, also shows that the Swedish vessel *Otto Bank* sailed from Leningrad to Cuba and then to Houston.

HOUSTON MAJOR GRAIN PORT

Another vessel, the Lebanese-flag *Nictric* picked up a cargo at Novorossisk, Russia, for Havana, Cuba, and from there went to Freeport, Bahamas. Vessels frequently pick up bunkers at Freeport before proceeding to the United States for additional cargoes.

Houston is one of the principal ports for grain exports under the aid program, provided for by Public Law 480.

The American Maritime Association said that the *Drzic* is picking up aid cargo for the United Arab Republic.

The association said it has informed the President of similar charter fixtures, approved by the Department of Agriculture, in which foreign-flag vessels alternately carried cargo for Russia or other Communist countries and the United States.

This information was sent to the Department of State on June 21, 1962, by J. Max Harrison, president.

STATE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

After consulting with the agencies most concerned with aid movements, the Department of State replied that it did not consider that any "meaningful facilitation" by the U.S. Government to Communist trade was involved in the carriage by such foreign-flag vessels of the Government-generated cargoes.

This was in a letter by G. Griffith Johnson, Assistant Secretary, in behalf of Dean Rusk, Secretary of State.

"This abuse of administration practice in the chartering of public-law cargo results in American foreign-aid dollars being used to

subsidize Communist shipping," the Maritime Association said.

"FLAGS OF CONVENIENCE" HIT

"In addition to this, the use of NATO ships and so-called flags of convenience ships in transporting Communist cargo releases Russian ships and permits them to concentrate on more strategic objectives.

"The use of American dollars to subsidize Communist shipping lessens popular support for the foreign aid program at a time when that support is most needed."

The *Drzic* and the *Otto Bank* appear to have been chartered by the same parties since both originally loaded in Novorossisk, discharged in Havana, and are proceeding to Houston.

REPORTED WITH GRAIN FOR CUBA

Paradoxically, the *Drzic* is reported to have loaded grain in Russia for Cuba. The vessel loaded on July 21, 1962, and discharged September 9. It is due to pick up its flour in Houston, September 28.

The cargo of flour bound for the United Arab Republic will be Government-generated aid cargo, the association said.

Similarly, the SS *Mlyet*, also Yugoslavian, sailed from Galveston, Tex., July 7, 1962, with a cargo of Government-generated aid cargo of flour for the U.A.R. it continued. After discharging its cargo in Alexandria, it proceeded to Cuba to load sugar for delivery to Yugoslavia.

"FLAGRANT DISREGARD"

"This flagrant disregard of shipping patterns by U.S. Government agencies when approving charter fixtures has resulted in foreign-flag ships obtaining American-aid cargo at higher rates than they could get in any other trade, which constitutes a subsidy to Communist trade," the steamship group declared.

"The facts of this unfortunate situation, Mr. President, indicate that:

"1. American foreign aid dollars are used to subsidize Communist shipping.

"2. The use of NATO shipping in the carriage of Communist cargo releases Russian ships and permits them to concentrate on more strategic objectives.

"3. So-called flags-of-convenience ships and NATO country vessels have completely disregarded U.S. economic and political objectives and are motivated strictly by economic inducements, regardless of their source.

"4. The depressed state of the U.S. merchant marine is further aggravated, lessening its national defense potential and its usefulness in any emergency."

House Resolution 211: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE BALTIC COMMITTEE
IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,
Seattle, Wash., August 22, 1962.

Hon. D. J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Baltic Committee, representing Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians residing in the State of Washington, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas we are engaged in a cold war which cannot be terminated by our own wishful thinking; and

"Whereas this conflict is no matter of military supremacy or economical challenge, but a clash of ideas; and

"Whereas the ideology of our adversary is a threat to our survival as a free nation under God; and

"Whereas in our survival we depend on our determination to keep alive the spark of freedom around the world and to kindle the hopes of those encased in the great prison of many nations; and

"Whereas many of us cannot grasp the truth behind the edifice of the Soviet propaganda and thus convey this truth to those so-called uncommitted, who still are enhanced by the Communist ideas but unconvinced by the Communist realities of which the fate of captive nations is a glaring example; and

"Whereas there is an urgent need to collect and evaluate facts concerning the captive nations and to pierce the mesh of lies surrounding the land of glowing promises and frustrating realities, where to avoid bloodshed more blood is shed, where liberation means expanding colonial rule and in a classless society a new class of mighty is emerging: Therefore, to gather facts and avoid guesswork, be it

Resolved, To establish a permanent Committee on Captive Nations at the House of Representatives.

Respectfully yours,

KORNELIJS PURGALIS,
President.

JURIS SEKSTE,
Secretary.

WORCESTER, MASS.,
August 1962.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As a Lithuanian-American I say many thanks for your kind remarks of July 16 in behalf of the captive nations.

Sincerely yours,

ALEX KARDOKAS.

BREMERTON CAPTIVE NATIONS COUNCIL,
Bremerton, Wash.

To: Kitsap County Republican Central Committee, Washington State Republican Central Committee Convention.

Subject: Establishment of a special Committee on Captive Nations.

America must continue its interest and Congress must not swerve from its efforts in behalf of the legions of Lithuanians, Germans, Poles, Albanians, Bulgarians, Hungarians and others.

President Eisenhower, in two proclamations on Captive Nations Week, summoned the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations."

The Governor, U.S. Senators, U.S. Representatives and city mayors of the State of Washington issue annual proclamations and statements on Captive Nations Week.

We all know words are not enough if we truly desire to help these people. As Republicans in the State of Washington, we must take action—clear, direct, affirmative action through statewide endorsement of a special Committee on Captive Nations in the Congress of the United States.

This committee, as embodied in House Joint Resolution 211, would be empowered to make a careful and precise study of conditions in the captive nations of the world with the aim of recommending policies by which the United States can assist these unfortunate people, by peaceful means, to regain their freedom and independence.

It is all too clear to everyone that being a Russian captive nation is not synonymous with being a Russian affiliate. Does anyone need more proof than Berlin in 1953, or Hungary in 1956? Or, for that matter, the infamous slithering wall that faces us now in Berlin? But these are just the more dramatic instances. It is the thousand and one daily deeds of oppression which make heavy the burden of these captive peoples. It is this burden that the Committee on Captive Nations would seek to lighten.

From the viewpoint of our own national security, there is a hazardous gap in our official and private facilities as concerns this necessary task of studying systematically, objectively, and continuously all of the captive nations, especially those in the U.S.S.R. Nowhere is there any agency, public or private, performing this essential task.

In every area of the Soviet bloc, within the Soviet Union itself, there are human beings striving for freedom, for safety, for dignity. Such aspirations can be nurtured by the work of the proposed special committee. Among the many functions of the committee would be its service in becoming a storehouse of knowledge which could be drawn upon for future policy decisions.

We urge that Washington State Republicans at their convention adopt the plank in the Kitsap County Republican Central Committee platform which states: "We recognize the plight of the Communist dominated captive nations. In the interests of national security we endorse and support the establishment of a special Committee on Captive Nations, now pending in the U.S. House of Representatives."

JAMES K. MORGAN,
Chairman.

RAYMOND A. NORTON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Briefly, the proposed special Committee on Captive Nations is endorsed by:

1. Congressman THOMAS M. PELLY is one of the original sponsors of a resolution calling for the establishment of a special Committee on Captive Nations.

2. The House Republican Policy Committee endorsed the creation of the special Committee on Captive Nations May 23, 1961.

3. Republican members on the Rules Committee have urged its adoption.

(Items 2 and 3 from the Republican National Committee news release of Sept. 30, 1961.)

4. Thirty-nine nearly identical resolutions have been introduced by Members of both parties in the House of Representatives.

5. On the occasion of the introduction of House Resolution 211, Representative FLOOD and more than 20 Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, held the floor for several hours with a stimulating and enlightening discussion of "Russian colonialism and the necessity of a special Captive Nations Committee" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 8, 1961).

6. All the major general organizations with a knowledgeable interest in this basic subject have endorsed House Resolution 211 and their representation exceeds 20 million American citizens (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 16, 1962, p. 12796).

7. The 1962 proclamation issued by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller states: "The United States, in the eyes of the enslaved peoples, is the citadel of human freedom. They look to us for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and restoring the enjoyment of their religious freedoms. If we fail to provide this leadership, we not only doom these captive peoples, but place our own freedom in jeopardy" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 16, 1962).

Progress in Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, one of our good neighbors to the south is Mexico. We are extremely interested in maintaining good relations with that country, as well as to see it make progress economically and in other ways.

Mr. Fred A. Orleans of San Antonio, Tex., is thoroughly familiar with United States-Mexican relations. He has lived in Mexico for a number of years and has visited it on various occasions. About a year ago he wrote a short article on "Impressions of Mexico," based on a visit to the northern part of the country. Recently he has revisited that area and has noted considerable progress. I believe his views are of great interest and importance, and therefore insert these two brief articles in the RECORD.

They read as follows:

IMPRESSIONS OF MEXICO, 1961

(By Fred Allan Orleans)

There has been too much written recently which gives the impression that the excellent relations between Mexico and the United States have suddenly descended to an all time low. Banner headlines in many parts of the United States would indicate that our good friends have suddenly become estranged from us.

Isolated incidents do not represent the feelings of the people of Mexico nor do the statements of individual Mexicans represent the policies of the government. These policies were very well expounded by President Adolfo Lopez Mateos on June 7, Freedom of the Press Day, when he stated that Mexico will not tolerate activities which tend to disrupt the national life. The President of Mexico further indicated that Mexico must never permit the freedom enjoyed under democracy to be used in order to destroy democracy and that Mexico must never permit the freedom which its people won to be used in order to destroy freedom.

It is felt in Mexico that statements made by one of their former presidents, considered as adverse to Mexico-United States relations, were unduly publicized throughout the United States without enough stress being given to the fact that these statements brought practically no response from the people of Mexico and that this gentleman has no position in the Mexican government; that he spoke as a private citizen expressing his own views and not necessarily the views of the people. The views as expressed by this former president of Mexico no more affect Mexico-United States relations than any statement made by a former President of the United States.

In order to obtain first-hand information regarding the real feelings of the people of Mexico toward the people of the United States, I have just completed an extensive trip through the northern part of Mexico, including Monterrey, Saltillo, Monclova and border states. Every place visited, I was accorded the usual warm hospitality of Mexico and the feeling prevailed that the true friendship that the people of Mexico feel for the people of the United States is a bond which cannot easily be broken.

In Monterrey, I renewed many old friendships and spoke with those in many walks of life who reaffirmed that the average Mexican will go more than half way to meet his friends from the United States and make them feel at home. It is most unfortunate that the few incidents which cause unpleasant impressions are overemphasized in the United States while the good treatment accorded most visitors is accepted as normal and never mentioned.

While in Monterrey, I had the opportunity of being the only foreigner at a reunion of the leading attorneys of Monterrey in honor of the next Governor of Nuevo Leon, Eduardo Livas. This gentleman was secretary general of the State of Neuvo Leon in the late forties and since then a Federal Senator. He is a very popular and dedicated man and a well-known attorney. He indicated that he intends to strive to solve the social, economic and political problems of the state; that we would uphold and enfore the constitution of Mexico against all enemies; that he would encourage private initiative and help to create and maintain a climate to encourage further development of industry and agriculture in the State of Nuevo Leon. He will do all in his power to help raise the living standards of the people and will encourage and assist in every way possible the construction of homes, hospitals, and schools. The next Governor of Nuevo Leon, Eduardo Livas, is a vigorous and dedicated man of the new political school in Mexico which represents the interests of the people. In Eduardo Livas, an outstanding political star is rising on the horizon of Mexico and a man with the background, knowledge, and experience to both wisely govern his state as well as contribute to the further development of good will between the people of Mexico and the United States.

MEXICO REVISITED, 1962

(By Fred A. Orleans)

In the past year I have had many opportunities to visit again Monterrey, Nuevo Leon, Mexico, and observe firsthand the efforts of Governor Edurado Livas, to transform into reality the programs he outlined as a candidate. After 1 year in office, he can boast of more road construction than in many previous years as well as plans for extensive additional roads to make Monterrey a true hub of Northern Mexico. A new section of the Monterrey-Laredo Highway will eliminate the dangerous mountain stretch north of Monterrey by routing the highway through a valley. Further improvements are being made on the road from Monterrey to the U.S. border and a highway is being built to connect Monterrey with the industrial center of Monclova in the state of Coahuila.

Aside from roads, the Governor has done much to encourage tourism, improve agriculture and build schools and hospitals. While running for office, he indicated a strong desire to provide decent housing for the people of his state and set as a goal the minimum construction of at least 15,000 homes for low-income groups. The construction of these homes would represent great progress since approximately 72,000 homes are needed in the City of Monterrey alone. Considering lack of funds and business conditions not being up to par in the last year, I believe that Governor Livas has made great strides in implementing his programs.

In many parts of Mexico, as Nuevo Leon, state governments are moving ahead with constructive programs that will result in ultimate benefits to the entire Mexican nation. Although relations between countries relate to international matters, and therefore, emphasis is always given to the policies of a Federal Government, I believe that in the case of Mexico, we should not overlook the great strides forward being made on the local levels.

Dean Pound—Great Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article entitled "Grand Old Man of the Law Honored." The article refers to the great, inimitable Dean Roscoe Pound, for many years dean of the Harvard Law School and one of the foremost legal scholars, teachers, and authorities of our times.

The career of Dean Pound has been fabulous beyond description. His life's work has covered an incredibly wide range of constructive activities. Few, if any, men have ever attained his stature in the teaching of the law. His public contributions have memorably influenced many fields of human endeavor, and he still engages in his legal studies, research, and writings.

I am proud to hail and salute this great American and great teacher who for more than 60 years has been dominant in the educational, legal, political, and public affairs of the Nation. I would not presume to evaluate the extent, importance, sweep, or penetration of Dean Pound's contribution to legal education and the improvement of legal and judicial institutions. It is enough to say that his voice and pen have served to bring necessary changes and reforms in the administration of justice and in the format and shape of our American Government.

The versatility and range of this great American almost staggers the imagination, but his noteworthy, historical, ac-

complishments are in plain sight for everyone to view. One of our greatest Americans, a man of outstanding distinction and dedication, Dean Pound enjoys the high esteem, regard, admiration, and affection of all those in the Nation who are interested in American legal institutions, in the integrity of the American system as an instrument for preserving and buttressing the role of law in our own country and throughout the world.

I compliment and congratulate Dean Pound upon his outstanding career and the wealth of his achievements and wish for him continued good health, success, and happiness for many years to come. May the good Lord bring him many more blessings, peace of mind, and contentment.

The article follows:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette, Aug. 10, 1962]

GRAND OLD MAN OF THE LAW HONORED

Fifty-six years ago this month, a little-known mayor from the plains of Nebraska rose to address an evening session of the 29th annual meeting of the American Bar Association in St. Paul, Minn.

The speaker, then 35 years old and dean of the college of law of the University of Nebraska, was Roscoe Pound, later dean, the Harvard Law School, and now, at 91, the venerated grand old man of the law who was honored by the American Judicature Society in San Francisco Wednesday.

SPEECH IS LANDMARK

Dean Pound's 1906 speech, a landmark of modern jurisprudence, was entitled "The Causes of Popular Dissatisfaction With the Administration of Justice." He proceeded to denounce the archaic system of courts procedure that was behind the times, the lavish granting of new trials, frittering away of the court's time on mere points of legal etiquette and the theory that justice would somehow triumph when opposing lawyers used all the tricks of oratory, surprise, and cross-examination that were available.

Iconolastic as it was in 1906, the address has received a major share of credit for the changes in legal thinking and methods of the succeeding years. The upstart from Nebraska came to be called the schoolmaster of the American Bar Association. Years later, with the promulgation of "The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure of 1938" Dean Pound was to remark how long it had taken to overcome the doctrine that the law ought to be left to change itself.

Dean Pound was already recognized as a great botanist when the speech at St. Paul thrust him onto the center stage of the law.

Born in Lincoln, Nebr., on October 27, 1860, the son of a lawyer, he received most of his education as a young boy from his mother. At the University of Nebraska, he majored in botany and did graduate work in plant geography, ecology, and parasitic fungi, earning bachelor and master of arts and doctorate degrees in the field. He was the first director of the botanical survey of Nebraska, which resulted in two books that he edited. A byproduct of his career as a botanist is that in Nebraska there grows a rare plant, a lichen known as Roscoepoundia.

Although he attained far greater prominence in the law, Dean Pound never received a law degree. Admitted to the Nebraska bar in 1890 after a year's study of law at Harvard, he practiced for a time in Lincoln, served as commissioner of appeals in the Supreme Court of Nebraska, taught jurisprudence and Roman law at the University of Nebraska and became dean there in 1903.

After further stints of teaching at Northwestern University and at the University of Chicago, he returned to Harvard in 1910 as Story professor of law. Six years later, still one of the newest members of the Harvard faculty, he was appointed dean.

PLEA FOR ENDOWMENT

Dean Pound continued to carry a full load of teaching, writing, lecturing, and advising, though his critics later said he devoted too much time to the petty details of administration. His first report to the president of the university was a plea for a national endowment. On Dean Pound's faculty were such men as Edward H. Warren, James Landis, and Felix Frankfurter. The number of students rose from 791 to a peak of 1,440 in 1925. Among them were Thomas Corcoran, David E. Lilienthal, and Dean Acheson.

Witty, a great storyteller and a powerful yet matter-of-fact speaker who never lost his Nebraska accent, Dean Pound was one of the school's most popular lecturers, though he once was described as a basically unknowable person. In his teaching, he followed the traditional case method adding others of his own out of his philosophies of sociological jurisprudence. He often used illustrations from actual practice, and he treated the ideas of the students seriously.

When he resigned as dean in 1936, Pound became Harvard's first roving professor—entitled to teach in any faculty of the university he wished. Eleven years later he was bound for China at the invitation of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to help reorganize the courts of the Nationalist Government.

Returning to this country in 1949, Dean Pound sharply attacked America's China policy, charging the United States with having aided the Communists and having put unreasonable pressures on the Nationalists.

During the New Deal, and after, Pound assailed what he called "administrative absolutism," asserting that the new administrative agencies were seeking exemption from judicial scrutiny. His critics recalled that in the celebrated speech of 1906 he had condemned the "Spectacle of Law Paralyzing Administration." He continued to attack these agencies even after a conservative Congress had enacted the Administrative Procedure Act to rectify the shortcomings of which Dean Pound complained.

RENOWNED FOR LEARNING

Dean Pound is renowned for his encyclopedic mind and his vast learning. At 76, already a master of French, German, Italian, Spanish, Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, he studied Chinese for his trip to China.

A prolific author, he was revising two articles on labor unity and the law when he flew west to be honored by the American Judicature Society, of which he is the only surviving founder.

Heavy framed, standing 5 feet 10 and weighing 200 pounds in his prime, Dean Pound was long possessed of great physical stamina. According to one apocryphal tale, he could still run a mile in less than 5 minutes at the age of 50. It was his habit for years not to wear an overcoat in the winter. He formerly put in as much as 16 hours of work a day.

Still wearing the green eyeshade he has worn for most of his life to protect his poor sight, Dean Pound now works an 8-to-5 schedule 5 days a week, going to his law school office from 9 to 1 on Saturdays. He takes his exercise in walking and his relaxation in philosophy.

"You'd think he's about 60," says Miss May M. McCarthy, his secretary since 1961.

Twice a widower and childless, Dean Pound met his second wife while serving in Washington at the appointment of President Herbert Hoover as a member of the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, known as the Wickersham Commission. The Commission was appointed to recommend whether prohibition should be continued. Dean Pound, never a teetotaler, voted with the majority of the Commission that prohibition should be given a further trial.

On Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Gastonia Gazette at Gastonia, N.C., carried an excellent editorial on September 19, 1962, entitled "On Federal Aid to Education."

The editorial presents some sound recommendations on the question of Federal assistance for institutions of higher learning.

Under request previously granted I ask that the editorial be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Sept. 19, 1962]

ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The Congress, in the past, has given specific subsidies for education.

Even now, conferees of the Senate and House are meeting to work a final compromise on the $2.35-million college education aid bill.

This is another specific subsidy that tends to become more general with each meeting of Congress.

This is just one education bill, with its own set of restrictions. Next year, there will be another bill, and it will have restrictions—though, in all probability, not as stringent.

This is the way with socialistic tendencies. First you get your foot in the door, and then you squeeze in your leg, then your big fat body. And, by that time, resistance has worn thin and nobody cares anyhow.

It's easier just to lean back and relax and let somebody else do your thinking for you.

We have no more objection to this education bill than any of the other paternalistic endeavors by this administration. In fact, it is our inclination to lean over backward to give education a push, for we see in education the cure for many of man's problems.

But, if this compromise bill is worked out, and it certainly shall be, then let us not overlook the fact that the Government has taken a tremendous plunge into the field of education.

The amount to be spent during the next 5 years is $2.35 billion, certainly not snuff-box money.

The Government will be willing to "give" this money to private and public institutions, but any legislation which "gives" money away must have some restrictions to insure that the money is spent for the intended purpose.

Those restrictions, however broad and reasonable as they might be, cannot fail to diminish the variety and the flexibility of the internal operations of the separate educational institutions.

College executives, no matter how determined they are to maintain independence of planning and programing, will find it neccesary to tailor their educational programs to meet the legal requirements of governmental subsidy on one hand and the personal views of the men who designate the recipients of grants on the other.

This subsidy business is like the Berlin wall. If you sneak a little of it in at a

time, nobody's going to yell loud enough to make it fall down. Then, once it's up, there's not much anybody can do about it.

We would be blind not to recognize the fact that the Government must concern itself profoundly with the extent and character of educational services. The GI bill, for instance, some loans, too, for needy, worthy students, have been outstanding examples of the Government's specific worthwhile efforts in education.

But, Congress must refrain from providing a general subsidy of higher education.

This is wholly contrary to the best interests of the separate educational institutions and to the general welfare of the people of this country as well.

Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriations, 1963

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13175) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. It is now 8:30, and I shall seek to set the good example of brevity.

First, I would join in the universal acclaim of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], with whose praise this Chamber has been ringing. During the long weeks and months that the distinguished gentleman has been working with his subcommittee on the pending bill I have seen him at close range as a fellow guest at the Congressional Hotel. How he has kept up the gruelling pace day after day, 7 days and nights a week, 1 month after another, has been the wonder of his colleagues living at the Congressional. Early breakfast, then to his office. Less than an hour for dinner, then back to his office until midnight at the earliest, usually much later. The same schedule on Saturdays and Sundays as on the other 5 days of the week.

Whether one agrees or disagrees with OTTO PASSMAN on all his conclusions—and, Mr. Chairman, it would be a sorry day for the country if everyone in this Chamber ever was in complete agreement on everything—all his colleagues will admit that he is a dedicated public servant who never spares himself. This is especially true among his colleagues living at the Congressional who have been privileged to observe at close range his working habits.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would express my concern for the African program if the cut in the Development Loan Fund stands. Africa is tremendously important to us and to the future of the world. This I could not overstress.

The administration requested $1.25 billion in funds for development loans for fiscal year 1963. The House Appropriations Committee reduced this figure to $775 million. At the present time the administration has commitments to Pakistan, India, and Greece totaling $715 million. This would leave a total of only $60 million for the rest of the world excluding Latin America—for which separate funds are provided.

I followed closely the remarks of the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] in which he said that the commitments to India and Pakistan were not final. I doubt, however, whether our country would wish to give the appearance to the world of reneging on an arrangement that has had so much of world notice and which has created such tremendous expectation.

Even assuming that the remaining $60 million were to be allotted entirely to Africa—which is highly unlikely—it would be inadequate even to move forward on the long-term commitments we have made to Nigeria, Tanganyika and Tunisia. For these three countries alone, it is estimated that we would need $120 million to $140 million in fiscal year 1963. While we can stretch out our programs somewhat since we have not made commitments that must be met specifically in fiscal year 1963, a cut far below this level would not only cause bitter disappointment but would raise serious questions as to the ability of these countries to continue with the development plans on which their hopes for future viability must rest. The proposed assistance from the United States is essential to the success of their plans, and a drastic cut would also undermine the careful groundwork we have been laying with other friendly countries to secure additional help needed from them.

There are also many important projects in other countries which are well advanced and toward which the countries concerned have had reasonable expectations for U.S. assistance. These include loans for major educational and health facilities in Liberia, roads in the Sudan, a development bank in the Ivory Coast and transport facilities in Ethiopia. In Morocco, where we had proposed cutting back sharply on supporting assistance, it was with the understanding that we would provide development loans. If this should now not be possible, the situation with respect to our bases will force us to seek additional supporting assistance—presumably from the contingency fund.

In a number of countries, including those mentioned above, we had moved items heretofore provided on a grant basis to development loans. These include funds for school and hospital construction, as well as traditional loan purposes. None of this will be able to go forward in any significant amount if the appropriation cut holds.

Mr. Chairman, I am not presenting an amendment to restore to the Development Loan Fund sufficient additional money to take care of the modest African programs that are vital to our national interest. I know how hard and conscientiously the subcommitiee has worked. I know how difficult it is intelligently to work these things out when we are sitting as Committee of the Whole. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the House conferees, when they meet with those from the other body, will consider an increase to the Development Loan Fund item at least sufficient to maintain our position in the huge and tremendously important continent of Africa. Our stake in Africa is large. That, Mr. Chairman, again I say we cannot overstress.

"Visit U.S.A." Program Paying Dividends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, as cosponsor of the International Travel Act of 1961, I was pleased to read in this morning's Washington Post that the "Visit U.S.A." program, though less than a year old, already "is paying swift dividends."

The U.S. Travel Service of the Department of Commerce has had considerable success in persuading residents of foreign lands to visit our country.

Tourism was a neglected industry in this country for many years. Americans are enthusiastic travelers themselves but until the entry of the U.S. Travel Service in the worldwide competition for the tourist's dollar this Nation did very little to promote our many attractions for foreign tourists. In fact, the United States was about the last major nation to develop a Government travel program. As a result, there was a billion dollar gap each year between the amount American tourists spent abroad and foreign tourists' expenditures in the United States, thus contributing to our international payments deficit.

As an indication of the progress being made by the U.S. Travel Service to solve this problem, I include here the Washington Post article:

VISIT U.S.A. PROGRAM PAYING DIVIDENDS
(By Ernest A. Lotito)

America's visit U.S.A. program apparently is paying swift dividends. And 130 Italian architects and engineers are only part of the proof.

The Italians, members of the Italian National Association of Architects and Engineers, arrived in New York September 17 for a 10-day tour of the United States. They and groups like them, from countries all over the globe, are responsible for an increase in the number of tourists.

According to Berney Wilburn, Director of the Commerce Department's Division of Facilitation and Planning, 18 percent more tourists visited the United States in the first 5 months of the 1962 than in the same 1961 period.

"I have seven single-spaced pages with names of groups that have come or are planning to come," Wilburn said yesterday. "And that's not all of them. One carrier estimates that his charter flights originating in Europe have risen by 300 percent."

Like the Italians, many are professional people. There have been contingents of Swiss dentists and French industrialists, for example.

The Italians, all carrying blue airline cards with President Kennedy's "invitation to all peoples" on the back, found that American redtape had been trimmed to facilitate their trip.

"Normally it takes a month and a half to get a visa to the United States," said Civil Engineer Giorgio Pomardi. "Your embassy in Rome gave us ours in 5 minutes."

Pomardi and the others arrived in Washington Wednesday night and left at 1 p.m. yesterday. They plan to spend 3 days in Pittsburgh and 2 in Boston.

"Our primary reason for coming is to intensify the relationship between American and Italian industries," said the group's president, Mario Pinchera. "We have little time and want to see Pittsburgh and Boston."

Because they have been here so short a time, the Italians have few permanent impressions of the United States. Signor Pinchera's wife, Teresa, describes the District as "una citta signorile"—a refined city.

Signora Dirce Rebicchini thought New York has "grandiose." Her husband, Paolo, felt the same.

Asked what he thought of New York modernistic Guggenheim Museum, Signor Pomardi replied: "An act of courage."

Socialism?—Boo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cheraw Chronicle, Cheraw, S.C., of September 20, 1962:

SOCIALISM?—BOO

Bill Workman says he believes in the Constitution.

So does OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

Workman criticizes liberals.

So does JOHNSTON.

Workman criticizes the Supreme Court.

So does JOHNSTON.

Workman is against more taxes.

So is JOHNSTON.

Workman supports the Bill of Rights, in so far as they limit the power of the Federal Government.

So does JOHNSTON. Neither pays much attention to the 14th amendment, which made the first 10 amendments binding upon the States as well as upon Washington.

Obviously, these are not campaign issues in South Carolina's senatorial campaign this fall.

Any effort to paint Senator JOHNSTON, who was governor for 4 years and has been Senator for 18, as a pink, a Socialist, or even a liberal, is foredoomed to failure.

If the voters didn't believe it when Governor Hollings tried to picture the Senator as a radical during the primary, they're not likely to buy the same thing from Bill Workman. It's most unlikely that the conservative voters of this State would have maintained a radical in office for over 20 years.

Senator JOHNSTON is a politician. He's a member of a team, he plays ball, and in the process, he scores home runs for South Carolina more often than he strikes out.

Senator JOHNSTON, heaven knows, is not without fault, but he's a more experienced, moderate, and sensible purveyor of the political arts than his challenger. That's why the voters will return him to office in November by a large margin.

Man And Disappearing Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, technological advancement is proceeding at such a rapid pace today that many of our Nation's working men and women are finding that their skills are becoming obsolescent. The painful personal hardships which this creates could be avoided by foresight and planning. This is an area in which the Federal Government, as well as State and local governments, private business and labor must cooperate in the coming years of economic progress in order to minimize the hardships of adjustment which automation and technological change will force upon us.

An article by Ralph McGill, appearing in the Washington Star of September 13, discusses this problem. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. McGill's article in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN AND DISAPPEARING JOBS

(By Ralph McGill)

A human problem halted the Chicago & North Western Railway. It is the plight of human beings which soon may bring all rail lines to a stop.

The dilemma poses a question. If work is perhaps man's supreme value, what happens when the work he has been doing for much of his life becomes unnecessary? What, if anything, is the responsibility of society, our competitive system, and government?

The trains of the C. & N.W. Railway were halted by a very small union with fewer than 1,000 members. Thousands of men and women, members of other unions, were thrown out of work. Many thousands of passengers, regular and occasional, were left without transportation.

The Order of Railroad Telegraphers called the strike. Its old-fashioned name gives a hint of its troubles. Time was when the telegrapher with his Morse-code skill was one of the glamorous figures of railroading. He sat by his clicking bug and typed out the messages received. The movement of trains depended on him. The safety of passengers and freight was in his hands.

But time moved on. Trucks and buses took a toll. Teletype machines replaced the code operator. The machines were faster. They gave the same message instantly in all stations. No relays were required. The ORT today represents chiefly station managers, tower operators, and maintenance workers in communications. The station manager has little to do. He actually "works," in the meaning of the word, very little of his 8 hours. The railroad wanted to consolidate suburban stations no longer needed.

Many of the men who would have been "consolidated" out of a job have worked from 20 to 30 years at the job they hold. A majority of them reportedly are of an age which would not permit retraining for new employment. Pensions would be some years away—and small.

Management refused what the Southern Pacific Railroad had granted—a negotiated plan of 2-percent dismissals per year with severance payments. North Western argued it is not as prosperous as the Southern Pacific. The strike closed the lines. Losses will be severe.

It is in this sort of situation that Arthur J. Goldberg, as Secretary of Labor, has been trying to produce an alternative to a strike. He was never a supporter of actual featherbedding. (Nor is W. Willard Wirtz, the able and experienced man who will succeed to the job, which, next to that of Secretary of State, is the most difficult and thankless.) Both men, however, believe that the industrial present brings forth new realities.

The issue of firemen in the cabs of diesel is another which must be resolved if there is to be peace in railroading. Nonpartisan boards have, after exhaustive review, recommended that firemen be phased out of diesel cabs. Arguments to the contrary are not convincing. But here again we have a human situation. What about the human beings involved? We could say, with truth, that the managements of railroads and the unions (the airline flight engineers are a similar example) inexcusably have failed them. Planning should have begun years ago to make these inevitable transitions as painless, and as decently humane as a civilized society would wish it to be.

Why wasn't it done?

This problem of the man and his value was neglected because labor contract negotiations traditionally have been a power struggle, rather than genuine bargaining. Today's economic and industrial revolution in techniques and machines has been a long time along the road. Everyone has seen it coming. Yet rare was the man in management or the unions who tried to inject reality and new ideas into the processes of negotiations in the big industries which are so vital to the national need. The Congress has been equally blind.

The odds are we—as a nation—will learn the new lesson the hard and expensive way. And this is a great pity because it is needless. The national need and the human need cannot, finally, be ignored in a free society. Capitalism, which is the basis of our economic society for both labor and management, cannot afford to ignore human costs. New concepts are badly needed.

Other Values, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in Wednesday's Jersey Journal concerning my constituent, Mrs. Frank Cornin, very ably states the benefits which can be obtained from higher education.

Mrs. Cornin's words are an eloquent restatement of the American philosophy of education. She has contributed greatly to stimulating thought in our community and I commend her remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

OTHER VALUES, TOO

Possibly in urging youngsters to stay in school we have been missing a bet by stressing the fact that education usually pays off in better jobs.

The economic value of education does not explain why Mrs. Frank Cornin, mother of a married daughter and a teenage son and busy in civic organizations, is enrolled in Jersey City State College.

Her explanation:

"For personal satisfaction and for what one can contribute to the community

through further education. For growth and character. So much opportunity is afforded people today, there is no reason anyone should be misinformed."

The economic value of an education is important, but it is clear from the experience of this mature student and many others that there are countless benefits to be obtained in the quest for knowledge.

Statement of David C. Acheson, U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there are usually two sides to almost every question. In yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] inserted a newspaper article critical of the office of the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. Today, I ask leave to extend in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a statement of David C. Acheson in connection therewith.

Mr. Acheson's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF DAVID C. ACHESON, U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The U.S. attorney's office for the District of Columbia through the years has evolved, with the approval and under the supervision of the municipal court, a system for handling complaints by citizens which we believe to be efficient and fair.

Where arrests are not made by officers on the spot, citizens and officers come to the office and register their complaints. Where probable crimes are discovered, hearings are set to discover all the facts and when these hearings bring out evidence of a crime, prosecutive action is taken.

The Municipal Court Division at our office, where Mr. Kelly's complaint was lodged, hears 50,000 complaints a year, takes further prosecutive action in approximately 22,000 cases, and sends to court approximately 10,000 of those cases.

I have carefully read Mr. Kelly's account and carefully review the matter in detail with the attorneys on our staff who handled the case at each step from the initial complaint to the termination of the trial. Our assistant in this case made the kind of judgment that they have to make hundreds of times daily, and the exercise of their judgment and discretion is indispensable to an orderly, efficient, and fair disposition of the high volume of complaints in municipal court.

The initial hearing that we held in this case covered all of the witnesses involved. On their statements there was a substantial conflict of evidence. On the basis of this evidence a judgment had to be made as to the prosecutive, triable merit of the case, and our assistant who first heard the case decided that, while a close one, the case did not warrant further prosecution. Nevertheless, Mr. Kelly obtained immediate action on his complaint and the defendant was then and there charged.

By Mr. Kelly's own account the trial continuances in this case were in large measure for his convenience, and at his request. As he listed no witnesses on the form provided for that purpose, none could be notified.

The painstaking process and careful scrutiny of the facts which Mr. Kelly points out are the necessary and desirable safeguards of our system and not due to any reluctance to prosecute where prosecution is warranted.

While the particular facts of this case were understandably distressing to Mr. Kelly, the assistant U.S. attorneys involved had a duty to be fair to both sides of the case before initiating prosecution. In such situations, similar to hundreds that come to municipal court daily, not every complainant can go away entirely satisfied.

In my opinion the Federal Government and the citizens of the District of Columbia can be proud of the office which is the subject of Mr. Kelly's article. The assistants in my office are here because they are unusually able; they perform an outstanding job under great pressure, and work long and irregular hours. They serve the public well and have my confidence and support.

The Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the people are away ahead of the President on recognizing the threat of communism in Cuba and coming up with an answer that is stronger than appeasement. The following excellent editorial appeared in Long Island's Newsday, on September 15:

THE UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

At his press conference Thursday, President Kennedy attempted to quiet the criticism ranging about his administration over the blatant shoring up of Cuba's military power by the Soviet Union. Those who were calling for military action to back up our Monroe Doctrine were accused of making rash talk, and Kennedy drew up his own ground rules for when military action would be deemed necessary.

The time for such action, he said, would be only if the Communist buildup in Cuba were to interfere with our security, our Guantanamo Bay base in Cuba, our passage to the Panama Canal, our activities at Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country. Other possible provocations he listed would be for Cuba to try to extend communism to any other nation in the hemisphere or if Cuba became an important offensive military base for Russia.

We would, of course, countenance none of these intrusions. But we already have permitted Khrushchev to grossly violate our Monroe Doctrine to the point where he now has what amounts to a Russian satellite just 90 miles off the U.S. mainland. But President Kennedy carefully skirted this and in so doing left too many questions unanswered.

First, how long are we going to continue to let Khrushchev send arms to Cuba? How can we hope for the internal collapse of the Castro regime, as Kennedy indicated we are hoping, when Khrushchev will keep working to build up Cuba both militarily and economically? Why cannot the United States impose a military blockade of Cuba, to make dead sure that no more arms are added to Cuba's already replenished arsenal?

Kennedy talked about Cuba's military capacity as being only a defensive threat to the United States which would be dealt with when it became an offensive threat. How will we know when that fine line has been crossed? And isn't this the time to make sure it remains a defensive threat? He said we had support on our Cuban position from our friends in Latin America. What about the big Latin American countries that deserted us at Punta del Este when we wanted to apply sanctions to Cuba? How are we beefing up our friends in the Organization of American States?

These are questions the President must answer now, while the Soviet violation of the Monroe Doctrine is going on. The answers the President gave us at his news conference covered only half of the questions. We are not looking to be lulled into complacency. But there is no place in this Western Hemisphere for a Soviet-dominated Cuba.

Congressional Franked Mail—A Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment No. 44 to the legislative appropriations bill denies the use of any simplified form of address on congressional franked mail.

As pointed out by able members of the committee, the House, by record vote, rejected this identical proposition last April. There is no reason, in my opinion, for the House to change its opinion on the vital matter simply because election time is at hand.

Henceforth, all franked mail—rural and star route mail as well as city and town mail—has to include the full name and address even for such mailings as ordinary lists of publications, farm bulletins, and other informative Government pamphlets and reports that were previously distributed and still are widely sought by a great many people in our respective districts all over the country.

Franked mail sent out by Members of Congress to their constituents now does not even have parity with private mailers on either rural, star, or city routes of boxes since private mailers can send rural mail addressed to "Postal patron, local" and city mail without a name.

Present simplified addressing procedure reduced the cost in congressional offices and in the post office. The Post Office Department states:

The per piece handling cost of congressional mail, addressed to "Postal Patron" without street address on city carrier routes and post office boxes, will be less than the same mail fully addressed to each householder.

Of course, the same held true for rural mail.

The House Doorkeeper testified at the March hearings in this matter that—

This patron mail, so-called, has not afected the workload of the House folding room whatsoever.

I share the view that Congress should protect the use of the frank as a practical means of effectively and economically getting Government publications and other information to the people and if any isolated abuses are deemed to be present regarding these matters, they should be considered and acted upon by appropriate legislative committees.

One of the great services we render our constituents is to provide them with valuable informational services available in the Government and I believe it is definitely against the public interest and the welfare and interest of our people to curtail or restrict these privileges in any way. That is why I voted against adoption of Senate amendment No. 44.

Let me make it clear that I have not made use of the simplified patron mail provision authorized last year. However, I see no reason why Members of Congress should be denied the right of the franking privilege in serving their people through less costly simplified patron mailings.

Depreciation Revision Not a Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the July 13 issue of the Wall Street Journal contains a very penetrating editorial commenting on the recent revision in depreciation schedules. It points out some important misconception, such as the idea that this revision is a tax reduction, and helps to quash them.

In order to give a better idea of the nature of this revision, I am placing this editorial in the RECORD:

A REDUCTION OF ABSURDITY

As Treasury Secretary Dillon says, the revised depreciation rules are long overdue, and certainly the Kennedy administration is to be commended for concluding this particular project begun by its predecessor. It is a little surprising, though, how many misconceptions of it are floating around.

The reform is widely discussed as a tax break or even a tax cut for business. Far from being any such windfall, it does not necessarily diminish ultimate tax liability; it constitutes a tax saving only in the early years of an asset's life. That is important, but it is no handout.

Morevore, it is hard to see how something can be called a windfall when it merely brings more up to date a hopelessly complex set of regulations that bore no relation to the current obsolescence of equipment and machinery. The virtues of the new rules are that they both shorten the taxable life of such assets and greatly simplify the categories; hosts of separate listings are now lumped under broad headings. If anything, the new flexibility underscores the absurdity of the rules with which business and industry had to struggle for so long—and even the new rules could stand a lot of improvement.

Another misconception, common in union circles, is that the reform is pointless because industry now has so much excess capacity that it does not need new plant and equipment. Actually, a good deal of that so-called excess is obsolete or obsolescent, and industrty does have a need to modernize—not least because of rising labor costs. President Kennedy is far closer to the mark when he emphasizes the importance of modernization to compete with modern plants abroad.

Whether the revision will stimulate business spending any time soon is another matter. But whether it does or not, it cannot be regarded as some kind of basic economic solution. The basic way to get the economy moving is to relieve the burden of Federal spending, deficits and debt that presses so heavily on all the people.

This depreciation overhaul is indeed a long-overdue step in the right direction. It is no depreciation of the Treasury's careful work to say that many more steps must be taken on the road to sound economic growth.

Political Nepotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under the heading of "Pragmatism to Nepotism in One Easy Lesson," Mr. James Reston, of the New York Times, writes the story of the recent Massachusetts primary election and its contribution to the growing Kennedy dynasty.

The implications of this election are of concern to all Members of Congress and the Nation. For that reason I submit for printing in the RECORD Mr. Reston's article as well as an editorial on the same subject from the New York Times.

PRAGMATISM TO NEPOTISM IN ONE EASY LESSON

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, September 19.—Washington has its own special reasons for resenting Teddy Kennedy's spectacular victory in the Massachusetts primary election.

This city lives on political influence. Nobody blushes about that. There is scarcely a man in the Senate who didn't get there because he knew somebody who did something to get him the nod. But Teddy gave the whole influence game away. He was so obvious, the terms of the battle were so unfair, and the margin of his victory was so large that even many of the President's most loyal aids here find the whole thing distasteful.

If the President himself had come to office defending the old familiar rules of political patronage and influence, Washington might have taken Teddy with a cynical shrug. But the President didn't do that.

He came proclaiming a new pragmatism for a new age. Ability was to be the test in all things. Even political advantage was to stand aside for talent. The best man for every job. This was his theme in the election of 1960, and he followed it better than most.

SOME GOOD APPOINTMENTS

His appointments to the Cabinet are a case in point. It is a ministry of machine-tooled technicians.

His appointments to the big fashionable embassies in Europe follow this same line. David Bruce in London was for a time a Foreign Service officer, and for the first time in the history of the country professional Foreign Service men are now heading the embassies in Paris, Madrid, Rome, Bonn, and Moscow at the same time.

It is noted here, however, that this impersonal and nonpolitical approach vanished whenever the President's own family was involved. His brother Robert, competent as he is, certainly did not meet the test as the best man available for the Attorney General's post. The same things can be said, perhaps with less force, about his brother-in-law, Sargent Shriver, at the Peace Corps. And of course Teddy's bid for the Senate, at 30 years of age, with the careful connivance of the President, is widely regarded here as an affront and a presumption.

This is not to say that the Senate of the United States is spangled with genius. In fact, it is virtually impossible to push through the swinging doors of that illustrious Chamber without knocking over some character of less ability than Teddy. But that is not the point.

The point is that the Kennedys have applied the principle of the best man available for the job to almost everybody but themselves. Teddy's victorious headlines are resented here partly because he is demanding too much too soon on the basis of too little. They are also resented within the Democratic Party because some prominent members of that party have felt that both the President and the Attorney General themselves expected to much in the way of public office too early.

THE MESS IN BOSTON

One other factor contributes to these sour reflections out of Washington. Over the last few years, the President and the Attorney General have talked with considerable earnestness in private about the need to clean up Massachusetts politics. In fact, they have been eloquent on the theme that since they were so intimately identified with the politics of that State there was perhaps a special responsibility for the family to take on the job themselves.

Teddy worked at it for a few months in a minor capacity, and then began dreaming of Georgetown and the loftier political and social life of Washington.

It is distasteful to pursue this personal line of criticism, but it is also unavoidable, for the personal activities of the First Family have important political consequences. These activities are the talk of the town. They influence political judgments about the President and his programs. In fact, there is now so much discussion of the Kennedy family here that many people seem to have little time left over for the Kennedy program. What is particularly surprising about all this is that the Kennedys do not see this line of criticism at all, and in fact deeply resent it. They have invoked the new pragmatism, but cannot see that, where the family was concerned, they applied the old nepotism.

This may not trouble the sensitivities of the voters in Massachusetts, and it will now be argued that George Lodge, like Teddy Kennedy, is in the race because of his name. But it does trouble a lot of people here, and in the end it is likely to cost the President more votes in the Senate than Teddy will ever give him.

LITTLE BROTHER WINS

The Democratic voters of Massachusetts have evidently decided that if a man has the right connections, those are all the qualifications necessary for nomination to the U.S. Senate.

That is the only credible explanation we can find for their designation in yesterday's primary of Edward M. Kennedy, whose record of public service comes close to absolute zero. His campaign revolved around a boast that "He Can Do More for Massachusetts"—a none too subtle reminder that he has one brother who is President and another who is Attorney General.

The insinuation that the State would receive favored treatment in Washington if young Mr. Kennedy went to the Senate should have been equally insulting to the White House and to the people of Massachusetts. Apparently it created no deep resentment in either quarter. We recognize that nomination carries no certainty of election. Nevertheless, this initial victory for Edward Kennedy is demeaning to the dignity of the Senate and the democratic process.

Raymond R. Corbett, Newly Elected President of the New York State AFL–CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the acceptance speech given by Raymond R. Corbett, the newly elected president of the New York State AFL–CIO, on September 11, 1962, at the fifth annual convention of the organization, held at the Hotel Commodore in New York City.

Because of the exemplary and forward-looking program announced by Mr. Corbett, I invite the attention of my colleagues to it.

The speech follows:

SPEECH OF RAYMOND R. CORBETT, PRESIDENT, NEW YORK STATE AFL–CIO, FIFTH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, NEW YORK CITY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1962

From the bottom of my heart I want to say thanks to you in the humblest way possible for the high honor that you have bestowed on me today. I can assure you that in meeting my responsibilities it will be my sincerest desire to do the best I can for the welfare of our membership and for the welfare of all citizens of this great State of ours. I promise you, with the good Lord willing and his His help to carry on my work according to the high principles upon which the labor movement of this State is founded, I will find inspiration and a sense of rededication from the struggles of those who went before us, of men like William Green, Philip Murray, Tom Murray, and from the leader of free workers of the world, George Meany, who is still with us, thank God, and we trust he will be with us for many years to come.

At this convention, as in all past conventions, we meet to chart our course for the future. And if we are objective rather than selfish, if we are constructive rather than destructive, we will chart our course in the light of our past experiences and the problems which will confront us in the next few years.

I am fully aware that in discussing these problems we may, as we have in the past, have disagreements and debates amongest ourselves. However, in the face of the opposition which our organization and every union in our State is confronted with today, we must resolve our differences intelligently and constructively. To do otherwise would aid and abet the very forces which now seek to divide, to weaken and to destroy us. It is about time, it seems to me, that we give a lot of thought to the importance of working as a team, to the idea that we must close our ranks, stand solidly behind our program, to preserve and expand what labor has gained over the years. It is my hope that when this convention is over every delegate and every officer of this organization will leave here with a warm sense of accomplishment, of purpose, of dedication and above all, a solidarity that no forces can destroy.

I make this plea to you with special emphasis—because in the present antilabor climate and in the face of even more serious threats—we in the united labor movement of this State cannot afford the luxury of internal feuding, friction and dissention. We must solidify our ranks and strengthen our entire labor movement. We must seek progress, not for ourselves alone, but for all the people of our great State. Historically labor's progress has always served as the basis for the State's progress. Our gains have been the State's gains and our losses have been the State's losses.

We are meeting here at a very critical time in the history of our Nation when on the international scene the whole world is in turmoil. We see additional evidence, if additional evidence is needed, that our enemies are determined to impose their dictatorial and most cruel form of government on the rest of the free world. In view of this enormous Communist threat to democracy we are duty bound as citizens and free trade unionists to help our country meet its heavy responsibilities as a bastion of freedom and democracy. I want to take this occasion to assure our State and the whole Nation that we, the members of the New York State AFL–CIO, shall do our part in defense of our beloved country against those who are determined by infiltration, by open aggression, or by subversion to place the entire world under the domination of those cruel tyrants in the Soviet Union.

But this is not the only problem we are facing here today. We have also to face the economic problem that is demonstrated quite dramatically when our economy starts skidding downhill again and when despite a general illusion of prosperity, a large part of our potential resources for growth have been translated into stagnation and unemployment.

It is incredible that in this supposedly richest, most abundant, and most productive State of ours, 1 family in 5 remains in the $2,000 yearly income bracket and that 1 out of every 11 families has an income of $1,000 or even less.

It is incredible that in a time when we have reached the peak of productivity there are 465,000 or 5.9 percent of the total State's labor force unemployed excluding the thousands of youngsters, older, and women workers who were forced to give up the search for a job and although jobless are no longer counted unemployed.

It is incredible that the number of those who have exhausted their unemployment benefits in this State increased from some 70,000 in 1956 to about 207,000 in 1961; this is approximately 300 percent.

It is incredible, that in a time when built-in economic stabilizers are to be strengthened and expanded, our whole system of unemployment insurance, sickness disability and workmen's compensation is faltering and failing badly with benefit payments recovering a smaller and smaller portion of the total wage loss.

It is incredible that 85 percent of our State's population live in urban areas but our rural dominated legislature, unfamiliar or unsympathetic to the needs of the cities does so little to solve the problems—problems like slum clearance, urban traffic congestion, juvenile delinquency, health problems, education, occupational safety, social insurance—and a score of others that plague city people but are often unknown in the rural areas.

All these things and more are certainly most incredible but unfortunately very true. Against this background our mission becomes clear. The problems which confront our State, the problems that confront our members are the problems that your elected officers must and will constantly consider and meet in the coming years.

We must be aware that our State government cannot solve these problems by itself. No single State has sufficient control over our entangled and complex economy to put its people back to work if the Congress of these United States sits on its hands.

There are no buttons in Albany that our Governor can push that would put one-half million working people back on the job. But something can and must be done to pump some purchasing power into the bloodstream of our State's economy and alleviate the distress that afflicts so many of our members and their families.

First of all, we need establishment of a minimum wage that would put a $1.50 floor under the wages and extend its protection to all workers in this State. There must be immediate elimination of all wage boards.

Second, our workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, and disability benefits should be increased to insure that workers more nearly receive their benefits to replace their wage loss. For this purpose we will continue our fight for enactment of a provision that would make possible an automatic adjustment of maximum benefit rates at two-thirds of the average weekly wages.

In the field of unemployment insurance we are determined to fight for a permanent extension of the duration of benefits up to 39 weeks—repeal the unjust qualifications that emasculates the law and raise the tax base from the present $3,000 to $4,800.

In the field of workmen's compensation we will follow with the greatest interest the work of the Governor's review committee that is now investigating the procedures and administration of the workmen's compensation board. We sincerely hope that out of this committee, recommendations will come that will put an end to the intolerable anticlaimant attitude that is now prevailing in the workmen's compensation board and designed to destroy or limit the benefits to which injured workers are justly entitled. We also expect from this committee that it will take a hard close look at the entire workmen's compensation financing system that permits benefits to constantly lose ground while more than 40 percent of the premium dollar is being retained by insurance companies. We also hope that a permanent watchdog committee will be established composed of representatives of labor, management, and the public at large to maintain constant vigilance over the administration of the workmen's compensation law. We are convinced that only a continued and unbiased scrutiny can check lax or arrogant administration and safeguard the legitimate rights of injured workers.

Third, we will continue to press for legislation granting to all government and public authority workers as well as workers in hospitals and nonprofit organizations the same rights of union representation, collective bargaining, grievance and impartial arbitration procedure as workers in private industry have enjoyed since enactment of the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

At the same time we are determined to resist all efforts to undermine the protective standards of our labor relations laws and once again reaffirm labor's traditional policy of opposition against compulsory arbitration and Government interference with the sub-

stance of bargaining agreements. We will continue to be guided in the coming years by the proven wisdom of the famous saying that government is best which governs least.

Fourth, to find an answer to declining job opportunities resulting from automation and increased productivity we will give full support to the campaign initiated by the National AFL–CIO for a 35-hour workweek without a reduction in take-home pay. For this purpose we intend to achieve changes in our labor law. And at the same time give every necessary support to our affiliates in their endeavors to achieve this shorter workweek at the bargaining table.

Fifth, a State Department of Urban Affairs should be immediately established. Its purpose would be to coordinate and provide leadership for the State's urban development programs, including urban renewal, community facilities, water pollution facilities, housing, school construction, transportation, and countless other programs of service to our cities and towns. It would seem to be simple logic to provide some one place within the State administration where these programs now administered by a variety of agencies may be coordinated in some logical manner; some one place which can serve as a clearinghouse for the relationships of the cities and towns to the State. The one place must be an agency at a department level, in order to give it the necessary status and prestige.

When the Department of Agriculture was established, less than one-fourth of the population was urban. Today not much more than 15 percent of the population is rural. Yet the Department of Agriculture continues as one of the most important of the State's agencies, while the urban population is not receiving and cannot receive its full share of justice and fairness to give this 85 percent of the population a voice that would be heard at the State level of government and secure for them the so critically needed vital services.

Sixth, we of organized labor recognize that heavy expenditures of this State require a heavy burden of taxation borne by all the people of the State. The wage earners of this State do not shirk their responsibility for paying their fair share of these taxes. We insist however that the State tax system as a whole be fair and equitable to all, regardless of source or level of income. We do not see any reason why wages and salaries should be subject to a very efficient tax collection system while the wealthy are allowed to escape taxes on dividends, interest and rent. To assure that taxes be levied on the basis of ability to pay and not ability to evade, we will urge our Governor and legislature, first, to withhold interest, rent, and dividends in the same way wages and salaries have long been withheld for tax payment; and, second, to restore the $2,500 allowance for a married couple and $1,250 for a single person and with tax exemptions for dependents raised from the present level of $600 to $1,000.

Seventh, we are urging the enactment of a law which makes the importation of professional strikebreakers a criminal offense.

And last but not least, the failure of our State government to give adequate representation to our expanding urban population is the root cause of the evil of misrepresentation both in Albany and in Washington. Therefore an action must be launched by labor to eradicate the minority rule over our legislature. Our senate districts vary in population from 207,000 to 366,000—our assembly districts vary in population from 15,000 to 150,000. Thus one citizen of one district has 10 times the voice of a voter in another district. Therefore, we have a situation where thousands and thousands of our citizens are denied the full value of their vote.

In view of this gross unfairness to the urban population—in view of the recent decision of the Supreme Court on apportionment—we believe that it is the solemn duty of our State government to offer an amendment to the constitution that would produce a fair and equitable representation in the legislature and thus restore the principle of a truly repersentative government of the people, by the people and for the people.

These, then, are the things that concern us, this is our program of action. This program is logical and sound as labor's program has always been. This is not a partisan program and neither are the issues partisan. They are human issues. I sincerely hope that these issues will be so understood by men of good will in our State government because these are issues that affect our daily lives, our standard of living, our ability to maintain a home and raise a family. These proposals must be treated on their merits alone without any partisan connotation.

What is needed right now is unity of mind—unity of purpose in the house of labor. Out of this convention must come a united and concerted action.

If we utilize our resources and abilities to our full potential then there is absolutely no question that we will see the day when decent and adequate legislation covering our social insurance system, our health laws, our education system, our safety laws and all the other things we have been fighting for will be placed on our statute books.

We have the membership. We have the organization. We have everything that it takes to turn the tide of an antilabor climate and to achieve our objectives.

We can do it. It is going to depend on how well you cooperate with the officers and how sincere and how dedicated, and how devoted you are to the program that we have enunciated here.

I am convinced that if we work together, if we dedicate ourselves to combining our efforts and strengthening our position in the legislative and political field, we will all live to see a much better tomorrow for our membership and for the whole community.

A Doctor Evaluates the Political Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, in the Rutherford (N.J.) South Bergen News, of September 6, 1962, there appeared an essay by Dr. Walter Wahrenberger, of Englewood, N.J., who is president of the Bergen County, N.J., Medical Society. The intelligent moderation advocated in this brilliantly written and unusually perceptive article should be carefully read by all of us who serve in Congress.

Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A DOCTOR EVALUATES THE POLITICAL SCENE

(Walter Wahrenberger, M.D., president of Bergen County Medical Society)

If recent political events in the field of medical legislation have taught doctors anything, it is that we must maintain a social awareness concerning our profession. We must make the scientific armamentarium, the individual relationship of patient and his physician, and the business of medicine as a means of livelihood for doctors fit reasonably, modestly into this modern cultural pattern of living. It rests upon us, therefore, to analyze the medical needs of society as a group as distinguished from the need of an individual patient. Toward this end we should be better suited than anyone—the legislator, the economist, the sociologist, certainly the labor union leader. None of these would question our better understanding of medical techniques, but in the sphere of medical ethics and our modus operandi of practice, they presume to challenge us with increasing frequency and vigor. I submit this is as wrong as if we were advised on the use of the stethoscope. But in order that we may properly discharge this responsibility, we must safeguard our thinking from the ways of narrow-mindedness.

Organized medicine—and therefore you—is engrossed deeply in an ideological battle between the individual and the state. On either side, it is surprisingly simple to fall into the habit of extremist thinking. The administration has given ample evidence of its purposeful yet thoughtless expressions of liberalism in pursuit of the welfare state. We, as doctors, must be careful not to champion conservative extremes and fall backward off the cliff as we recoil from the enemy. We must be careful not to aline ourselves with those who espouse the defiant opposite extreme and do so with equal denial of truths. I wish to recommend the importance, albeit the difficulty, of accepting the challenge of the middle road. This is not to call for vacillation, uncertainty, unprincipled compromise, but to encourage the wisdom that grows only out of moderation.

While Republican and Democratic as labels of political philosophy have become comparatively meaningless, we are caught in a crossfire today of New Frontier liberalism and old guard conservatism. Both are radical. And being radical, both are dangerous. They parade a high road of would-be forthrightness, they challenge because they stimulate conviction; they are startingly intellectual; but they both lack wisdom. Wisdom grows only out of weighing and evaluating facts, and neither the radical liberal nor the radical conservative are so interested. Having made up their minds at the outset, they simply define what is fact. Just as the clever statistician has shown that figures can be made to prove anything, so the "facts" are made to bend to the principle. In final analysis, this is the weakest kind of thinking because it substitutes a pattern, e.g., Birchism or New Frontierism, for a delicate and considerate evaluation of each situation on its own merits.

Our challenge in thought today is not distinguishing right from wrong. Except in the deranged or constitutionally inferior mind, this is no problem. We all know the pure difference between good and bad or faith and doubt. Such dichotomous extremes we learn early in our schooling, but the finer nuances of recognition in the gray areas between come only from leaving the mind open and being willing to let it challenge itself. This is the middle road of maturity, of wisdom and not the wild adventure into extremism of the intellectual radical. From such deliberate self-analysis and criticism rises the confidence and conviction of truth. Through the eclectic acceptance of that which is useful and truthful from all sides, grows a happy medium of moderation that transcends the doubt of uncertainty and vacillation.

While progress implies change, to alter without purpose or accomplishment is not progress. This is unbending devotion to an attractive but illogical idea. The art and the challenge is to distinguish between real values and their distorted exaggerations. One confuses piety with goodness, weakness with humility, intellect with wisdom, stubbornness with purposefulness, material gain with wealth, complaisance with happiness. Hence, in this atmosphere of devotion to extremes, a very pragmatic government threatens carelessly to destroy the balance of relationship between doctor and patient. As citizens, we are obliged to defend prin-

ciples of government that are moderate, and as physicians we must maintain a professional equanimity that allows for steady advancement and yet protects itself from the brave new world of the welfare state.

In this house of philosophy, there is no room for offering mule-like stubbornness in dedication to an opposite extreme. We must rise to the greater challenge of accepting the maligned middle road, not because it is weaker, because it is courage, not because it is surrender, because it is truth.

Castro's Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of September 12, 1962:

CASTRO'S CHAMPION

It is reassuring—but not too much so—to read that our officials and statesmen are not "frightened" by Mr. Khrushchev's warning against an attack on Cuba by the United States.

Perhaps these officials are right. Mr. Khrushchev may be bluffing. Possibly he is setting up a straw man just for the fun, not to mention the propaganda value, of knocking him down. Especially so if he is quite certain that the United States is not planning to attack Cuba. Still, the threat is there, and our hasty official reactions may take too much for granted in so blithely brushing it aside.

One thing is certain—the record of Cuban-American judgments respecting Castro and communism is filled with tragic errors.

It was only 4 years ago, though it seems like a decade, since the "best people" in Havana were clamoring for the overthrow of Fulgencio Batista. They said he was an ironfisted dictator who had trampled on the liberties of the then-prosperous Cuban people. And perhaps he was. But where today are those Cubans who signed the anti-Batista manifesto—the university professors, lawyers, doctors, architects, journalists, religious, and civic leaders? They have been ground down under an oppression such as they never dreamed of when Dictator Batista was all they had to fear. There are no such manifestoes being circulated in Havana today. The Castro firing squads have seen to that. And where are our own eminent journalists, television commentators, and public officials who damned Batista and cheered for Castro 4 years ago?

The point is, we think, that the United States today cannot afford to make any more errors of judgment with respect to Castro's Cuba. Mr. Khrushchev may or may not be bluffing. But the price and the hazards of "doing something" about Cuba now are certainly much greater than they were 4 years ago. Still, for the sake of the record, some things should be put straight.

We do not think it is true that a "clear issue" has arisen in Cuba over which we should go to war at this time. It is not true that weakness and vacillation now on the part of the United States may lead to war, as in 1914 and 1939. Prior to those two World Wars the United States, in a relative sense, was militarily very weak. Today we are tremendously strong. Furthermore, in contrast to 1914 and 1939, we now have formal treaty commitments to go to the aid of our allies if they should be attacked by the Communists. We think the Kennedy administration, terrible though the consequences may be, will honor those commitments. And we think that Mr. Khrushchev also believes this to be the fact.

If this is correct, it follows that the problem of Cuba should be kept in proper perspective. So far, Khrushchev seems to be doing in Cuba about what we have done in South Vietnam, Turkey, Iran, etc. He is (or says he is) sending in military equipment and technicians to help Cuba build its defenses. This, of course, may be a semantic coverup for a program designed to establish a really dangerous Communist beachhead in Cuba. But we do not think this has happened yet, and our intelligence system in Cuba certainly should be efficient enough to keep us from being caught again dozing at the switch.

In a year or 2 years from now we may have to move in with American forces and smash a Communist buildup in Cuba. If so, it will be harder and costlier then than now, and it certainly will be much harder than if the President, for whatever reason, had not faltered and canceled the air support for the abortive invasion of Cuba in April, 1961. But no clamorous calls for ill-defined "action" now, no ringing speeches about a Monroe Doctrine which hardly can have the meaning in 1962 that it had in 1823, should be permitted to stampede this country or President Kennedy into any misconceived or poorly executed Cuban venture at this time.

One of the most sensible comments we have read recently came from Kentucky's Senator COOPER. He said: "Whatever the Government does with respect to this dangerous situation must be done, not as a gambit, but as a careful policy which we are fully prepared to follow up." In other words, no phony heroics, please. Let's not blockade Cuban ports unless we are resolved, if necessary, to sink a Russian (or even an Allied) ship which might try to force its way through when loaded with "technicians" or military supplies.

Out on the American frontier, or so the TV westerns have led us to believe, the word among the gunslingers was: "Don't draw unless you intend to shoot." This must have some application—both at home and in the Kremlin—to those who, in this H-bomb age, would like to draw if they could be sure they wouldn't have to shoot—or be shot.

Amendments for Substitute Wilderness Bill Advocated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks appearing in the body of the RECORD today, I wish to include the release, comments, and proposed amendments for a substitute wilderness bill as advocated by the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources on the 16th of August 1962, 1 week after the Subcommittee on Public Lands, of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, had reported out the Aspinall amendment.

The release follows:

AMENDMENTS FOR SUBSTITUTE WILDERNESS BILL ADVOCATED

Some 15 amendments are being advocated by the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources to make a sound preservation measure out of the subtitute wilderness bill approved on August 9 by the House of Representatives Public Lands Subcommittee.

The measure, now before the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and expected soon to be reported to the House, would without amendment, according to Ira N. Gabrielson, chairman of the citizens committee, hamper the wilderness designation even of areas now being handled as wilderness. It would also, he said, make difficult the preservation as wilderness of areas that would be designated.

Pointedly criticized was inclusion, as a special title I in the substitute wilderness bill, of a separate measure dealing with land withdrawals in general. This, said Gabrielson, should be considered separately and not be attached to the wilderness bill.

The substitute wilderness bill in its present form Gabrielson described as a massive crippling amendment.

The Public Lands Subcommittee, it was explained, replaced the Wilderness Act which had been passed 78–8 by the Senate with a House bill that had been introduced by Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pensylvania. The subcommittee then struck out all of the Saylor bill after the enacting clause to make way for the substitute proposal.

Both the Senate act and the Saylor bill are supported by wilderness bill advocates.

"Their purpose," said Gabrielson, "is to provide for the establishment of wilderness for the benefit of the whole people. The purpose of the substitute seems to be to preserve for a minority of commercial interests an opportunity to exploit any area of the public's land that may attract them."

The amendments now being advocated by the citizens committee are intended principally (1) to restore essential features of the Saylor measure that have been omitted, and (2) to eliminate subcommittee additions that would be contrary to wilderness preservation purposes.

Especially criticized were provisions permitting mining to continue in wilderness areas and a proposed requirement that wilderness areas be subjected to reconsideration every 25 years.

Joining Gabrielson in his criticisms and proposals was also Howard Zahniser, committee vice chairman and a prominent advocate of wilderness legislation. He was especially critical of the proposal to make the wilderness areas run a gantlet of opponents every 25 years.

"The nature of our civilization," said Zahniser, "is such as to make wilderness preservation difficult at the best. That is the reason for wilderness legislation. To make it tentative and to provide for the mobilization of forces working against it every 25 years—four times each century—is to be as dubious in a Wilderness Act as in a marriage vow would be inclusion of a similar periodic review."

Gabrielson is president of the Wildlife Management Institute and Zahniser is executive secretary of the Wilderness Society, but both spoke on the wilderness legislation as officers of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, a task force organized by individual conservationists to advance conservation and sound management of natural resources in the public interest, espeially concerned with legislation affecting natural resources. Secretary and full-time employee of the committee is Spencer M. Smith with headquarters at 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

The citizens committee statement including specific amendments proposed is as follows:

"HOUSE PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE WILDERNESS BILL

"(A comment with proposed amendments by Ira N. Gabrielson and Howard Zahniser, chairman and vice chairman, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources)

"The substitute wilderness bill approved by the House of Representatives Public Lands Subcommittee on August 9, 1962, and incorporated in committee print No. 23 of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is immediately recognized as the sort of proposal referred to as crippling amendment by advocates of the wilderness legislation as passed by the Senate or sponsored by Representative JOHN SAYLOR and others in the House. Unless further amended, it would be a massive crippling amendment.

"The purpose of the Wilderness Act is to provide for the establishment of wilderness for the benefit of the whole people; the purpose of the substitute seems to be to preserve for a minority of commercial interests an opportunity to exploit any area that may attract them.

"The effect of the substitute would be (1) to hamper the wilderness designation of even areas now being handled as wilderness, and (2) to hamper the preservation as wilderness of any areas that would be designated.

"The substitute as a whole is not only apparently proposed legislation to prevent true preservation of wilderness and to promote and encourage continued exploitation of remaining areas of wilderness; it also includes provisions that are inimical to wilderness preservation.

"Detailed comments

"At its outset the substitute bill includes as a title I a piece of proposed legislation that incorporates the substance of other bills that the wilderness bill, proposals that deal with the broad public-land policies of Congress, especially with withdrawals.

"This title has not been discussed on the Senate side in connection with the wilderness legislation, nor was it a part of the hearings held on the Wilderness Act by the House public lands subcommittee.

"The wilderness legislation at this late time in the closing session of the Congress should not be used for such an extensive rider as this.

"Title I should be removed from the wilderness bill and considered on its own merits.

"Substitute bill contrary to Wilderness Act

"Confining comments to title II then, which it is provided 'is to be cited as the Wilderness Act', we can see apparent a purpose contrary to that of the Wilderness Act as passed by the Senate and advocated by Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR and other sponsors in the House and by its proponents throughout the Nation.

"The purpose of the Senate's act and similar House proposals is to preserve wilderness for the benefit of the whole people. A particular purpose is (1) to designate, as wilderness, areas that are within parks, refuges, and the specially classified wilderness portions of the national forests. These areas are thus susceptible to wilderness preservation without interference with other programs. A further particular purpose is (2) to provide for the accommodation of this wildnerness policy and program to other interests.

"A central statement, for example, in the Senate act is in the first sentence of section 6 which say that nothing is to interfere with the purposes now being served by the park, refuge, and forest lands involved except that they are to be administered for these purposes in such a way as to continue to preserve their wilderness character. (The same statement is in the first sentence of sec. 3 in Congressman SAYLOR's H.R. 776, p. 12, lines 5 to 13.)

"The proposed substitute states no such purpose of accomplishing wilderness preservation for the common good as something that is compatible with other purposes of land administration and that is readily feasible.

"On the contrary, the substitute wilderness bill requires the wilderness areas to run the gantlet of opponents every 25 years in a review that has been advocated by opponents of wilderness legislation.

"It is of the nature of wilderness preservation to provide, if possible, for preserving forever something that has always so far been that way, although of course future Congresses can alter any such preservation.

"The nature of our civilization is such as to make wilderness preservation difficult at the best. That is the reason for wilderness legislation. To make it tentative and to provide for the mobilization of forces working against it every 25 years—four times each century—is to be as dubious in a Wilderness Act as in a marriage vow would be the inclusion of periodic review.

"The substitute is an act to protect miners

"To read the Senate Act is to see that preserving any areas as wilderness is difficult in our civilization, with its increasing mechanization and growing population, and, therefore, because it seems desirable to so many people, wilderness preservation is something to be provided for by the Congress.

"To read this substitute is to feel ironically that there is a grave danger that wilderness preservation will threaten our civilization and its dependence on commercial activities to such an extent that the Congress of the United States must protect the embattled miners, grazers, and others against a rampant wilderness preservation movement about to take over the whole Federal estate.

"For commercial interests to succeed in combating a program that would preserve only a few areas unspoiled and succeed to such an extent as to bring about this kind of legislative proposal to restrict and control the preservers would be a gross perversion of a very good purpose.

"Substitute bill serves wilderness opponents

"The apparent effect of the provisions of the substitute would be to serve the interests of those who have opposed the wilderness program. Instead of ratifying sound wilderness-preservation accomplishments of administrative agencies to date and making these more orderly and more secure in accordance with the national purpose, this proposed substitute puts in jeopardy some of the areas and administrative policies now established. It would hamper the secure wilderness classification even of areas now being handled as wilderness.

"Even with regard to the very small remnants of our once vast wilderness that are now protected as wilderness, this substitute for the Wilderness Act mobilizes the forces that represent the developments in our civilization which make wilderness preservation difficult.

"Areas to run a gantlet

"Even our protected remnants of wilderness (with few exceptions) would be given congressional protection by the substitute only after running a gantlet and surviving the representations to be made after examination by county boards, State agencies, Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Mines, and other Federal agencies (10 in all) who are to bring out every possible alternative to preserving even these comparatively few protected remnants. Many of these primarily represent user interests.

"Finally, as to the effects of this substitute, its section on 'Use of Wilderness Areas' actually takes care to provide for maximum possible nonconforming use of a wilderness. The Senate Act already includes liberal special provisions to avoid unnecessary interferences. This substitute even would allow mining to continue in the wilderness areas of the national forest for another 10 years, and even thereafter the areas would continue to be examined for minerals.

"Thus the proposed substitute goes so far in providing for nonconforming uses as to threaten to frustrate the preservation as wilderness of even the areas that would survive the gantlet through which the substitute would require all proposed areas to be carried.

"Amendments proposed

"Study of the measure, however, shows that a series of amendments to restore provisions of the Saylor bill thrown aside by the subcommittee, and to remove damaging additions, can make of this proposed bill a sound measure to serve the public interest in wilderness preservation.

"These amendments are as follows, approximately in the order in which they occur in committee print No. 23:

"Proposed amendment No. 1: Take out 'Title I', drop the heading "Title II', and drop the '200' series in numbering sections: The separate legislation included as a title I rider for the wilderness legislation should be considered on its own merits. Wherever reference is made to 'Title I' the bill should be corrected. Thus on page 28 in line 6, the word 'title' should be changed to 'act.' On page 32 in lines 6 and 7, the words 'and notice, if any, required under title I of this act' should be removed. On page 33 in lines 11 to 13 the words 'which shall include, in addition to other pertinent data, the information required by section 103 of this act' should be removed.

"Proposed amendment No. II: Remove 5,000-acre limitation from the definition: In section 202(a), in item (3) of the second sentence of the definition the words "has at least 5,000 acres of land and * * * therefore' have been added (p. 28, lines 22 to 25). The Senate act requires simply that the area be 'of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition.'

"This act does elsewhere use the 5,000-acre size as a criterion for a minimum national park system roadless area to be considered, and 5,000 acres has been the Forest Service minimum for wilderness classification (such areas being called 'wild areas'); but the addition of this formal requirement in a definition is questionable, for it seems to indicate that 5,000 acres is a large enough area or, on the other hand, that it is always a minimum. Some islands might be smaller but suitable. Some areas of 5,000 acres because of their surroundings might not qualify.

"It would be better to omit this addition or at least to delete the word 'therefore." Requirement (3) of the definition (lines 22 to 25 on p. 28) should read as follows:

"'(3) is of sufficient size to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition;'.

"Proposed amendment No. III: Clarify the definition by adding the omitted last sentence of the definition in Representative SAYLOR's H.R. 776: H.R. 776 has the following last sentence in its definition (sec. 1(d)), which is omitted in the proposed substitute: 'For the purposes of this act wilderness shall include the areas provided for in section 2 of this act and such other areas as shall be designated for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System in accordance with the provisions of this act.'

"Without this sentence in the act's definition, in the absence also of definite declarations as to areas later, the phraseology in the proposed substitute's section 203(b) could be obstructive later.

"This is true because certain existing intrusions that literally or by nature do not conform to the first two sentences of the

definition can be tolerated for practical purposes, and indeed are so tolerated in establishing the system in accordance with S. 174. Yet under the substitute bill's provisions such existing nonconformities could be used to frustrate inclusion of an area later.

"Accordingly, the following should be added (on p. 29, line 2) to section 202(a): 'For the purposes of this act, wilderness shall include the areas provided for in section 203 of this act and such other areas as shall be designated for inclusion in the national wilderness preservation system in accordance with the provisions of this act.'

"Proposed amendment No. IV: Provide for establishment of the wilderness system: In section 202(b) there is no establishment of the national wilderness preservation system, although the title does state the purpose of establishing such a system. Accordingly, on page 29, in line 6, following the comma and quotation marks after the word 'areas,' there should be inserted the words: 'shall comprise the National Wilderness Preservation System and.'

"Proposed amendment No. V: Limit provisions to Federal lands: In the last clause of section 202(b) the word 'lands' should be qualified to refer only to Federal lands (p. 29, line 12).

"Proposed amendment No. VI: Provide for immediate designation of areas as wilderness to be followed by review: Section 203(b) should be revised to provide for the immediate designation of the areas it refers to, with a provision for review over a 10-year period. As it is, this proposed substitute makes the same provision that was decisively defeated in the Senate for requiring separate action on each of all these areas that are now in fact protected as wilderness. They should be given legal status at once so as to continue to be protected until Congress determines otherwise.

"Section 203(b) should be changed to read as follows:

"'(b) The following federally-owned areas are hereby designated as wilderness areas subject to review as provided in section 204 of this act:'.

"In accordance with this amendment, the words 'section 203(a)' should be removed in lines 21–22 on page 36 and 8–9 on page 37 and in place thereof in each place there should be inserted the words 'or under the provisions.' The words 'or under the provisions of' should also be inserted after the word 'by' in line 10 on page 41.

"Subsections (2) and (3) of section 203(b) should also be changed to provide for the 5,000-acre criterion of roadless areas in refuge and park system units, by making the subsections read as follows, the added words being in black brackets:

"'(2) Roadless portions [comprising 5,000 acres or more] of parks, monuments, and other units of the national park system; and

"'(3) Roadless portions [comprising 5,000 acres or more, or islands,] within wildlife refuges and game ranges under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior on the effective date of this Act.'

"Proposed amendment No. VII: Provide for protection of areas under review until Congress determines otherwise: The areas involved in this legislation, there provided for in section 203 (a) and (b) of the substitute bill, are relatively few and all are within what is at present viewed as the Nation's wilderness preservation resource. These areas all should be protected as wilderness till Congress says otherwise.

"Section 204(a) should be revised to provide for continuing protection of each area until such time as Congress has determined otherwise. It might then read as follows (the added words being in black brackets):

"'SEC. 204(a) To assist Congress in determining which of the areas described in section 203(b) shall [continue] to be designated at wilderness areas, the Secretary of the Department having jurisdiction of the lands involved shall, within 10 years after the effective date of this Act review the suitability of said areas for continued protection as wilderness and report annually his recommendations to the President and Congress, together with a map of each area and a definition of its boundaries. [The areas shall continue to be preserved as wilderness in accordance with the provisions of this Act until Congress, following the review hereby required, shall have determined otherwise.]'

"The word 'continued' should be inserted as the second word in line 25 on page 32. The words 'continue to' should be inserted after the word 'should' in line 7 on page 33. The words 'to continue' should be inserted at the beginning of line 1 on page 34.

"Proposed amendment No. VIII: Remove the requirement for reconsidering wilderness designations every 25 years: Section 205 on pages 34 and 35 should be removed in its entirety. A review every 25 years of wilderness areas, can only unreasonably subject to the pressures that make wilderness preservation difficult in our culture, the few areas established as wilderness for preservation. The Congress, of course, at any time in the future may change the designation of any area and can be expected to do so if this is desirable in the public interest.

"Proposed amendment No. IX: Make plain that the wilderness character of areas is to be preserved and that this in accord with the purposes of the areas. Section 206 on 'Use of Wilderness Areas' should make plain that the areas involved must be so administered as to preserve their wilderness character. It should also make plain that such preservation is consistent with other purposes of the lands involved. This could be accomplished by including the first sentence in section 6 of Representative SAYLOR'S H.R. 776—the sentence already referred to in this statement.

"This would be accomplished by inserting at the end of line 7 on page 35, at the end of the first sentence in section 206(a), the following:

"'Nothing in this act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purposes stated in the establishment of or pertaining to any national park or monument, national forest, national wildlife refuge, or other area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the Wilderness System shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purpose as also to preserve its wilderness character.'

"Proposed amendment No. X: Correct mistake in providing for accommodations and installations in wilderness. In the second sentence of section 206(a)(3) a change in phraseology from what is substantially otherwise the same sentence in the Senate act makes a drastic and undesirable change. The accommodations and installations referred to would not be permissible 'in wilderness areas' as stated in this sentence in the proposed substitute. Instead of the phrase, 'in wilderness areas,' the sentence should have the words, 'in such designated areas,' referring to the designation of an area (as referred to in the preceding sentence) for roads, etc., as provided in H.R. 776. Accordingly, in line 3 on page 36 the word 'wilderness' should be removed and in its place inserted the words 'such designated.'

"Proposed amendment No. XI: Remove permission for mining but provide for mining and prospecting when in the national interest: Section 206 (c) (2) with its proposed damaging permission of mining should be eliminated except that: (1) mining could be included in the possible authorizations set forth in section 206 (d); and (2) the provision in the last sentence of section 206 (c) (2) providing for studies by the Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines would seem consistent with wilderness preservation and thus might be retained.

"This would be accomplished by the following amendment: Strike out in section 206(c)(2) all beginning on page 37, line 16, and ending on page 39, line 13, to the word 'designated' and all beginning in line 19 on page 39 with the word 'with' and continuing to the end. This would make the subsection read as follows:

"'(2) Designated and proposed wilderness areas shall be surveyed on a planned, recurring basis consistent with the concept of wilderness preservation by the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines to determine the mineral values, if any, that may be present; and the results of such surveys shall be made available to the public and submitted to the President and Congress.'

"Proposed amendment No. XII: Correct provisions for exceptions to be made in the national interest: Section 206(d) should be amended so as (1) to limit the wilderness areas involved to national forest areas, (2) to entrust to the President rather than the Secretary the authorizations, as the Senate determined after the change to a Secretary had been proposed in an amendment on the floor, and (3) to include provision for authorized mining when in the public interest. The first four lines would then read as follows, the added words in black brackets:

"'(d) Within [national forest] wilderness areas designated by this Act, (1) the [President] may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize [mining, prospecting,] prospecting for water resources," etc.

"Proposed amendment No. XIII: Bring grazing provision in line with Forest Service and Department of Agriculture established policy: In accordance with Forest Service and Department of Agriculture policy, the grazing proviso at the end of section 206(d), in lines 11 and 12 of page 40, should be removed; the word 'well' should be inserted before 'established' in line 8; and the words 'restrictions and' should be inserted after the word 'reasonable' in line 10. This would make the provision read as follows, the added words in black brackets:

"'(2) the grazing of livestock, where [well] established prior to the effective date of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable [restrictions and] regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture.'

"Proposed amendment No. XIV: Limit hunting provision to national forest areas: The special provision regarding hunting in section 206(h) should be limited to national forest areas, by inserting the words 'national forest' before the word 'wilderness' in line 10.

"Proposed amendment No. XV: Include provision for gifts: In the final subsection (section 207(d)) relating to acceptance of gifts, the Secretary of the Interior should be included as the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Senate provision for accepting contributions and gifts should also be included. This can be accomplished by inserting in line 15 on page 42 after 'Agriculture' the phrase 'and the Secretary of the Interior' and at the end of line 23 adding the following:

"'The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to accept private contributions and gifts to be used to further the purposes of this act. Any such contributions or gifts shall, for purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, be considered a contribution or gift to or for the use of the United States for an exclusively public purpose, and may be deducted as such under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, subject to all applicable limitations and restrictions contained therein.'"

Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have been interested in the rehabilitation of our handicapped citizens so that they could become self-supporting and enjoy the dignity of personal work and achievement.

The fact is that handicapped people can perform many jobs as well—and sometimes better—than those without handicaps. This was demonstrated at a press tour arranged by the Federation of the Handicapped in New York City recently. As the executive director of the federation said, the handicapped person is a perfectionist and takes pride in his work, which is all too rare these days.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times of September 13, discussing this program of the federation, be included in the RECORD.

The article follows:

DISABLED EXHIBIT TECHNICAL SKILLS—SHOW PLANT WHERE CLASSES FOR MISSILE JOBS ARE HELD

(By John C. Devlin)

When the first American lands on the moon, there is a strong possibility that he will have found his way with the help of handicapped persons in metropolitan New York.

This was suggested yesterday at a press tour of the Federation of the Handicapped, 211 West 14th Street, where the determination and skill of handicapped persons have made them experts in assembling key units in guidance systems for both missiles and spacecraft.

The handicapped persons are working under contracts with such concerns as the Bendix Corp., Western Electric, and the Minneapolis-Honeywell Co. and are doing specialized industrialized packaging for such companies as the General Instrument Corp. and Dialight Corp.

Because of their skills, most of them will take full-time jobs with these and other prominent companies.

SHOW PRIDE IN THEIR WORK

"It is easy to see the very special quality of the handicapped," Milton Cohen, executive director, said. "Each one regards himself or herself as an artist and they have the pride of craftsmanship of the type one finds in an artist with his paintings. They are perfectionists."

The function of the federation is to train the handicapped in 18 to 24 months to handle more and more meticulous tasks so that they can take on full-time jobs as experts in industry.

Hundreds have been graduated from the free courses during which they received pay for work done, to jobs with some of the Nation's major industries. Their special assets are quality work, high performance rate, and an ability to get work done on schedule.

Some of the handicapped have had polio, others have birth defects, heart conditions, or epilepsy. Others have been injured in accidents; some are paraplegics.

YOUNG PERSONS BEING TRAINED

Some of high school age are being trained to use typewriters, adding machines, telephone switchboards, or shop equipment. Some will become electronic experts.

All punch timeclocks as part of the job of establishing discipline.

"They respond to it extremely well," Mr. Cohen said. "They love challenges. They all do their best because they have become perfectionists."

He said attitudes in industry had changed greatly in recently years because personnel directors had learned that the handicapped, instead of being a liability, have made themselves industrial assets in an area where skill was badly needed.

New Spencer Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my remarks at the dedication of the Spencer, Mass., Post Office on August 25, 1962.

The material follows:

NEW SPENCER POST OFFICE

Reverend clergy, distinguished guests, and friends, it is a special pleasure and privilege for me to join you today in this historic, meaningful dedication of this beautiful new post office.

Your town and its loyal people are very close to my heart, and I rejoice with your distinguished Representative and Senator, town and post office officials and all your people upon the completion of this useful, post office facility.

I compliment and congratulate the Post Office Department, the builders, and all those who have had anything to do with the completion of this building, which will fill an important need in this community for years to come.

Our great Post Office Department with its farflung organization and innumerable units spread over our great country is the largest and most efficient communication and mailing system in the whole world.

It enjoys outstanding leadership and outstanding personnel whose painstaking devotion to duty and efficient service is unmatched in any nation.

These faithful postal workers in Spencer and elsewhere throughout our great postal system give us daily proof of their unswerving purpose to serve us with complete dedication. This facility we dedicate today with such satisfaction, pride and gratitude is but another instance of the determination of our Government, the Department and Congress to support and improve our postal service in every way we possibly can to keep pace with every modern development. So this, my friends, is an occasion which we may all well appreciate and cherish, since it marks a distinct improvement in the postal facilities of this beautiful town.

There is a broader significance that we all are mindful of today and that is that facilities like this one are the product of free, democratic government. The loyal spirit which the people of Spencer have always manifested, and particularly your devotion in war and peace to the cause of freedom is greatly needed in the Nation and the world today.

We must constantly have in mind that those who would destroy freedom and democracy, not only here, but throughout the world, are working unceasingly with skill and vigor to achieve their evil purpose of destroying freedom in the world and enslaving mankind.

While our great Nation is dedicated to peace based upon freedom and security, our people are resolutely determined to preserve our birthright and our heritage, and we do not propose to allow any other nation, or group of nations, to steal away our hardwon liberties or to challenge the safety of our shores and the security of our homes.

As we carry out our high purpose for peace, and earnestly work to bring about a better world, organized under the rule of law, let it be well understood by those who conspire against us, that we are unalterably pledged to the perpetuation of free government, just as we are resolutely committed to the cause of world peace.

It is for us to try to build and shape a greater, stronger and more prosperous nation, and to hold out the hand of friendship and assistance to other nations who earnestly seek peace, and who wish to live and develop under free institutions.

It is for us to maintain our strength at every level, military, economic and spiritual, and to uphold at all times the moral precepts and spiritual truths upon which our great Nation was founded.

If we pursue these ends, tomorrow may be a brighter day for all humanity, and we and other nations pledged to freedom may well be able to persuade the leaders of the Communist conspiracy to outlaw war, effectively control nuclear weapons and substances, agree to universal disarmament and adopt world, legal institutions to promote world cooperation, unity of the human family, and order and justice for mankind.

In that way, tyranny will cease and peace with justice will prevail.

In the presence of this distinguished group of officials, dignitaries and honored guests, and so many people of this great community, I am happy to express the hope that this new postal facility will serve your beautiful town and its devoted people for many years to come. It will do much to strengthen your municipal posture and provide for the convenience of your people.

Not only this generation, but future generations, will have reason to be grateful for the place it will have in the affairs of the people of Spencer. May your beautiful community continue to grow in strength, unity, prosperity and the ways of freedom.

Let me thank you warmly for the privilege of being with you, today.

Public Access to Commission Dissents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, 1962, I brought to the attention of the Members of this House the fact that the Federal Trade Commission was attempting to suppress information about dissenting opinions of its minority members. This fact was uncovered by the Special Subcommittee on Government Information shortly after the same practice by the Federal Power Commission had been discovered and corrected. When I last informed the House on this subject I provided the text of a letter sent to the Federal Trade Commission urging it to reverse the policy of secrecy and to adopt a positive policy assuring that majority and minority decisions and

opinions would be made available to the public.

I have been informed by the Federal Trade Commission that it has adopted a new policy that follows, generally, the suggestion made by the subcommittee. The new policy declares that a dissenting Commissioner "shall have the right to have his dissent and reasons therefor shown on the document or accompanying papers evidencing such action." The new policy does not apply to actions of the Commission that are not made public, such as a decision to drop a matter or a decision on some nonpublic procedural matter. The language of the FTC letter could be interpreted to hold that, in such a case, a dissenting member has no right to make known his objection to the decision of the majority. There is no valid basis upon which the majority of the Commission—or two Commissioners constituting a majority of a three-man quorum—may muzzle or delay the issuance of the views of dissenting Commissioners with regard to any Commission actions. The subcommittee has asked the Commission to state whether the new policy prevents a nonconcurring Commissioner from expressing views on any Commission action which is not made public. The pertinent letters follow:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., September 6, 1962.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
Chairman, Special Government Information Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reference to your letter dated July 23, 1962, in which you requested me to advise the subcommittee subsequent to the Commission meeting the first week in September as to the action taken by the Commission in regard to any procedure adopted by the Commission for noting dissents and issuing dissenting opinions.

At the Commission meeting on Tuesday, September 4, 1962, the following action was unanimously adopted by the Commission:

"When the Commission takes any action which it makes public, and a member of the Commission does not concur in such action, such member shall have the right to have his dissent and reasons therefor shown on the document or accompanying papers evidencing such action."

Sincerely yours,

PAUL RAND DIXON,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SPECIAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., September 18, 1962.

Mr. PAUL RAND DIXON,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DIXON: Thank you for your letter of September 6, 1962, advising that the Federal Trade Commission on September 4, 1962, unanimously adopted a resolution recognizing that any Commissioner who does not concur with any action with the Commission makes public is entitled to have his dissent and the reasons therefore shown on the document or other accompanying papers evidencing such action.

The Commission's new policy is excellent, as far as it goes; however, it does not cover actions which the Commission fails to make public. The language of the Commission's new policy, as quoted in your letter, could thus be interpreted as denying the right of a Commissioner to make known his objections to a Commission action such as a decision to drop a matter, or a decision concerning Commission procedure, or any other Commission matter, if the Commission does not make the action public.

There is no apparent basis upon which the majority of the Commission (or two Commissioners constituting a majority of a three-man quorum) may muzzle or delay the issuance of the views of dissenting Commissioners with regard to any Commission actions. Please, therefore, clarify whether the policy statement of September 4, 1962, is intended to prevent a nonconcurring Commissioner from expressing views on any Commission action which is not made public.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Chairman.

Retraining for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the major causes of our unemployment problem is that many of our jobless men and women lack the skills to fill the new jobs opening up in our dynamic American economy. This problem is certain to grow more severe in the future unless we launch a national program to upgrade the skills of our people.

This problem was discussed by the respected financial writer, Sylvia Porter, in her column in the Washington Sunday Star of September 16. Miss Porter points out that while total employment is scheduled to rise 20 percent in the 1960's, the need for workers to fill the jobs in professional, technical, managerial, and service occupations will grow much faster. One sound remedy offered by Miss Porter is for young people to stay in school in order to prepare for these jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this column by Miss Porter at this point:

RETURN TO SCHOOL—FOR WHAT?

(Sylvia Porter)

"Return to school," urged President Kennedy in his Labor Day message to America's youngsters—and he quoted the familiar but always shocking projection that "7.5 million boys and girls will fail to complete high school during the decade of the 1960's unless we, as a nation, take positive steps to prevent it."

Yes, return to school, for the facts submitted in Thursday's column about the warning that if you're among this 7.5 million—or worse among the 2.5 million, who Labor Department studies indicate won't even complete elementary school—you're dooming yourself to the job underworld. You'll be in a self-made minority, handicapped group.

But return to school for what? Stay in school to train yourself for what fields or jobs? Here's that story.

GENERAL OUTLOOK

First, the general outlook: Total employment is scheduled to rise about 20 percent in the 1960's. But rising twice as fast—40 percent—will be professional and technical occupations, and particularly bright are job prospects for engineers, scientists and such technicians as engineering aides and electronic specialists.

Also rising much faster than average—30 percent—will be clerical and sales jobs. Third in line in the white-collar class will be the manager, official and proprietor occupational group, with a fastest growth rate within this group among salaried officials in business organizations and government.

Among the blue-collar or manual occupations, the great rise will be in jobs for skilled workers—craftsmen, foremen and, particularly, building trades craftsmen, mechanics and repairmen.

By industries, the highest rates of growth in employment will be in construction, finance, insurance, retail sales, trade, government and all the services.

SPECIFIC OPPORTUNITIES

Now here are specifics about job opportunities which can be filled by normal youngsters without the extraordinary aptitudes or intelligence needed to qualify as an engineer, mathematician, physician, physicist, etc.

Technicians: The Department of Labor's most recent "Occupational Outlook Handbook" lists technicians who work with engineers and physical scientists as among "the fastest growing occupational groups in the United States." The significant point here is that you might qualify after only a 2-year technical college course or after a comprehensive high school program and may then get additional training on the job. The field is wide open.

Secretaries, typists, stenographers: Despite automation, the "supply" of these, says the handbook, "never seems to catch up with demand." Girl high school graduates with these skills will find jobs waiting and the secretary with a college degree, too, will have a superb choice.

Construction workers: Skill is the need here, not a batch of degrees. But you must have skill to earn the high wages in this industry, which will skyrocket in the decade of the 1960's.

Nurses: The jobs are begging for the workers. It is a top profession for a woman and there are many types of training programs.

Teachers: This tale needs no elaboration. The demand is huge; it will continue to grow for the indefinite future.

Accountants: A high school diploma may be sufficient in this fast-growing professional field, but a college degree is preferred.

Social workers: There were 12,000 vacancies in this field in 1960, reports the handbook. The shortage of workers is "acute."

School counselors: In every State, there were shortages of school counselors in 1960–61 with the situation "expected to continue for at least several years." Another wide-open field.

This listing just skims a tiny part of the surface. The "Occupational Outlook Handbook" includes thousands of statistics about 650 occupations in its 800 pages and each is a valuable guide.

One of the soundest moves communities the Nation over could make is to obtain copies of this handbook for placement in any center where youngsters gather. What this book could say to a lost, confused dropout could be worth more than a million words of general advice, no matter how kindly or well meaning. It even might save his life for him.

Soviet Propaganda on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star of September 12, 1962:

SOVIET PROPAGANDA ON CUBA—MOSCOW BELIEVED TAKING ADVANTAGE OF U.S. SILENCE ON VIOLATION

(By David Lawrence)

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since the news was given out that the Soviets had begun an arms buildup in Cuba. The United States, so far as known, has sent no protest to the Soviet Government against its flagrant violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Government has taken advantage of America's silence and has filled the broadcast waves of the world with one propaganda blast after the other, characterizing President Kennedy's callup of Reserves as a "provacative" action. The latest accusation actually turns the tables on the United States and warns the Washington Government that it must not do anything in Cuba to interfere with the Castro government's policy of acquiring Soviet arms. The claim is reiterated that Cuba is arming for "defense." President Kennedy thus has given away a propaganda advantage by appearing to accept the Castro and Soviet arguments that the supplying of arms and the sending of "technicians" are simply for "defensive" purposes.

It is a puzzle just why Mr. Kennedy chooses to forfeit the initiative in propaganda. Time was when the American Government uttered its protests through formal diplomatic channels and made them public in situations comparable to the present controversy over the Soviet buildup in Cuba. The action of the Moscow Government not only affects the Monroe Doctrine as a policy but is directly related to America's own security. To place missile pads and missiles in Cuba, which is just 90 miles away from our own shores, is an act that can be construed as hostile to the United States. Yet the administration prefers to say nothing by way of formal protest.

The seriousness of the situation is not diminished but actually increased by the failure to make any protest before the world. Unfortunately, the Soviets may come to believe that they have successfully bluffed the United States into silence, and they may take further chances in the cold war. Moscow in its latest outburst even hints at a nuclear war if the United States does anything about Cuba.

The impression in Washington is that the administration has all along been afraid of increasing tensions by saying anything to Russia about the Cuban buildup. Still, the Soviets do not mind increasing tensions by their propaganda statements. These could be regarded as of little importance if they were merely part of an exchange of words between the Soviet Union and the United States. Unhappily, the propaganda is circulated all over the world. The peoples of allied as well as neutral countries can thus be influenced to believe that the United States is afraid to speak out and is being shoved into a corner by the aggressive pronouncement of the Soviet Union.

The administration has known for a long time about the Soviet arms buildup in Cuba. On September 2, the United Press International in a dispatch from Washington said:

"A State Department spokesman said today that the Soviet announcement of arms aid to Cuba 'merely confirms what has been going on in recent months.' The spokesman said:

" 'The announcement does not seem to represent anything new. We've been saying right along that the Soviet Union has been sending military equipment and technicians to Cuba.' "

But the American people were not told officially about this until about 2 weeks ago, and there is no public record that the United States has filed any protest with the Soviet Government concerning the arms buildup. Naturally, the Soviets would construe this as an acquiescence and would be inclined to increase their military buildup in Cuba and begin to send arms to other parts of Latin America which they are planning to infiltrate through agents already on the job.

Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, Democrat, referring to some of Mr. Kennedy's recent statements, said the other day in the Senate:

"The President's comments indicate strongly that the Monroe Doctrine has recently been reinterpreted with major omissions to the extent that the Monroe Doctrine is no longer a bulwark of U.S. foreign policy which it was for over 100 year."

In Congress, Members of both parties are restive and uneasy about the apparent surrender of the initiative to the Soviet Union. Authority to call up 150,000 Reserves has been overwhelmingly endorsed, but this does not overcome the feeling in Congress that the United States is being portrayed over the airwaves as afraid to stand up to the Soviets. Paul Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs, in a television interview over the ABC network Sunday, really summed up the situation. He wasn't trying to be critical of the administration and, in fact, was endeavoring to defend it. But he unwittingly stated the case against the administration's policy of silence when he said:

"I think the grounds for concern are, first of all, that this assistance the Soviets are giving Castro makes it more difficult for the Cuban people ever to restore their freedom, and, secondly, this helps Castro consolidate his position in Cuba and thereby might increase the possibility that Cuba could be used as a base for Communist infiltration into the rest of the hemisphere."

Yet nothing has been said officially for the last several months to the Soviet Government in protest about all this.

Three Hundred Soviet Tracking Stations Bob Off Eastern Coast of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the reading of the following article which was printed in the September 4, 1962, issue of the Washington World:

THREE HUNDRED SOVIET TRACKING STATIONS STATIONS BOB OFF EASTERN COAST OF UNITED STATES

Floating leisurely 50 miles off the coast of Long Island, heavily equipped Soviet tracking stations are serving as a vital communications link between Soviet space vehicles and their Moscow headquarters.

The three tracking ships, sailing as fishing trawlers, mingle easily with other vessels in the ever-growing Communist fishing fleet off the North American coast. Today, with virtually no public notice, there are more than 300 such Soviet vessels off our coasts.

The experimental Mackay Radio tracking station at Southampton, N.Y., recently reported that high-powered radio activity from three Soviet trawlers coincided with space signals as the twin Red space craft passed overhead.

The signals from both the trawlers and space craft were beamed on the ones Moscow reported for the orbiting capsules. Tape recordings of the radio conversations have since been translated by CIA interpreters.

RUSSIANS A FAMILIAR SIGHT IN NOVA SCOTIAN TOWN

Russian seamen are now a familiar sight on the streets of Halifax, Nova Scotia. The Russians' visits are the consequence of a tremendous expansion during the past 4 years of Soviet fishing operations on the Grand Banks off Newfoundland, and on George's Banks to the south of Nova Scotia.

Today there are some 325 Communist fishing boats, including Polish and East German craft, at work all year round in the western Atlantic.

Each unit in the Russian fishing fleet is a self-contained floating industry, able to process, can, and refrigerate the catch at sea. Every unit is self-sufficient, containing a factory or mother ship, a tug, a repair vessel, and a fuel tanker.

Last year the Soviets had an entertainment ship in the fleet, the *Riga*, which moved among working ships showing movies and providing other recreation. The *Riga*, like many Red ships, had a number of women aboard.

Even so, there are times when the Russian vessels must put into Halifax or St. John's for repairs, tackle, food supplies, or fresh water. During the past 18 months, Soviet craft have made more than 80 calls at Halifax alone.

SOME CANADIANS VOICING CONCERN

While officials of the Halifax Port Authority, and the agents for the Communist vessels, I. H. Mathers & Son, Ltd., are pleased with the good relations that have developed ashore, some Canadian fishermen are voicing concern at the extent of Russian operations at sea.

R. G. Smith, general manager of National Sea Products, Ltd., concedes that the Russians are entitled to fish in these international waters but points out:

"There are only so many fish out there. The more the Russians take, the fewer there are for us."

Another point of friction is the size of the trawls and drift nets used by the Soviets. The Russian nets are often spread out for 3 miles behind the boats. Often these nets are poorly marked and cannot be seen at night. Nova Scotian and American fishing boats sometimes plow through them, damaging the Soviet equipment and fouling their own propellers.

One Halifax skipper became so incensed at the size and bad marking of Russian nets that he armed his crew with shotguns for one trip last year. The crew, however, refrained from using them.

Mr. Speaker, this article poses the immediate and critical problem faced by New England in the loss of local resources to fleets of other countries, especially that of Russia. Each of the many Russian stern trawlers is capable of catching and processing during one trip as much fish as is landed by an average American trawler in 1 year. The question as to whether the fish stocks can sustain the proposed increase in fishing effort remains to be answered.

The time has arrived when we urgently need information on the natural habits of important food fish and their ability to withstand increased fishing pres-

sure. This is most important for the fishing banks off New England which support one of the world's greatest ground fisheries. The major species are haddock, cod, redfish, flounders, herring and scallops. These fisheries have a strong international flavor that has existed since before 1600, and which is, in fact, becoming more obvious with the development of better fishing vessels with filleting and freezing plants aboard. Until recently, the fishing banks directly off the U.S. coastline were fished very little by other nationals. On George's Bank today, however, one is as apt to see a 300-foot Russian factory trawler or a Canadian scalloper as an American fishing vessel.

This threat to the resource will not be resolved quickly, but scientists are working toward overall management and conservation procedures which may be proposed and placed into effect by international agreement. The information needed for this is not all available, but it can be obtained through oceanographic research.

In addition, oceanographic and fishery explorations can develop new fisheries which will help relieve the new foreign fishing efforts. There are stocks of several species of ground-fishes on the banks, the whiting and hake, for example, which may occur in considerable quantities, but which are underexploited because of the more valuable haddock, redfish, flounder, and scallops. Studies must be conducted on these species also to determine their true abundance and the effect which fishing will have on the populations. Similarly new fisheries on the high seas and in deeper waters might be found, but new intrumentation and fishing methods will be required to explore the resources which lie deep in the oceans.

Mr. Speaker, the House has passed S. 901, as amended, which provides a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography. I believe that this legislation is a practical and realistic answer to the serious problem of foreign competition in fisheries. It is my hope that the Senate conferees will agree to the House amendments that the 87th Congress may lead the way for significant advances and discoveries in the oceanography field.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Address by Arthur W. Steinfeldt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the acceptance speech of Arthur W. Steinfeldt on receiving the National Equal Opportunity Employer Award, presented to the Missile and Space Division, Philadelphia, of the General Electric Co., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The speech is well worth the attention of Members of this body and those who subscribe to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It shows what one great corporation, enlightened at least in the field of race relations, has been able to do to implement the President's policy of fair employment practices.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(NOTE.—Acceptance speech by Arthur W. Steinfeldt on receiving the National Equal Opportunity Employer Award presented to the Missile and Space Division, Philadelphia, of the General Electric Co., in recognition of its policy of equal job opportunity and its contribution to a program of career guidance. The award was presented by Mr. Hobson Reynolds, Grand Exalted Ruler of the Improved Benevolent Protective Order of the Elks of the World at its national convention in Detroit, on August 29, 1962.)

Thank you Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Vaughn, and members of the Elks.

A minister, a priest, and a rabbi were walking together down the street when suddenly there appeared before them a fairy godmother. She said to them, "I'll give each of you one wish, whatever you would like." The minister was the first and he said that well, he wished she'd do away with all Catholics. The priest was second and he wished that she would do away with all Protestants. The fairy godmother turned to the rabbi and asked what he would like. He said, "Oh, don't bother about me, nothing for me, just take care of my two friends."

About 25 years ago I had a taste of discrimination and I have never forgotten it. I hesitate to bring it up here, because it is so minor as compared to the things that you have to put up with. Because it did make such an impression on me, however, I would like to share it with you.

Back in the late thirties I attended a large public high school which had a sizable Jewish student body. I am not of Jewish origin, but my name can easily be thought to be. Because some of the students though I might be Jewish, I found I was not invited to certain fraternities or social events. Actually, later on it turned out to be a blessing in disguise, because with the help of my Jewish friends I was elected president of the 3,000-member student body. But, I can still remember what it felt like to be rejected; not because of what I was as an individual, but rejected because I might be of a certain religion. I have never forgotten how hurt I felt at the time and how angry, because it seemed so unfair. Ever since that time I have tried to do what I could to work positively toward solving the problems created by our blind and stupid prejudices.

And so, it is a real source of satisfaction for me personally, to be receiving this award. It also means a great deal to the management of the Missile and Space Division of the General Electric Co. and particularly to the people who have worked so hard to make our employment and career guidance programs a success. The people you see up here—Charlie Dates and Judge Allen, also Dr. Floyd Flom, manager of public affairs, and Helen Ruddy of his staff, and also my secretary, Mrs. Sarah Smith, a wonderful Negro lady and efficient and charming secretary and administrator.

The fact that you have paid us this honor means a great deal to all of us. I hope that it also means a great deal to you, for it is recognition—not of me or of the General Electric Co.—but of the success story of Negroes, performing magnificently as engineers, scientists, supervisors, secretaries, technicians, personnel experts, as well as in maintenance and development shopwork. And, they are doing these jobs in the most complicated and complex industry in the world—the missile and space industry.

We accept this award, then, with considerable pride in our people, but more in the hope that it will accomplish two important things.

First, that it will be successful in publicizing to other business firms that your large and influential organization is endeavoring to open up employment opportunities by giving recognition to businessmen who carry out their responsibilities in this area, and secondly, that it will further inform Negro youngsters that the doors of opportunity are beginning to swing open to them more than at any time in history.

In your efforts with businessmen you can rest assured that many of them will be anxious to cooperate with you. Any smart businessman facing tough competition hires the best personnel available. He cannot afford to restrict himself to a particular race, color, or creed. This is particularly true in the space and defense industry. Here the competition is for keeps, with national survival at stake. Whether employees are Negro, Caucasian, or Mongolian American makes no difference at all. The critical need is to tap all sources of talent and provide for the future by making available the best educational system we can to train people for the jobs ahead.

Offering equal employment opportunities to all segments of society is good human relations policy and good business policy. Also, by providing jobs and improving skills and abilities, we increase the national income and swell the revenues to national, State, and local governments. In the long run, these things too, mean tangible dollar-savings to business.

With all these good reasons on your side, your job will still be difficult in many cases. There is no kidding ourselves. Discrimination still exists. For example, in interviewing several of our employees for a series of vocational guidance articles in the Philadelphia Negro press, we found that many of them batted their heads against prejudice's walls for 5, 7, and 10 or more years before getting the jobs they sought and were trained for. Today's youth must be prepared for such disappointments, but at the same time should be appraised of and urged to follow the example of those who have accomplished workins through perseverance and determination.

However, there are many encouraging signs. Employment practices, in the past few years indicate that doors have opened in the walls of discrimination. As the doors open, it will be your task to see that there are qualified Negroes ready to step through them. I predict that the formation today of the career guidance program by your organization will someday be looked back upon as a milestone in the struggle to equalize future employment opportunities by equalizing education and counseling opportunities today.

The crying need today is to provide youth with the education and training that will be needed in the future. It is an unfortunate and unforgivable commentary on this land of opportunity that Negroes for years have been discouraged from preparing themselves.

The caliber of education provided them, whether in the South or in the large urban schools, has often been of submarginal quality. In most cases, the Negro youth has had to make his way in spite of, rather than because of, the education he received. I congratulate you on your sense of social responsibility in working to improve this situation.

It is of the utmost importance that we work together at all levels to encourage our youth to prepare themselves. Business careers and scientific research and development work require long years of study and hard work. In the sports world Negro baseball players, football players, boxers, and track stars have always provided a source of inspiration for the youth. Now, they need the same inspiration and even more help and encouragement to stay in school and study.

Encouragement is needed from teachers, guidance counselors, business leaders, and most important of all, from you parents in the home. It is often tempting for Negro youngsters to develop a defeatist attitude. This must be replaced with the realization that the opportunities are there if they will prepare themselves, and furthermore, that there are many people of all races who care very much and want to help them succeed.

Our own vocational guidance work has uncovered the hopeful sign that your youngsters, with only a little evidence of hope, will respond with determination.

At one high school it was cited as being an important factor in cutting the dropout rate in half.

We think the primary selling point in the conference was that many of our employees who spoke to the students were Negroes who had made the grade and with whom the youngsters could identify. This experience indicates that the youth, when they see attainable goals, can be encouraged to greater educational heights.

At this point, I would like to extend one very special thank you to Postelle Vaughn. His inspiration and cooperation have been important ingredients of the success of our vocational guidance programs. He has done a wonderful job. As you know, his work in Pennsylvania in the field of career guidance has earned him recognition by the State in

his appointment as the Philadelphia Youth Placement Officer of the Pennsylvania State Employment Service.

With men like him working on this problem and the support of a large organization like the Elks, I expect 20 years from now, when you hold your convention, the problem will not be: How are we going to get Negroes into industry? but How de we pay tribute to all of the outstanding business leaders and scientists of your race?

New Attacks on Communist Control Measures Due This Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the VFW American Security Reporter, September 1962:

NEW ATTACKS ON COMMUNIST CONTROL MEASURES DUE THIS FALL

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the Internal Security Act of 1950 (the McCarran Act) will come under increasing attack from a variety of sources during the next few months.

U.S. Communists are launching a souped-up campaign to break the back of Government agencies and laws which now restrict Communists' freedom to deceive and to subvert.

A primary target for this campaign will be the McCarran Act. It is under this act that the U.S. Communist Party and certain Communist leaders have been ordered to register with the Attorney General as agents of a foreign power.

Such registration would destroy U.S. Reds' pretense that they are a domestic, American political party. Once registered they would be tagged as agents seeking support in the United States for the foreign policy aims of the Soviet Union.

The campaign—which also will attack the FBI and the House Un-American Activities Committee—will get its main steam from three regional mass meetings scheduled for September, October, and November. One will be on the east coast, one in the Midwest, and one on the west coast.

Political Affairs (August 1962) says that the meetings will be designed to expand local activities aimed at "deluging the Attorney General and the President with demands to halt all the proceedings under the McCarran Act."

Political Affairs further urges like-minded individuals and groups to demand that candidates for public office in November "take a stand against the McCarran Act" and to step up the distribution of "anti-McCarran Act" bulletins, leaflets, and pamphlets.

Being a hard-hitting political campaign, its climax is scheduled for early January 1963. Two national conferences are scheduled for Washington, D.C., then to coincide with the opening of the new Congress.

One will be composed of some of the civil liberties and peace groups. The other is being set up by forces in the "anti-House Un-American Activities Committee movement." Both are expected to demand the repeal of the McCarran Act and abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The aim of non-Communists who become involved in such attacks is a matter of debate. Each individual is guided by his own conscience. But it can be stated without reservation that the Communist aim is to work through such mass rallies and conferences to force Congress to repeal the Internal Security Act of 1950 and to deny operating funds to the House Un-American Activities Committee if not to abolish it entirely.

U.S. Communists want more freedom for their efforts to win support for Soviet foreign policies, to undermine our free society, and eventually, to gain political power for Communist leadership in the United States.

The most effective countermeasure at this time to (a) make the general public aware of Communists' interest in abolishing the Internal Security Act of 1950 (McCarran Act), and their active support of any and all meetings, conferences, and demonstrations which promote this end, and (b) make sure that Congress and the administration as well as the general public is fully aware of your positions in respect to the Internal Security Act of 1950, the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Railroad Mergers and Monopoly—Address by Senator Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, since my statement to the Senate on August 27, 1962, on railway mergers, I have become impressed with the growing concern among my colleagues with respect to this problem and the need for some stopgap legislation to give the Congress and the administration sufficient time and opportunity to analyze what now appears to be a broad proposed reorganization of our Nation's rail plant.

In this connection, I had the privilege of addressing the Metropolitan Railway Employees' rally at Manhattan Center in New York City on September 19. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROAD MERGERS AND MONOPOLY

(Address by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, chairman of Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, before the metropolitan railway employees rally at the Manhattan Center, New York, N.Y., Sept. 19, 1962)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am very grateful for your invitation to appear on this very important occasion this evening.

I want you to know that I am also concerned with the problems which you forsee in the giant rail consolidations proposed by the trunkline carriers. In these efforts, I see an attempt by a large part of the rail industry to contract its plant and diminish rail service in an effort to reduce its capacity and achieve short-run savings at the expense of long-run growth and service. At a time when we need to grow as a productive and inventive nation, when our citizens are eager and ready to put their hands and minds to work for that growth, it is incredible that we talk of the abandonment of lines, the elimination of trackage, the reduction of passenger and freight schedules, the destruction of terminals and facilities and the laying off of hundreds of thousands of workingmen over the next 5 years. This is negative business thinking which places the maximization of profits above the basic transportation standards of competition, service adequacy, and community growth. It is a type of thinking that has filtered into some other industries in this country and it is, I believe, partly responsible for the dangerous slowdown we are experiencing in our economy.

Admittedly, some railroads are not in good shape financially. But there is too much reliance on merger as the simple way out. The railroads say they want to concentrate into a few firms, eliminate duplication and competition, stabilize the price and keep it high, and contract the plant, which generally means layoff the work force and reduce capacity.

That kind of philosophy has proved to be dangerous in the past, and it is a pitiful sight to see it being rejuvenated now, at such a crucial point in our continued effort to preserve our world leadership as a productive nation.

We need to expand and grow at a rate far greater than we are growing. We will enjoy such expansion and growth when those in positions of policy both in government and industry begin to apply the incentives for that growth. We will need all the railroad plant we have, and more, when that upturn begins to accelerate, and it will be the competitive and independent innovators of the railroad industry which will be quick to take advantage of that growth in lower rates and greater revenues.

In the meantime, it is dangerous for us to move into this panic philosophy of concentration in every field. Merger and consolidation of the big companies may result in short-term savings, appreciation of stock values, new credit, and in more acceptable business status, but it is a serious question whether in an industry already greatly concentrated, such short-time success is best for the long-range security of all the people or for the rail industry itself.

Thus, the dedicated intention of most of the rail industry, as well as a substantial part of the airline industry, to merge trunkline systems, and to reduce facilities and the work force, is a national economic problem of the very first order. It is not just a problem for railroad or airline "labor" alone, as the carrier's managements would like to have the people in this country believe. It is an issue which everyone must understand, for in one way or another, these proposed transportation mergers and the consequent intention of the rail and airline industries to shrink their facilities and employment will affect transportation service and economic development in nearly every community of the United States.

In the railroad situation, over 75 percent of the Nation's rail assets are involved in merger petitions before the Interstate Commerce Commission. In the airline field, over 50 percent of airline assets are either before the Civil Aeronautics Board for merger review or are presently in merger negotiation stages expected to lead to Board consideration within the near future. By far the key transportation mergers presently proposed in these industries are the Pennsylvania-New York Central rail merger and the American-Eastern airline merger. These mergers represent a combination of the first and third largest carriers in the railroad industry and the second and fourth largest in the domestic airline field. There is little doubt in my mind that approval of these two mergers will lead to vast counter-mergers resulting in a massive concentration of economic power in the

hands of a few companies and in the loss of vital competition and independent business action which are the basic ingredients to a healthy private enterprise economy. In addition, I believe they would trigger additional concentrations in the trucking and water carrier industries, and might drastically accelerate the present trend toward concentration throughout the country in many other industrial fields.

Today, I believe, we are at the crossroads in our national transportation policy. We either retain the structure of a competitive, balanced, multifirm system in each transportation mode, or we move on to regional monopolies and eventually to nationalization accompanied by massive contraction of facilities and service. The choice is ours today, for when once this proposed reorganization by the railroad and airline industries gets started, there will be little chance to turn back and try it a better way.

THE PRESENT INADEQUACY AND INABILITY OF GOVERNMENT TO COPE WITH THE RAIL MERGER PROBLEMS

During the past 6 months, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of which I am chairman, has been looking into the merger problem with respect to the railroad industry. The situation which we have found can indeed be described as a failure of responsibility and policy for which both government and industry must share equally. It is a confused situation without necessary direction, guidance, or present resolution.

In the first place, the existing law delegating sole authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission to permit mergers and consolidations is totally lacking in appropriate and definitive criteria for the acceptance of such transactions. Instead, the law gives to the Commission only the vague instruction to find rail mergers "consistent with the public interest" before allowing them to go forward.

There are no adequate prerequisites which must be determined, no norms or minimum standards which must be met, nor are there proper guides in the statute for Commission participation in the directions of merger. The Commission is quite free to approve mergers resulting in national or regional rail monopolies, the elimination of vital competition, the undue contraction of railroad facilities and service, substantial unemployment of workers, discrimination of areas and communities, and the like, if it feels that the enhancement of railroad profits and financial conditions are of paramount importance, or that other similar advantages can be achieved in "the public interest."

This type of broad legislative determination may have been workable in some of the smaller rail consolidations or acquisitions in the past, but it would seem to have serious implications, and might lead to substantial economic imbalances, when applied to the huge trunkline amalgamations being presented to the Commission today. Thus, this is an area where Congress should take action to impose upon the Commission protective and definitive safeguards and prerequisites which must be met before any large consolidations are allowed to be consummated.

In the second place, the Commission is not presently equipped to test and appraise the impacts of these mergers being proposed by the rail industry, and it has not yet developed its own specific criteria applicable to the broad plans being presented. Considering the wide latitude which the Congress gave to the Commission in rendering these vast social and economic judgments which will affect the businesses, the jobs, and the lives of so many people in this country, it is most alarming to observe such an inadequacy on the part of this regulatory body.

For instance, at a time when this agency is allowing major rail merger cases to be completed and submitted for final argument, its Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics is still conducting a research study into new and useful criteria, the susceptibility of such criteria to measurement, and procedures and tests for economic analysis of public interest factors. It further appears that there is no definite pattern for testing the statutory criterion of adequacy of service and no overall procedures for analyzing the effects of plant contraction on economic growth of communities. In fact, the Commission's staff has raised the issue of whether these big trunkline mergers may well result in increased costs per unit of output, and in other inefficiencies because of size and utilization, but the Commission has developed no methods for proper consideration of this matter.

Further, this agency has made no helpful studies concerning the density of rail traffic along major rail routes and between major points in order to determine the extent to which many areas can support rail competition. Likewise there have been no independent and across-the-board studies made by the Commission of the impact of diversion of traffic at major interchange points resulting from mergers. In addition, the Commission is without adequate information for the determination of the effects of truck and water carrier competition over specific routes and between major points, in order to test fully the allegations of the merging roads that they are suffering from competition from other modes of transport.

Most important, is the admission by the Commission that it has no details as to what groups actually control railroad companies and the actual influence exerted upon present systems, and to be exerted upon proposed systems, by commercial banks, insurance companies, investment banks, and other financial and investor institutions. Except what by chance may be brought out in the hearings of each merger case, the Commission will not be aware of the true picture of financial overlay which may result if these gigantic mergers and consolidations are permitted to go forward.

Finally, the Commission rigidly adheres to a policy of considering each merger application on an isolated basis and renders its decision only on the particular facts developed within the separate proceeding. It has not adopted procedures to consider the merger's impact in relation to other proposed mergers in the region, or other possible mergers which might be effected to counter the strength of the combination being proposed. The Commission has so far refused to consolidate cases and make any broad determinations. It does not make independent investigations of its own, in order to develop its own appraisal of sound merger directions by which it can more sensibly test the mergers proposed. Consolidation of all merger proposals would appear to be fundamental at this stage in the eastern merger proceedings. Only by such consolidation, can we get, for the record, an adequate opportunity to examine the real economic imbalances between the proposed systems, the possible effects of traffic diversion, the discriminations to communities and areas, and most important, the long-range impact which a Pennsylvania-Central merger will have on transportation in the East. There is too much to be determined here to continue on with this piecemeal approach, basing each decision on a limited, and many times, untested, case.

The big carriers like the case by case approach, because they know that approval of the B. & O.-C. & O. merger will justify similar approval of the Norfolk & Western-Nickle Plate-Wabash combination. They also know and they know that the Commission knows, that the effective establishment of these new systems is conditioned upon the Commission's acceptance of the Pennsylvania-Central merger at best, a very questionable combination in the public interest. At the recent hearings before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, the chief executive officer of the Pennsylvania Railroad boldly admitted that these three eastern mergers were a package deal, and that we had to buy the Pennsylvania or nothing at all.

What kind of responsible planning is this? The only merger plan presented to the Commission for decision requires approval of the consolidation of the country's largest railroads. For this reason, I have urged that the Commission consolidate all petitions in the East, and issue a stay on the final decision of all pending merger cases, so that a realistic, unencumbered determination can be made on this Pennsylvania-Central amalgamation, and appropriate appeals taken upon that decision before any of the other mergers are allowed to go forward.

Third, it was hoped that the administration would vigorously cope with the serious inadequacies of the present law with respect to rail mergers and the inability of the Interstate Commerce Commission to give a sufficient and perceptive testing of this complicated problem.

On January 17 of this year, in my speech on the Senate floor, and also by special letter to the President of the United States, I called for the establishment of an executive commission composed of representatives from management, labor, the Government, and the public to begin without delay a thorough study of the rail merger problem and to make recommendations both to the Interstate Commerce Commission and to Congress with respect to the development of a national transportation merger policy. Some 2 months thereafter, in his transportation message to the Congress, President Kennedy specifically recognized the administration's responsibility to recommend more specific guidelines and procedures with respect to transportation mergers and he announced the formation of an interagency group composed only of administration officials to formulate general administration policies on mergers and to assist the Department of Justice in "developing a Government position" in merger cases before regulatory agencies. Although this type of organization was a far cry from my recommendation, I nevertheless supported it as a good first step in obtaining some objective and independent analyses of what was developing as a national domestic problem.

At the hearings of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly in early July, I learned that this group had met only twice since its formation, that its meetings were devoted substantially to procedure and organizational matters, and that except for the circulation of certain staff papers and memorandums among its members, there has been no real attempt to investigate and analyze the present transportation merger movement, in general, and the rapidly moving individual cases in particular. It appeared that the bulk of its staff work was done by a few employees of the various agencies and that there had been no substantial hearings or consultations conducted with interested parties. Over 6 months have now transpired since that interagency group was formed and it has yet to make any recommendations or any official announcement as to the particular work it has been doing or as to the information which it has obtained in its analysis of the rail merger problem. From what I have been able to learn, there is some type of final draft of a general criteria statement being circulated among its members. However, I was specifically informed yesterday that at no time has railway labor been given an opportunity for a hearing or consultation with all members of the group, or the chance to make a personal presentation of their position on these merger issues. One can only conclude that either the interagency

group needs considerably more time to analyze the problem before it or that it is not too serious about meeting the issues at hand. Either way this group, made up of members who I am informed have had very little experience in the transportation field, does not appear to be the type of organization best fitted for the responsibilities created by the crisis we have before us.

Also, I have learned that the Department of Commerce, which appears to be a basic source for furnishing information to the interagency group, has made no investigations, studies, reports, or analyses concerning existing competition along major routes and within areas of the country, the existing ownership, control, and influence by investors, banks and other financial interests over the railroads, or the interlocking directorates and interests between the railroads and other carriers, shippers, customers, banks, and institutions. No investigation has been made by the Department with respect to the effects of the reduction of freight and passenger service upon economic growth in the areas involved in these prospective mergers. In particular, the Department has not compiled any information on the operation of the various rate bureaus in order to assess the impact of these large mergers on the ability of independent action in ratemaking. In fact, it appears that the Department has made no substantial independent analysis of the rail merger problem whatsoever, but rather intends to rely on the opinions of interested parties and reports from outside institutions and writers.

Thus, at this late date, when Congress is only a few weeks away from adjournment, we have not yet received an assessment of this problem from the administration, nor any constructive legislation or policy recommendations for meeting the inadequacies and inabilities which obviously exist in the handling of the industry's reorganization proposals.

Fourth, the carriers themselves have come up with vast proposals for the combination of their trunklines which would seem to create great imbalances and inequities within the various regions served. In their helter-skelter search for attainable mergers satisfactory to owners and investors, they have inevitably been drawn to merging the strong with the strong, and to eliminating competition and creating regional monopolies. It is their own aggressive desires to reduce capacity rather than to increase competition and fulfill capacity which has brought them now into a questionable plan for reorganization.

In the Northwest, the proposed Northern Pacific-Great Northern-Burlington combine will be over four times larger than its nearest competitor in assets and over three times its size in operating income. In the Southeast, the prospective Seaboard-Atlantic Coastline merger will produce a system almost twice the size of its only substantial competitor and will result in a number of monopoly situations through the Southeastern States. The present intention of the Southern Pacific to acquire the Western Pacific as well as the Rock Island has most certainly raised many questions among the experts with respect to the imbalance of power in the Southwest.

However, the most far-reaching and, to me, the most inadequately planned proposal by the railroad industry, is the proposal to merge the New York Central with the Pennsylvania Rialroad. These two roads are in effect the two largest railroads in the United States. They have traditionally been powerful influences in the rate associations and in the trade associations, which to a large measure effectuate rail policy. They presently provide the largest share of the rail competition in the Central, Eastern, and Great Lakes regions of the country which area contains over 50 percent of the country's production and population. It is incredible to me and I am sure to those of you who have spent your careers in railroading, that of all the possible savings which could be derived, joint ownership and leasing and other methods which might have been effectuated by each of these carriers to improve their conditions, they would end up in urging a joinder of their properties creating such an imbalance of economic power in the railroad industry.

It should be noted that a combination of the Pennsylvania and the Central was not a part of Prof. William Ripley's draft plan for consolidations of the Nation's railroads under the 1920 Transportation Act, nor was it even suggested in the Commission's tentative or final plans under that act. The four-system plan of 1932 proposed by the eastern carriers specifically kept the Pennsylvania and the New York Central as separate competitive systems. Indeed, such a combination of giants was not even recommended by proponents of the Prince plan, which plan provided for two separate competitive systems in the East, one centered around the New York Central and another around the Pennsylvania.

Experts have testified before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly that a combination would have over 50 percent of the assets, trackage, operating revenue, employees, and slightly less than 50 percent of the carloads originated and terminated, and freight cars owned. It has been estimated that this merged company would be about twice the size of the next proposed system (C. & O.) and about three times the size of the third proposed system (Norfolk & Western, Nickel Plate, Wabash).

These percentages indicate a position of monopoly control over rail operations in the respective area. As stated by the experts, it would give the big company excessive power in the purchasing of railroad supplies, the influencing of rates throughout the Nation, and in effectuating rail transportation policy. There seems to be little doubt that such size and power would give the company a big advantage in its dealings with the Interstate Commerce Commission and with other branches of the Federal and State Governments which could be detrimental not only to other railroads but to alternative modes of transportation as well.

One of the more serious implications of the bringing together of the Nation's two largest carriers concerns the diversion of traffic to the favor of these companies at the major southern and western interchange points and at various other interchange points within the area served. The Pennsylvania and the New York Central carry a great percentage of freight traffic to the western gateways of Chicago, Peoria, and St. Louis, and to the southern gateways of Washington, Cincinnati, and Louisville. Over the years they have built up traditional relationships with the interchanging carriers. One such relationship which is well known is that between the Pennsylvania and the Santa Fe. By combining the Pennsylvania with the New York Central, a tremendous bargaining advantage at these interchange points can be used to swing a substantial amount of freight traffic away from competitive roads. Furthermore, the bringing together of the large and experienced staffs which over the years have handled freight solicitation and given this company a superior position over all other remaining carriers in its area, will put this giant company in a most advantageous competitive position. Already these companies have large freight offices in nearly every important city in the United States.

Finally, the Congress itself, perhaps assuming that the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board were adequately equipped to handle this stepped-up transportation merger movement and that the executive arm of the Government was prepared to assess the matter and make the necessary recommendations to Congress for straightening out any incapabilities and inequities which might exist in the process of such movement, has not yet undertaken any sufficient extensive study of the transportation merger problem. The Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee recommended in 1958 that there should be an examination of Federal policy on the subject of the large-scale consolidations and mergers in the railroad industry. A draft report of a Special Study Group on Transportation Policy in the United States, known as the Doyle Report (Rept. No. 445, Senate print, 87th Cong., 1st sess., dated June 26, 1961), devoted some 40 out of 732 pages to a discussion of a history of rail mergers and rail merger policies and gave some broad suggestions for a new transportation policy dealing with rail consolidations. This was in no sense an adequate and perceptive investigation and analysis of the social and economic impacts of transportation mergers and consolidations being proposed today.

CONCLUSION

Now, in conclusion, let me say this: I am not opposed to railroad and airline mergers, as such. I recognize that there may be some types of mergers which will improve economies and services, and retain a healthy, competitive balance among systems. Mergers among small and medium lines, or small lines into the larger trunklines may be helpful. End to end mergers coupled with traffic protections might be acceptable. What I am concerned about are these giant consolidations among the Nation's largest trunkline carriers, which mergers tend toward monopoly throughout vast regions of our country.

The railroads claim mergers the size of the Pennsylvania and the New York Central are necessary to improve their earnings, but we have learned from our study of this problem that there are a number of effective ways, short of merger, that the larger railroads can help themselves toward financial improvement. They can reduce their capacity in areas which no longer support them and expand capacity in areas where growth is taking place. They can work out joint uses of trackage, repair shops, terminals, accounting procedures, and management responsibility. They can improve their management, conduct efficiency studies, reduce costs, and revamp working procedures. They can, under present law, adopt flexible competitive pricing methods to recapture for them profitable freight lost to other modes of transport. Thus, they should strive to help themselves.

There has never been a time when such a large measure of the Nation's rail properties have been involved in such a serious and dedicated intention to consolidate. It is my great fear that we are moving too fast without realizing the consequences, and that once this is done, there will be no undoing it. That is why I introduced S. 3097, the railroad merger moratorium bill, to give us breathing time and a chance for Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the administration to investigate thoroughly this proposed reorganization of our rail plant. This bill is not an absolute moratorium. It is a fair and reasonable piece of legislation. It seeks to prevent for a limited time merger approvals by the Commission involving a railroad of over $200 million in assets, not then in bankruptcy, where such merger would not substantially lessen competition and tend toward monopoly. Thus, it would permit many necessary and good mergers to go forward today.

Time is indeed necessary to determine whether we really want to tread the path to monopoly in the railroad industry. Time

is necessary to develop ways in which we can be absolutely certain the smaller and weaker railroads will be protected and improved by any merger plans accepted. Time is necessary for us to study the effect of these mergers on communities and areas of the country in terms of their long-range growth. The problem of the future of New England rail transportation is an example in this area.

All I am asking, and all I am intending, is that we have the time and opportunity to analyze these vast anticompetitive and, in many instances, monopolistic plans which are being put together by the industry.

S. 3097, the moratorium bill, has been reported favorably by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly and is presently on the agenda of the Senate Judiciary Committee awaiting action. I urge you to support this bill with all the enthusiasm you can muster. The session is growing short, and we need to get that bill out for a vote. I am very pleased to find support increasing for the bill. Both the majority leader and the deputy majority leader of the Senate are cosponsors of the bill and are working for its passage.

Thus I urge you, and I want you to urge your friends, to stand behind this legislation, and work for it now so that Congress can become alerted, and so that we can have a strong and healthier private transportation system in this United States.

Thank you again, my friends, for allowing me this opportunity to associate with you and discuss what I consider one of the most important domestic issues of the day. This has been an important evening for all of us. I hope I have helped in a small way to make it so.

The C. & N.W. Railway Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have another long list of letters and telegrams this morning demanding action on the part of the administration in settling the C. & N.W. Railway strike. Mr. Speaker, I place a few of these in the RECORD because I think this is of national interest, not simply affecting the Midwestern States:

HURON, S. DAK.,
September 22, 1962.

Representative E. Y. BERRY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We have been encouraged by the action of President Kennedy in demanding the opposition arbitrate immediately. If an immediate settlement isn't made, the sugarbeet crop of 1962 in South Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa can be written off as a total economic disaster to all concerned and such economic loss can seriously affect the future of the sugar industry in this State.

JAMES VALLEY BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
DUANE BUCKLEY,
Vice President.

SIOUX CITY, IOWA,
September 24, 1962.

Congressman E. Y. BERRY,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

Vacationing and campaigning is wonderful for the President, but tied up railroad strike crops rotting in the fields are more important and vital to the Nation. Thanks for keeping the public informed on the New Frontier program.

KATHERINE V. FRANK.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
September 22, 1962.

Hon. E. Y. BERRY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The following wire sent today to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman, Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate and Hon OREN HARRIS, chairman, Committee on Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.: "Early settlement of C. & N.W. Railway strike and immediate resumption of service imperative to assure harvest by hundreds of South Dakota, Iowa, and Nebraska farmers of 150,000-ton sugarbeet crop solely dependent on C. & N.W. for shipment to Belle Fourche, S. Dak., sugar factory. Failure to provide cars and full service of railroad immediately will prove disastrous to farmers and sugar company if delay is followed by early freezing so frequent in that area. Similar situation said to prevail in other beet-growing areas served exclusively by C. & N.W. Continued failure of parties to agree on terms of arbitration after accepting President Kennedy's request to arbitrate issues involved in present strike indicates necessity that Congress enact legislation to prevent widespread public injury by strikes resulting from deadlocks by requiring that all parties be bound by decisions of emergency factfinding boards."

D. W. LOVE,
Executive Vice President and General Manager, Utah-Idaho Sugar Co.

BELLE FOURCHE, S. DAK.,
September 21, 1962.

Hon. E. Y. BERRY,
Washington, D.C.:

We have been encouraged by the action of President Kennedy in requesting the opposing sides immediately submit the arbitrations but the strikes continue and every day the sugarbeet situation becomes more critical. A few weeks more of talk and negotiations and South Dakota, Iowa, and Nebraska sugarbeet growers can write off their 1962 sugarbeet crop. Such an economic loss can materially effect the future of the sugarbeet industry in the three States.

KEN ANDERSON,
President,
Black Hills Sugarbeet Growers.

Soviet Propaganda About the U–2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, at the time when our U–2 supposedly was shot down over Russia, I expressed great dissatisfaction about the way in which the affair was handled. I continue to feel that the way it was put to the American people and to the world was a propaganda mistake on our part.

Mr. Bill Henry writes very enlighteningly on this subject in the Los Angeles Times, with a dateline from Las Vegas, where he was attending the Air Force Association convention last week. I think my colleagues should read this column, so I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY THE WAY—DO YOU WINCE AT MENTION OF U–2?

(By Bill Henry)

LAS VEGAS.—Everybody talks about propaganda, especially the Soviet variety. Have you ever tested yourself? What's your reaction when somebody brings up the subject of the U–2? Do you blush a little and stir uneasily as if they'd mentioned the no-good uncle who robbed the bank? If so, you're a sucker for the Kremlin's line. There are even people up here at the Air Force Association and Defense Orientation Conference meetings who are inclined to lower their voices and glance uneasily around the room when the U–2 is mentioned—as, indeed, it is, because of recent Russian and Red Chinese yelps that they've been spied upon. The U–2 seems to be a little like a gal with a shady reputation. Everybody wants to hear all the gossip about her and wouldn't miss the chance to see her. But nobody wants to take the responsibility of being caught with her. Actually, of course, that isn't entirely true. The Lockheed people, who are well represented at the big space age show, are mighty proud of the U–2 as all Americans ought to be. The wide-winged plane is one of the most astonishing products of the air age—in every way. Nearly 10 years old, the U–2's performance still hasn't been equalled, much less surpassed. The very idea of proposing to build such a plane was a fantastic bit of pioneering. When Kelly Johnson, Lockheed's vice president in charge of advanced development projects, thought up the idea and proposed it to the Air Force they not only turned it down but officially informed him that he was nuts. No plane could be built, they said, to develop such speed and carry such loads at the utterly implausible height of 80,000 feet. Later, they wanted it and Kelly turned out his first hand-built model in a fantastically short 8 months.

IT'S STILL A VERY USEFUL ASSET

The U–2 has been in ill repute through guilt-by-association. Nobody seems to think of it as an amazingly successful aerial development which, even now, supplies us with enormously valuable information about weather, radiation, fallout and no end of other scientific subjects. Everybody remembers the headlines when Francis Gary Powers was downed and Nikita Khrushchev built it into a great world event by using it as an excuse to call off a summit conference. Our own news people unwittingly aided "Nikky's" cause by calling the U–2 a "spy plane" and a "snooper plane." The actual fact is that without the information gleaned by the U–2 we would still be almost totally in the dark about Soviet air and missile bases. In the dozens of flights over Russia we gained an enormous amount of information, not to mention a complete mapping of a great part of the Communist empire. What we are learning nowadays from our latest photographic satellites becomes more intelligible because of the basic knowledge supplied us by the U–2.

THERE'S NOTHING PASSÉ ABOUT IT

When the big air show comes to an end tomorrow with a spectacular firepower display at a nearby base, nothing would please the spectators more than a good look at a U–2, even though, on the ground, its vast droopy wings give it the appearance of an exhausted carrier pigeon. Nevadans have a claim of sorts on the U–2 success. It was to a strip at Watertown, Nev.—see if you can find it on a map—that Kelly Johnson surreptitiously trucked the first U–2 to assemble and test-fly it. It is a superb technical development, produced so far ahead of its time that even today, many years after it was

proposed and built, it is absolutely unique in its great capacity for usefulness. It offers one great and good reason why our enemies would like to shame us into not continuing to fly it.

Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the California Farmer, of September 15, 1962, contained the following editorial by Jack Pickett on the subject of soil and water conservation districts:

EDITORIALLY SPEAKING: WE BELIEVE
(By Jack Pickett)

One of our subscribers wrote us to say she was canceling her subscription and went on to say that she thought this editor hated the State of California and hated his country because he was so critical of both.

Lady, we love this country and State with a consuming passion. We all have differing ideas of what is best for our country. Personally, we put the country way above political party. In fact, to our observation, the two political parties have sort of swirled together into an indiscriminate blob. The main idea of both seems to be to outpromise the other to obtain votes.

For this reason we still think the individual is much more important than the party. To this you might add that the type of people that our leaders surround themselves with is also of great importance.

Yes, we think this country is the greatest and we saw some of the others during the war. This State is the greatest and has a remarkable virility. We are admittedly biased in favor of agriculture and, as our father before us said, we are proud of our enemies and we have dedicated a great deal of time and research developing our prejudices.

Some people say, "Don't discuss politics or religion." Unfortunately, religion has got itself immersed in politics and politics has immersed each and every one of us right up to our necks.

If organized labor confiscates part of their members' dues for the purpose of electing politicians and influencing legislation, and businessmen abstain from political action for fear of losing a customer, who will end up owning the legislative halls?

We will fight for our country, for our State, and for agriculture, and we will criticize any and all political parties that wander away from the ideals that made this country great.

SOIL CONSERVATION IS REACHING AGAIN

In the past we have referred to the propaganda outfit called the National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts. All this outfit does is try to figure out new ways that the Soil Conservation Districts can, first, get more Federal funds; second, get more powers; and, third, encroach on or absorb other Federal and State agencies and their functions.

Their newsletter of August 14 is beating the drums for new responsibilities. They say they are restless under the limited power of just attending to soil erosion and the conservation of soil and water resources.

Now, get a load of what they want in the way of new responsibilities: We use their own words. "These responsibilities include not only watershed development and the upstream share of the flood prevention job, but farm forest development and marketing of farm forest products, the development of recreational facilities on farm and ranch lands where such facilities are physically and commercially desirable, adjustments in land-use in accordance with physical and economic needs, rural and community development programs designed to fortify the local economic base and relieve rural underdevelopment, water resource and river basin development, conservation and resource development activities on public lands, and the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources."

Now isn't that a modest demand? What they are saying is, "Let us take over the main functions of the Army Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, State, and Federal forestry services, fish and game, etc."

The truth of the matter is that if an impartial board of honest men were called in to make an appraisal of the present effectiveness and value of the entire soil conservation set-up they would recommend that the entire deal be abolished and that a few functions that they do perform be absorbed by other more efficient agencies already in the field.

DUPLICATION AD INFINITUM

This National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts keeps us all stirred up with their tactics. Never did an organization work harder at self-perpetuation and expansion.

In their August 21 newsletter, they are trying to make a point but in our estimation they defeat their own purpose. We all know they want to greatly expand the soil conservation districts' activities in the field of soil and moisture conservation. Trying to get more money, they make quite a point of the increased appropriations of other Government agencies in this same field. We don't know how this affects you, but to our mind it just drives home with tremendous force the duplicating services and overlapping services of a great number of Government bureaus.

Take a look at these budget figures of five Government agencies for this same service:

	1962 estimated	1963 appropriated
Bureau of Land Management: Soil and moisture conservation	$6,413,530	$10,074,200
Bureau of Indian Affairs: Soil and moisture conservation	5,166,692	5,577,000
National Park Service: Soil and moisture conservation	106,540	200,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: Soil and moisture conservation	208,000	700,000
Forest Service: Forest land management	127,641,000	139,400,000

Wiley Program for Improved Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the conservation, best management, and utilization and possible replenishment of our soil, water, and natural resources is a major challenge confronting the Nation.

In a weekend address over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to review fundamental principles of what I believe to be a sound conservation program. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the address and a supplemental statement on conservation.

There being no objection, the excerpts and supplemental statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY OUTLINES 11-POINT CONSERVATION PROGRAM

(Excerpts of address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, over Wisconsin radio stations during weekend of September 22 and 23, 1962)

For the future, Wisconsin, and the Nation, will require ever-greater resources. According to predictions, this will include: By 1980, we will need twice our current utilization of water now totaling 300 billion gallons of water a day; timber requirements, too, are expected to double in the next 40 years; preserving a fertile, productive soil to feed an ever-growing population.

In Wisconsin, fortunately, we are blessed with a rich natural, heritage, including: A beautiful, scenic outdoors; a bountiful water supply; a fertile, productive soil, and great forest lands.

For the years ahead, however, we must assure not only enough, but good use of our natural resources. The goals to shoot for, and which I have fought for, include:

1. Generally improving soil, water, and forest conservation programs.

2. Further expanding the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. (of tremendous value to wood products industries, and now providing over 50,000 jobs and a billion dollars in income, annually).

3. Guarding against pollution of Wisconsin's lakes and streams.

What else should be done?

4. Expanding watershed projects (in Wisconsin, a leading State, for example, plans for 33 projects are underway; of these, 18 have been approved for planning, and 11, covering almost 500,000 acres, have been approved for operation under the small watershed program).

5. Improving flood-control programs.

6. The Congress, too, should approve the Wiley-sponsored legislation creating the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in Wisconsin (now getting favorable consideration). The Reserve would serve not only to protect Wisconsin's unique formations of the glacier age but also valuable outdoor areas of scenic, geological, and historical significance; and, as well, create more tourist attractions.

7. In addition, we need to guard against threats to Wisconsin's water resources (for example: The Chicago water steal, still pending before a special master, would threaten to lower water levels, not only of Lake Michigan, but all the Great Lakes).

8. Improve and further expand fish and wildlife habitat programs.

9. Improve and extend highway, including primary and secondary roads, and access roadways to all of Wisconsin, including the northland.

10. Expand airports to provide better air access to all of Wisconsin.

11. Enactment of Senate-passed bill S. 3117, to provide $50 billion for assistance to States in expanding outdoor recreational programs.

All of which I have voted for and shall continue to fight for.

WISCONSIN'S CONSERVATION NEEDS OF THE FUTURE

Over the years, Wisconsin has had a remarkably good record in conservation; however, there is still real work to be done.

According to the "Inventory of Soil and Water Conservation Needs," recently completed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and cooperating State agencies, for example: More than 60 percent of the agricultural land in Wisconsin still needs conservation treatment of some kind; of the State's 12 million acres of cultivated cropland, 7⅓ million acres need soil and water conservation measures. Erosion is the dominant problem on 53 percent of the cropland needing treatment; excess water on 27 percent; and other unfavorable soil conditions on 20 percent; establishment of new grass is needed on 1,126,000 acres of pasture, including land to be shifted to this use by 1975—more than one-half million acres of existing pasture needs improvement of cover; of nearly 14 million acres of privately owned forest and woodland, 8½ million acres needs conservation treatment—this includes establishment of new stands on 5 million acres, and stand improvement on 3¼ million acres.

In creating a more effective conservation program, the challenge, of course, is not just to preserve, but to better utilize our resources: For the needs, and enjoyment, of our people; for industry and the economy; and to serve our children, and children's children of the future.

In accomplishing many of these objectives, I can be of special service now that I have been appointed by Vice President JOHNSON to the National Forest Reservation Commission.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT ON CONSERVATION

As Senator of Wisconsin—a State with an outstanding record in conservation—I would like to review my other efforts—and goals—in establishing a more effective conservation program in Wisconsin:

Introduction of legislation to provide Wisconsin a fair share of funds annually apportioned under the Pittman-Robinson Act for wildlife restoration and management projects.

A more effective antilamprey program to prevent further killing off of lake trout—of great importance to Wisconsin's commercial fisheries.

Cosponsorship of legislation to establish a program for making saline, or brackish water suitable for industrial, agricultural, and human consumption purposes.

Supported acceleration of onfarm soil and water conservation practices.

Expanding public education on the need for conservation of natural resources.

Improvement of the Necadah National Wildlife Refuge and the Horicon National Wildlife Refuge.

Improvement of and expansion of fishery management programs.

Expanding research studies on weather forecasting to minimize losses from unwarned-of storms.

Improvement of our national forest, including the Nicolet and Chequamegon Forests.

Expansion of our highway program to provide better access to more communities.

Supported passage of the 1962 Outdoor Recreational Act: (1) To carry out operations of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; and (2) authorizing the appropriation of $50 million for aid to States in developing outdoor recreational programs; and support of additional funds for forest antidisease research.

TWELVE-PRONGED ATTACK ON ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF WISCONSIN

In Wisconsin, particularly the northland, there are extremely serious economic problems.

Tragically, a great many commnuities have been hard hit—for example, by the closing of the Montreal Mine—resulting in loss of jobs, diminished income, lower living standards and generally, a very bad economic situation.

Recently, I urged the Area Redevelopment Administration to provide "crash" economic assistance.

In response, Mr. William L. Batt, Administrator of the area redevelopment program, stated that "within limitations of personnel and funds, work was (a) underway in a few areas of Wisconsin; and (b) the administration is developing more task force teams."

Because the situation is critical in northern Wisconsin, however, I have urged high priority for efforts to develop not only immediate—but long-range—programs for improving the economy. This includes creation of task forces for exploration of the following possibilities:

1. Survey, and discuss with local labor, business, and civic leaders, problems—and economic potentials—to determine the best way to break out of the economic doldrums.

2. Explore the possibility of channeling more Government contracts—particularly defense—to these hard-hit communities. Under present procurement policies, contracting, unwisely, is shifting away from Wisconsin and the Midwest.

3. Promoting greater use of Wisconsin ports for shipping, both by Uncle Sam and private enterprise and by so doing, increase trade and commerce, creating more jobs, business, and industrial activities and economic progress.

4. Expand efforts to attract new industries in these communities blessed with wonderful environment, plenty of manpower, ample water supplies, and other resources.

5. Development of tourist attractions projects to promote greater tourism (now one of our State's largest industries).

6. Develop facilities for winter sports to make Wisconsin an all-year-round tourist mecca.

7. Tackle the problems confronting fishermen in Bayfield, and other communities, now prohibited from taking lake trout (because of the diminished supply resulting from lampray killoffs).

8. Extension of better roadways into the northland to bring tourists, fishermen, hunters, and vacationers, and to promote trade and commerce.

9. Exploration for development of new, wood-using industries to utilize the growing surplus of uncut timber (of which about 50 percent of the present annual harvest is now going to waste in the woods).

10. Expanded research for beneficiation of low-grade iron ore, of which there are tremendous reservoirs in Wisconsin. The goal would be to find a way to economically process this ore and thus make it more competitive on the market.

11. Take a new, hard look at imports now damaging domestic mining with the object of recommending changes in import policy.

12. Provide all possible economic assistance, including distribution of surplus foodstuffs, to enable the good folks of the north land to stay on the land they love—until a new, dynamic, economic program can be set up there to brighten the future.

Who's in Charge Here?—Not Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a recent issue of the New York Times magazine carried an article on the subject of the President's Commission on the Status of Women. It is entitled "Who's in Charge Here?—Not Women."

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times magazine, Sept. 2, 1962]

WHO'S IN CHARGE HERE?—NOT WOMEN: SPACE-AGE WOMEN, SAYS A WOMAN, ARE STILL IN THE 19TH CENTURY

(By Lee Graham)

(NOTE.—Lee Graham is the author of "If You Are a Woman," and conducts weekly TV and radio interviews on stations WUHF and WNYC.)

There has been a tendency in recent years to picture the American woman—at home and abroad—as a domineering mom who exploits the male, destroys his masculinity and reduces him to a quivering Milquetoast. This image is a serious distortion of reality.

The truth is that women may have been considered emancipated when the 19th amendment gave them the vote in 1920, but in various areas— particularly the economic, political, and legal ones—they are still second-class citizens; in the middle of the 20th century, women are subject to prejudices that smack of the 19th century.

The fact that women are still far from emancipated is accented by recent moves to remedy the situation, among them these:

Item: President Kennedy has found it necessary to order Federal departments and agencies not to practice discrimination against women in Government career service.

Item: Congress has before it legislation embodying the principle of equal pay for equal work by women employed by firms engaged in interstate commerce.

Item: The President has established a Commission on the Status of Women.

The last is a particularly interesting development. The 26-member commission, under the chairmanship of Eleanor Roosevelt, plans to report its findings by October 1, 1963. This is the first time so broad a study of discrimination against women has been undertaken. Racial prejudice has certainly received its share of analysis, but, as Dr. Goodwin Watson, Columbia University psychologist, has pointed out, "Prejudice on the basis of sex has been largely neglected up to now."

In the areas of discrimination, some of the worst examples lie in the area of employment. Although job-evaluation techniques may indicate that a woman is doing the same work as a man, surveys made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveal a double wage standard in every business, industry, and profession.

A 1961 Board of Labor Statistics study of wages in a number of Chicago firms, for example, showed that women assemblers earned $1.68 an hour; men, $2.07. Women machine-tool operators were paid $1.71; men earned $2.05. In retailing, women averaged $1.15 an hour; men averaged $1.74. In a special review of basic take-home-pay guarantees, women could count on $35 a week; men, on $45.

Women do no better in offices and banks. The National Office Management Association asked 1,900 companies in the United States and Canada whether they had different wage scales for men and women, and more than one-third answered "Yes." When a large number of banks were asked the same question, it was found that women tellers, with the identical background and experience as their male counterparts, were paid anywhere from $5.50 to $31 a week less.

Nor is life any easier for the woman who is professionally trained. Her annual salary, Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg said in a recent talk, is about $1,000 less than that of a comparably trained man.

If women worked only for mink coats and new cars, this inequity might not be dam-

aging. But, contrary to many popular conceptions, almost all women work from economic need. Esther Peterson, an Assistant Secretary of Labor, and the Commission's Executive Vice Chairman, is adamant on this point.

"I get so annoyed," she recently said, "when I still hear people say that women work for pin money. Are the 4,600,000 women who are the sole support of their families working for pin money? Are the 7,500,000 mothers whose husbands earn less than $3,000 a year working for pin money? Are the widowed, separated and single women who have no man to support them working for pin money? Our studies show that these women work for the same reasons that men do—to support themselves and make life brighter for their dependents."

Another form of discrimination against working women is the denial of equal opportunity. True, the latest census report lists women in almost every imaginable job classification—including welders, stonemasons and nuclear physicists. But the number of women in top-level jobs is astonishingly small, even in traditionally feminine fields like library work and teaching. How many women, for example, are college presidents? Or, for that matter, how many women fashion designers, interior decorators or chefs are their own bosses?

In some fields, a woman has virtually no chance at all. The New York Stock Exchange will not allow one on its floor—even if she is a partner in a member firm. Seventy-five percent of bank employees are women; yet they are refused admission to three of the four graduate banking schools run by bankers' associations and, with rare exceptions, are barred from interviewing loan applicants or handling trusts.

Insurance companies are also reluctant to promote women to top positions. Clients, they explain, have no confidence in a woman's suggestions or decisions. Law firms relegate whatever aspiring Portias they do employ to routine cases. And most churches refuse to allow a woman in their pulpits.

In contrast, women receive a much warmer welcome from newspapers, magazines, advertising agencies and department stores. They also face no perceptible bias in the creative arts. But in the performing arts it is otherwise. Thus, for example, while they are irreplacable as coloraturas, ballerinas and ingenues, women find careers as instrumental soloists, just about impossible (a Morini or a Novaes is a great exception).

Women's progress in politics is also not very encouraging, in spite of the fact that they now hold 52 percent of the votes. The Senate has 2 women members; the House of Representatives, 17. There are close to 350 women in State legislatures, as well as some assorted mayors and judges. But the figures are hardly impressive, considering that women outnumber men in the United States by 100 to 97.

Nor have women made much headway in obtaining appointive offices. To be sure, there is Mrs. Peterson in the Labor Department—not to mention the White House physician, Dr. Janet Travell. But despite these appointments and the President's order on women in the career service, many women, including Mrs. Roosevelt, feel that he still has not named enough of their sex to policymaking posts. He is the first Chief Executive since Herbert Hoover, for example, not to have had a woman in a full-fledged Cabinet position.

One politican who has done well by women is Mayor Wagner. He has put three into important jobs in New York City's administration. They are Hortense Gabel, head of the rent and rehabilitation administration; Anna Kross, commissioner of correction, and Dr. Leona Baumgartner, commissioner of health. All seem to be doing effective work.

But in the area of legal rights, the American woman has yet to achieve full equality. The Constitution contains nothing that would bar her from any elective or appointive office, yet there are three States which refuse her the right to serve as a juror. There are also certain States where she can't open a business of her own without her spouse's written permission. But for a truly feudal abrogation of her rights, the place to go is Texas. There the law provides: if a husband catches his wife in an act of adultery, his killing of the lover is justifiable homicide; if a wife slays her husband's mistress in the same circumstances, she may be tried for murder.

Do such inequities have a valid basis? Or are they simply vestiges of outmoded custom?

Members of the valid-basis school—all men—seem to subscribe to the Aristotelian theory of "the natural defectiveness of the female nature." In their opinion, women are biologically and intellectually inferior, and thus deserve the second-rate treatment they receive.

One misogynist, after admitting that there were, of course, exceptions, said, "Women don't get top jobs because they don't know how to handle men. They have no initiative, no sense of responsibility. They spend more time fixing their hair and making personal phone calls than they do on their work. Their main interest is in landing a husband who'll give them babies and a split-level house. Or if they are already married, just when you've finished training them, they suddenly ask for maternity leave. Any sailor will tell you that a woman on board ship brings hard luck. Well, that's how I feel about women around an office."

An insurance company vice president, who agreed that women are their own worst enemies, explained his viewpoint this way: "The gals who want to get ahead generally make one of two mistakes—both fatal to their progress. Either they try to use their sex appeal with utter ruthlessness. Or they go to the other extreme, and try to act like men. Too feminine or not feminine enough I don't know which is worse, but we have no room for either type. The ironic part of it is that they claim they can't compete with us. That's nonsense. It's we who can't compete with them."

The president of an advertising agency had another objection. "I hire quite a few women because I like the different approach they bring to many of our problems," he said. "But there are numerous instances where their sex is an obstacle. How can I send a gal account executive to lunch with a male client who's an alcoholic? If she's married—or even if she isn't—how can I ask her to spend the night on the town with a married man whose business we want? Or how can I take her to stag meetings where the air is full of cigar smoke and offcolor stories? No woman can successfully deal on equal terms with men—and remain a woman. If she tries it, she becomes ridiculous or repulsive."

The head of an employment agency was more terse in explaining why women don't get top jobs. "It's been my experience," he said, "that nobody wants a woman boss. Men certainly don't—and women don't, either."

Bernice Fitz-Gibbon, one woman who has become a successful executive as an advertising and public relations consultant, retorts: "I have yet to meet the man or woman who wouldn't work for a woman as long as it meant getting ahead. This is just another one of those myths invented by men to keep women from occupying that corner office with 'vice president' on the door."

As for the masculine complaint that career women lose their femininity, Miss Fitz-Gibbon says: "Just another one of the fictions that the typists and salesgirls will lose their jealousy. If you'll notice, they don't worry that the typists and salesgirls lose their femininity. Their concern doesn't begin to show until a woman is on the way up."

Mrs. Roosevelt finds another element in men's discrimination against women. "Although I've seen enormous progress in the field of women's rights," she said during a recent interview in her office overlooking the United Nations Building, "we can't deny that inequality of opportunity between the sexes still exists. Why is this so, in light of the fact that women can compete favorably with men except in areas of physical limitation? It's simply a matter of tradition—a tradition that dies hard."

Ruth Tomlinson, vice president of the International Federation of Business & Professional Women, reiterated Mrs. Roosevelt's views, rather more bluntly. During a recent visit here from England, she said: "Men have been giving women second-class treatment for years—and have managed to get away with it. Naturally, they're reluctant to give it up now. What master relinquishes a slave voluntarily? This is too much to ask even from the noblest of men. We'd better settle this through legislation."

Did any of the women interviewed believe that women were to blame for some of the discrimination against them? Yes. Mrs. Roosevelt felt that women's greatest drawback was their oversensitivity to criticism. Miss Tomlinson conceded that women could improve themselves by organizing their time better. And Dr. Baumgartner suggested that women take the chips off their shoulder and concentrate on doing the best possible job.

Nevertheless, it will need more than a course in self-improvement to sweep away the barriers to full partnership for women in the United States. As Miss Tomlinson said, it will take legislation.

The Commission on the Status of Women has already given full support to what many insist is the most important legislation in this field right now: The equal-pay bills passed last month by the House and pending in the Senate.

If a Federal equal-pay law is not enacted, the United States will fall behind many countries which have written the principle into their constitutions. These countries include Canada, Mexico, all the nations of the European Common Market, and the majority of the nations in Africa and Southeast Asia.

Nor is the idea a totally new one in the United States. Twenty-two States already have equal-pay laws, although they are of varying types and limited application. The Federal Civil Service Commission adopted the standard of equal pay for equal work as far back as 1923. So have many State and local civil-service bodies. The National War Labor Board insisted upon it during World War II. Both political parties wrote it into their national platforms in 1960. And labor and management alike have endorsed it as a desirable principle.

The most ardent supporters of a Federal equal-pay law do not claim it would be the entire answer to bias against women. But, in the opinion of Mrs. Peterson, "We will be satisfied with specific bills for specific ills. This is the ill which we think should have top priority. Once this is accomplished, other solutions to other problems will inevitably follow."

Many influential women's organizations, however, will not settle for less than an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution. One has been introduced at every session of Congress since 1920. It reads, in part, "Equality of rights under the law shall not be abridged or denied by the United States or any State or account of sex." Still, it does not guarantee equal pay for equal work. And those who oppose it point out that it would remove certain laws which, in Mrs.

Roosevelt's opinion, "rightfully discriminate in favor of women."

Although equal pay has been the most urgent issue before the Commission so far, the group will cover much ground before it turns in its report. It will complete an investigation of the employment practices of the Federal Government as well as those of companies holding Federal contracts. It will study Federal and State labor laws dealing with such matters as hours, night work, and wages to see if they are benefiting women as originally intended.

It will analyze the effects of Federal social insurance and tax laws on the net income of women. (Why should a man be allowed to deduct the salary of his secretary, for example, while a working mother can't deduct the expense of a babysitter?) It will probe the differences in the legal treatment of men and women. And it will propose new and expanded services for working wives and mothers.

But broad as it is, the Commission's mandate from President Kennedy does not include the newest area of discrimination against women—outer space. The House Space Committee has been investigating complaints from a number of women that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has chosen only men as astronauts—in spite of the fact that some doctors say women are better adapted to the stresses of orbital flight. Women, it seems, must continue to fight bias even in the space age.

Teddy's Victory Hurts Entire Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial entitled "Teddy's Victory Hurts Entire Nation," written by Charles L. Dancey, in the Peoria Journal Star, Thursday, September 20, 1962, be reprinted in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TEDDY'S VICTORY HURTS ENTIRE NATION

As expected, Teddy Kennedy has won the Democratic nomination for Senator in the State of Massachusetts, and we can only hope that this is as far as that farce goes.

This race (in which in the words of a top Democrat quoted in the Journal Star by Inez Robb some weeks ago "the Kennedy's own the stables, the racetrack * * * etc.") has demonstrated that there is still a lot more of "Honey Fitz" about the Kennedy clan than there is of Harvard.

The demonstration has gone a long way toward reversing the long love affair between John Kennedy and the Washington press corps, has sickened responsible Democratic leaders, and is on its way toward making the United States look pretty silly in much of the world.

This is becoming a comic-opera affair of the sort that used to be more typical of Nicaragua, or the Dominican Republic than of American democracy.

Even Mayor Daley doesn't have a brother as police commissioner, another as an alderman, and a brother-in-law in charge of poor relief in the city of Chicago.

Yet, that is pretty much the situation developing in the Government of this great leader of the world—the United States of America.

There is a lot more to "good taste" than having Pablo Cassals to a publicized concert, or inviting Nobel Prize winners to tea, and that has nothing whatever to do with knowing which fork to pick up at dinner.

The tremors have been visible for some time; the sick, queasy, unease of many of the professional folk and many of the political folk on both sides of the aisle who are close observers of the Washington scene.

Teddy's inevitable victory merely tells these folks, including many nervous top Democrats, that their fears were well grounded.

When it comes to things that really matter, obviously the Kennedy clan will do things that would make Harry Truman retch.

The whole thing now provokes a reaction less of fire or anger than one of sadness and a slight nausea.

At a time when American democracy is on trial in the eyes of much of the world, and trying to prove itself as "the way," we are making ourselves look cheap, gauche, and silly.

A little thing, but a big one—and very, very sad.

C. L. DANCEY.

Lack of Fiscal Responsibility in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, following is the text of a letter I sent to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare this past Friday, which is self-explanatory in its message:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 21, 1962.

Hon. ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CELEBREZZE: I always have and shall continue to oppose waste in spending the taxpayers' dollar.

Yesterday a 520-word telegram over your signature was sent to each Member of the House. Friends with legal training assure me this is a direct violation of the United States Code which prohibits the use of appropriated funds by departments of the executive branch for influencing legislation.

Western Union stated at straight-wire rates the cost would have been $12,800. Apparently someone in your Department did some quick footwork, anticipating unfavorable reaction, which the transaction deserved. It appears Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public will now pick up the apparently illegal check for $3,562 to send the message 2 blocks.

Recent figures indicate a great increase in personnel in your Department. It would appear it would not have been too difficult to find a mimeograph operator and a messenger, which probably would have saved at least $3,500.

Isn't it about time those in high positions of trust display some sense of fiscal sanity? Here it was completely lacking.

I shall await your justification of this expenditure.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. GOODLING,
Member of Congress.

Need for Inspiration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in our preoccupation with programs and policies, armament and aerospace, we often forget the power of compelling ideas to alter events. Today, as all mankind searches for survival in the shadows of rockets, missiles and satellites, the need for guidance flowing from new inspiration has never been more apparent.

The following excerpt from an address delivered at the 1962 commencement exercises of Hamilton College, located in my congressional district, challenges us to reassess freedom's heritage and to think and act anew. Its author is a distinguished American, Dean Alfange, a former resident of my community of Utica, N.Y., and a famous alumnus of Hamilton College. I am confident all who read his remarks will find them a source of deep inspiration.

[From the Utica (N.Y.) Observer Dispatch, June 15, 1962]

NEED FOR INSPIRATION

(By Dean Alfange)

Forty years have wrought a new world, but not a better one. We have more security but less liberty; more income but less character; more leisure but less dignity. I fear we are living in the twilight of freedom; and our colleges and universities cannot escape their share of responsibility.

About 10 years ago I wrote a small piece on what it means to be an American, which was published in Reader's Digest:

"I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon—if I can.

"I seek opportunity—not security.

"I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the State look after me.

"I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed.

"I refuse to barter incentive for a dole.

"I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence, the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of utopia.

"I will not trade freedom for beneficence nor my dignity for a handout.

"I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat.

"It is my heritage to stand erect, proud, and unafraid, to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations and to face the world boldly and say, this I have done with the help of God.

"All this is what it means to be an American."

That breed of American is fast disappearing. Instead, we are developing a softer bellied breed that keeps on wanting more and more for less and less. Labor leaders want a 30-hour week with still more benefits and featherbedding to boot. Politicians want votes and play it safe by keeping quiet. And thus the downward slide continues unabated.

The stock market collapse reflects, I think, a worldwide awareness that American leadership is in a great decline on all fronts—moral, political, and economic.

This crisis of leadership, this melancholy trend away from solid values, will not be arrested by the fanatics of the John Birch Society nor by the equally fuzzy-minded

left. Nor will it be arrested overnight by anyone. But the place to start is here. The colleges and universities provide the last clear chance to reverse this trend.

We need inspirational leaders and inspirational ideas much more than nuclear weapons or flights to the moon. The Roman Empire was not destroyed by force of arms. It was destroyed by a simple idea put forward by a young Jew. The young Jew was Christ and His idea simply: "Thou shalt not kill," "Love thy neighbor." The physical power of Rome was destroyed by the spiritual power of that idea.

The need, therefore, is not alone for generals, admirals and scientists. The need is greater still for men who can inspire; yes, even for dreamers and poets.

The presevation of our peace and the survival of our heritage are both conditioned upon the restoration of America's mental health. That is our greatest present challenge; and we hope this little college will contribute its share in meeting that challenge.

College Academic Facilities and Student Assistance Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the distinguished lady from Oregon, Congresswoman GREEN, for her able and capable presentation of the conference report on H.R. 8900 this morning.

I would also like to thank her on behalf of the young people of this Nation for the long hours she has spent on the conference committee working on the legislation before us today.

I am supporting this conference report because I feel it is one more step in the development of educational facilities to meet the tremendous needs of this century in the field of education.

The president of one of my larger junior colleges in the State of Washington at Vancouver, the distinguished Dr. Dwight C. Baird, wired urging support of this conference report. He says:

This could give some much needed help to the growth and development of the community college program in Washington. I hope you will give it your support.

May I say at this point that the State of Washington is one of the outstanding junior college States in the Nation. These institutions of higher learning have met a genuine need, for our universities and colleges are unbelievably crowded, and the present junior colleges in my district—four of them I may add—have made possible higher education for many young people who otherwise would have no opportunity for it.

The distinguished president of our great University of Washington in Seattle, Dr. Charles E. Odegaard, has also wired and said:

Urge your support for H.R. 8900 conference report bill since universities desperately need assistance now.

Mr. Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education, which has member institutions and organizations of colleges, universities, and junior colleges, both public and private, representing more than 90 percent of the student enrollment in the United States, urged passage of the bill.

In contrast, I was deeply disturbed that the National Education Association and its member State associations found occasion to oppose the conference report. This is a saddening stiuation, for at this time in American history, education should not be divisive, but positive and approaching the complete problem as unified Americans seeking better solutions to their needs.

I had the privilege of serving as chairman in the education committee in the Washington State legislature for many years and was a member of the committee through my 22 years of legislative service. I am not a teacher, but a parent, interested citizen and taxpayer and it is from this background in the field of education legislation that I say I am genuinely sorry that education must speak group against group.

Our junior colleges, our universities, and the young people who attend them, genuinely need our assistance in programing now. The vitality of democracy lies in educated citizenship, for the challenge of tomorrow is great. We must waste none of our youth and the resources of youth. Each person, poor or rich, who has the ability to contribute to the understanding and development of America's future, must be given the tools to meet the national challenge.

The distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon has reviewed for you the history of higher education, and she has reviewed for you title II which broadens the opportunity of young people who have no other opportunity to attend a college other than through this title.

I am happy to associate myself with the members of this conference committee who worked long and hard to develop the best possible bill and I am particularly happy to join with the distinguished lady from Oregon in her support.

Amending Section 305, Communications Act of 1934

SPEECH
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11732) to amend section 305 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly aware of the good intentions of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. We all know of his intense interest in matters of national security. We all know how intensely interested every Member of this House is in our security. I do not think any one of us can say that we hold any particular claim to the interest of our country more so than anyone else. I am not an expert on foreign affairs, I must acknowledge that fact. I wish I knew more about our foreign affairs. I wish I had the answer to many of these questions with reference to Cuba, Berlin, Russia, and the Communists. However, the Constitution of the United States says the President of the United States has that responsibility. For 8 years prior to 1961 we had a man as President who should have been, because of his experience as President of the United States, who should have known since he was involved and experienced with communism, with Berlin and with the foreign relations of this country. He gave 8 years of his life and we had a lot of confidence in him. That was President Eisenhower. During the time he was President he would do the best he could.

Mr. Chairman, we have got to depend upon the President of the United States to lead and direct these affairs. I am as interested as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], and all of us in this House are interested, in the President and anyone else giving us as great assurance as he or they can as to what is best for us. We want to contribute to it in the best way we can, and we want and strive for it as an objective.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to call attention of my colleagues to the fact that the amendment says "the approval of two committees of Congress." We pass a law, and we say that it cannot be operable unless two committees of Congress approve it. My friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] talks about a review. A review is different than approval. There is a serious constitutional question involved here, but outside of that, after the amendment is adopted, then there has to be not a review but approval. If the gentleman provided for 30 days' consideration, as is provided in other matters as, for instance, the Armed Services in the selling of real estate, and so forth, that is an entirely different proposition. This bypasses the House and the Senate, and bypasses the Speaker. I am not expressing any pride. A review is one thing, but vesting in a committee the power to disapprove, why, that is an entirely different thing and is an unwise precedent, in my opinion, for the Congress to institute.

Mr. HARRIS. The Speaker is eminently correct, and I was going to come to that. That is precisely what I was leading up to. I thank the Speaker for calling it to the attention of the Members of the House much better than I.

I do think it is a dangerous precedent to give committees of the House the power and authority to override a decision of the President of the United States.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I would suggest to the distinguished Speaker, with whom I do not particularly relish taking issue, that in the first place the amendment is limited to Communists and Communist-dominated nations insofar as congressional approval through committees of specific licenses is concerned. Much of this information has to be confidential in nature and could not be made available to the House in the first place. The committee is the best place to make the decision without dealing in this area with confidential information. May I say, in the second place, that I am sure the distinguished Speaker is fully familiar with precedent with respect to committee approval and I specifically cite to the distinguished Speaker the Jones-Cramer Public Buildings Act in which the Public Works Committee of the House and the Senate were given specific authorization and authority with regard to public buildings, without the Congress acting in any of them. There is precedent for it. As a matter of fact, I understand there is precedent in the trade bill for exactly the same thing.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I insist that it would be a very bad thing to do. I hope the Committee will not approve the amendment.

Amending Section 305, Communications Act of 1934

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11732) to amend section 305 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am rather impressed with all of these amendments that spring from lack of confidence. There is nothing that I know of that we can put in legislation that is going to instill confidence in anybody. I was quite impressed with the gentleman from South Carolina, who was very honest and confessed that if it were left in the hands of the President he would not complain too much about it, but he had the idea that it would be handled by the State Department and he had no confidence in the State Department. In legislation we cannot put confidence in the hearts of anybody. It cannot be done.

The objection that I have to this amendment is that it brings something entirely new into our foreign relations. So far as I know, there is no precedent at all for the Members of the House, certainly not our committee, to have anything to do with foreign relations. If it were limited to approval by the Senate, considering that this relationship between the two countries was in the form of a treaty and should have to be approved by the Senate then I would say there was certainly some precedent, some reason for it. But in its present form I certainly could not approve the amendment, and I hope the House turns it down.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. On the latter point—and I, of course, have great confidence in the gentleman's opinion—the gentleman takes the position that the bill under consideration, involving foreign affairs, but coming out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, should not have been here in the first place. All I am asking is that the gentleman's committee and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate be given a chance to look at what was done for the very reason the gentleman indicates; and that is that this involves foreign affairs and the Foreign Affairs Committee should have the opportunity to consider it. That is the very purpose of the amendment. It amends the action of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in bringing it out in the first place.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman also realizes that even on the matter of treaties the House Committee on Foreign Affairs does not approve. It is the Senate that has that power of approval. These reciprocal agreements might very well be considered in the form of treaties. I did not have the assignment of this bill to our committee. As it develops, perhaps it would have been better if it had not been given to our committee. Nevertheless it came to our committee and we did the best we could with it. It is something that the administration needs, something they are very anxious to have, and so far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to give it to them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield gladly to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman seems to indicate that the House has nothing whatever to do with foreign policy, or at least very little. I am under the impression that we will be called on next week to pass a resolution dealing with Cuba. That certainly puts the House of Representatives very deeply into the matter of foreign policy and foreign affairs.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is a guideline and this bill is a guideline. In this bill we have definitely set forth guidelines and instructions and legislative history as to what we believe the President ought to do.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, only yesterday we did something more than set up guidelines and yardsticks, in the foreign give-away bill. We dealt with transportation of various materials to Cuba, did we not, and we put definite prohibitions and restrictions into the bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is correct; and we can do that. But it has to be approved by the Senate, also.

Constitutional Rights of American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, recently, Nelson Jose, chairman, National Congress of American Indians Constitutional Rights Committee, submitted a report relating to the constitutional rights of American Indians. I consider it to be a very good summary and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

(By Nelson Jose)

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

This is the preamble to the Constitution of this country, and in its various sections are spelled out the powers of Government and the rights of the people.

Article 14 of the Constitution states: "All persons, born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of laws."

As Indians, we sometimes overlook the fact that we, too, are all people, and that we, too, have constitutional rights. Even before the adoption of the Constitution, it was recognized that Indians possessed full rights to the lands they occupied, "until that right should be extinguished by the United States with their consent." Indians were regarded as having a semi-independent position, not as states or nations or sovereign groups, but as a separate people with the power of regulating their internal and social relations.

Neither are many Indians aware of the fact that the American Constitution developed from that of the Iroquois confederacy. Both Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson admitted that they had drawn upon the governmental philosophy of these Indian groups in charting the plan for the new United States of America.

It remained for Andrew Jackson to deviate from this recognition of Indians as independent people, and it was his influence that brought about the declaration by Congress in 1871 that Indians were no longer in this state of independence.

As we all know, for many years the Indian was then a ward of the Government, held on restricted reservations and under the complete domination of the Government. True, wardship came about through the request of Indians themselves, who wished protection from avaricious men. But Indians today are no longer wards. The protecting hand of the Government does not apply to the person of any Indian, and in ever-lessen-

ing degree—in some areas, in no degree—does it apply to his property other than trustee land.

Through the Citizenship Act of 1924, all Indians became citizens of this country. Some Indians, long before, had been granted citizenship by treaty stipulations, by special acts of Congress, or through military service. Now, in 1924, every Indian automatically became a citizen, vested with the same rights, privileges, and responsibilities of any other person of this status yet having certain special services and privileges by virtue of their Indian blood.

These special services include health care, education, and property administration as well as the exemption of taxes on property held in trust.

It can be argued that it is not possible to confer citizenship upon a people native to the country and indigenous to the soil and this would be a point well taken. However, strange indeed are the ways and the laws of the white men and like it or not, under the law we are citizens and we have these constitutional rights: We have freedom to come and go, to any place and in any way we see fit. We have the freedom to choice—to leave or to stay upon our reservations which are the lands belonging to us. There are no limitations placed upon us.

We have the rights to vote in every State on the same basis as others, whether or not we live on a reservation. In recent months, the matter of reservation voting was challenged in New Mexico when a defeated candidate for the office of Lieutenant Governor contended that ballots cast by Navajos were illegal. He said that Indians were not subject to State laws, that reservation residence was not legal residence in the State, and that violations of the New Mexico elections code could not be prevented or punished on Indian lands. The State supreme court upheld the voting rights of reservation Indians with a qualifying statement. The complexities of the Indian situation under law at times can snarl up logic and it is true that the rights to vote on a reservation which is not under the control of State laws gives Indians an advantage over other people. The Constitution does not sanction that any group have larger rights than others. Voting, however, is a privilege and a responsibility in which we should all participate. Ballots are our modern weapons and the means by which we can put men and women in office who will help us.

We have the rights to religious freedom. Many of us still observe our native forms of worship, while many of us have accepted the white man's road to God. This is our inherent right, as it is the right of others, to determine for ourselves how and in what way we shall worship.

We have the rights to freedom of speech, to hold our own meetings, to say and write what we think and to express our opinions. We have this privilege, but we do not exercise it enough. Our voices should be heard and our thoughts given wings. Often our silence confuses people, for silence can be interpreted as acceptance. We must ask for what we want, and ask and ask again, without being discouraged if there is no answer or the answer is no. This is also true for others—the continued asking, however, will make its own impact.

We have the same protections of the due processes of law as anyone else. We may hire our own lawyers and except in the case of certain major crimes, our tribal courts are recognized by both State and Federal Governments as the authority on reservations.

We are entitled to the same social security benefits as other Americans, and this includes special assistance for the aged, the orphaned, the physically and mentally handicapped, and those in need of temporary relief. Indians who go into the cities and become eligible under the laws of residency are entitled to these welfare assistances. This is not often understood and charitable groups will deny Indians aid in the belief that this is taken care of by the Federal Government. It must be understood by Indians, however, who can then protect themselves when such rights are endangered.

We are free to work anywhere and in any type of occupation without restriction. We even have special hiring and retention rights in Federal positions which service Indians.

We are entitled to all extension services provided by the Government to any citizen. Our farmers can secure the advice of agricultural experts along with other farmers; our women can have homemaker services; our youngsters can form 4-H Clubs.

Our veterans are entitled to participate in any of the programs open to veterans.

We are a free people, Americans all under one flag and united in love of country. Freedom is not given to us, or to anyone else. It is ours. To borrow the title of a wonderful book, we are "Born Free," and as we made use of our freedom and call upon our constitutional rights, we strengthen ourselves and our country. As Indian citizens, we need to grow in our understanding of what we can do with this freedom we have.

The People Must Continue To Elect Their Public Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been reliably informed that there is a move on foot to do away with the election of county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation boards at a duly called election of their neighbors, and instead, to have the county boards appointed by the respective State ASC boards, or from national headquarters, which does not appeal to me at all.

During the past 30 years the present system has evolved a broad foundation of experience and know-how.

An overwhelming majority of these committeemen and their office staffs are devoted and dedicated citizens who hold a trust and an obligation—and who are elected annually by their neighbors to see that the ASC farm program is carried out in a fair American way to conform with the intent of the Congress.

An interlying strength of this system is the decentralization of operations at the point of contact with our farmers. Authority and responsibility for the administration of the program is placed on the individual county committees. Final application of farm programs is under the constant check of fieldmen, program reviewers, internal auditors and investigators. Further, day-to-day supervision and direction of all farm programs is divided up among 50 State committees—each responsible for the direction of county offices in its State.

The more than 3,000 elected ASC county committees in the 50 States constitute a vital element in the applied legislation. They stand as an example of that American principle wherein we elect all our public servants to insure that the rules are applied in a fair and impartial manner. Generally speaking, these farmer-citizen committees have served in the high tradition of civic endeavor.

This public service would cost millions more annually if these services had been delegated to paid full-time employees.

The farmer committee system is truly American and should be recognized as such and continued as such.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in conclusion, that I would hope to see the time come and soon, when politics is kept out of our ASC farmer committee system completely. However, even though I know there are relatively few cases where committees have been unduly influenced, such as the one in Texas recently, still I do not want to see the farmer-elected committee system traded for a State or Federal dictatorship.

Revolt and Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal of September 19.

There is no question that the people are becoming increasingly doubtful as to the value of the foreign aid program to the strength and welfare of the United States. The editorial makes this very clear in the closing sentence where the proposal is made to make "fundamental reforms."

The time for these reforms is now:

REVOLT AND REFORM

All this year the attacks on foreign aid, in both Houses of Congress, have been unusually severe. And this week a House Appropriations subcommittee voted to cut $1.5 billion out of the President's request for new funds of more than $4.7 billion in the current fiscal year.

Whatever figure Congress finally agrees on, it is significant that this is the largest reduction in foreign aid the group has ever proposed and that the full Appropriations Committee yesterday went along with most of the cut. Combined with the other congressional criticisms of the program, these actions show that many lawmakers are not only rebelling against the incessant and excessive spending; they are also beginning to sense their responsibility for forcing foreign-aid reforms.

Certainly the administration, for its part, has shown little disposition to effect basic reforms. It has rearranged the bureaucratic machinery, an exercise which has been performed over and over in the past. It has devised the Alliance for Progress subsidies for Latin America, an undertaking which is already demonstrating that it was both ill conceived and oversold.

What has been left undone is the formulation of an effective aid policy. Our military aid is so heavy because our diplomacy has failed to persuade others to do more in their own defense. As for economic aid, the basic trouble is not waste, flagrant though that often is. The roots of the trouble, we think it should be clear by now, are these: The assistance has gone on so long on such

an indiscriminate basis that it has largely lost its leverage in influencing world affairs to our advantage. In many cases it promotes the wrong things, like socialism, and thus does more harm than good to the receiving nation. And the yearly totals of foreign aid contribute both to the Federal budget deficits and to the deficits in our international payments.

Congress alone cannot remedy all these ills. But if it will follow through with substantial reductions in aid money, it can powerfully underscore the need for fundamental reform.

A Refreshing Touch to Serious Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Hoppe, who always gives a refreshing touch to serious problems, has published the following four columns in the San Francisco Chronicle on September 10, September 12, September 20, and September 21:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Sept. 10, 1962]

OUR MAN HOPPE: A BIG LOCOMOTIVE FOR MR. KENNEDY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Mr. Kennedy now wishes authority to call up 150,000 reservists. As I understand it, he desperately requires this authority because the Russians don't have 12,000 troops in Cuba. I think Mr. Kennedy's making a mistake. I think he ought to seize the railroads.

As every expert will tell you, Mr. Kennedy doesn't want the reservists to fight anybody. He just wants them to look as though they'd fight anybody. This is called diplomatic pressure. Last time, Mr. Kennedy called up 155,000 reservists to show Mr. Khrushchev he would stand firm on Berlin. It was very effective. Only it was a little hard on the reservists.

While it is true that "They also serve who stand and pick up cigarette butts," the reservists were never convinced. They looked on themselves as trained fighting men. So they fought 7 days a week with their officers, their Congressmen, and their wives. And if they have to go through that again—

Well, you can see why I think Mr. Kennedy ought to seize the railroads instead. Railroads have a practical, utilitarian use. You can do something with railroads.

Seizing railroads, of course, is a fine American tradition. Whenever the Nation is in dire straits, any President worth his salt immediately seizes the railroads. I have never been quite clear as to what he does with them after he seizes them, but there is no question such action would panic the Kremlin.

"Ho-hum," says Mr. Khrushchev, picking up his Pravda as Mrs. K. serves him his morning platter of scrambled shashlik, "I suppose that Kennedy has called up the reservists again to—Madre de Dios. He has seized the railroads. He must mean business. Quick, rush another 100,000 nonexistent troops to Cuba to reinforce the 12,000 we don't have there already."

If seizing the roadroads should, somehow, fail to prove Mr. Kennedy is standing firm, there are many other steps he could take. For example, he could really show Mr. Khrushchev a thing or two by imposing gasoline rationing. This is very warlike.

He might also quicken the Nation's pulse by reimposing the World War II 35-mile-per-hour limit on the highways in order to speed our effort up, or down. New tires could be confiscated and while we have plenty of sugar at the moment, patriotic housewives might all volunteer to appear at their supermarkets at a given hour daily so that we could have long lines of housewives waiting to buy sugar.

I'm sure we each would be willing to cut down on our cigarettes, if we couldn't get any. And the American Tobacco Co. could loyally send Lucky Strike green off to war again. No, wait a minute. Lucky Strike green never came back from the last one. In fact, Lucky Strike is the only gold star cigarette we've got. Well, we all must make sacrifices.

That's the key to the whole thing. The longer we live in a warfare state, the more sacrifices we will be asked to make. And the more authority we will delegate to our leaders.

But I'm willing to do my part. In return for a self-addressed, anonymous envelope, I will be glad to send you six black-market pork chops. Stock up before the hoarders get them.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Sept. 12, 1962]

OUR MAN HOPPE: A RECIPE FOR PEACE—GARNISH WITH NUTS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

I guess we all agree no more gracious hostess has ever graced our White House than Mrs. Kennedy. She's attractive, charming, and knows her salad forks. I'm glad she's won the highest accolade any gracious hostess can get.

"No other First Lady in history has sparked such international interest and enthusiasm," enthusiastically writes Miss Clementine Paddleford, "in food."

Miss Paddleford's enthusiasm stems, presumably, from her position as food editor of This Week magazine. But gracious food is very important these days. Because, says Miss Paddleford, "Mrs. Kennedy believes that the dinner table, whether at the White House or your house, can do its part in bringing 'peace in our time.'"

It just goes to show you. All along I've secretly felt that Mrs. Kennedy, while most charming, might devote a little less attention to the gracious affairs of the evening and a little more to the grievous affairs of the day. And it turns out she's really been struggling to bring us peace in our time. I feel awful.

The way Mrs. Kennedy is bringing peace in our time, says Miss Paddleford, is by serving delicacies from 60 different nations. Which is unquestionably a new path to peace. Through the esophagus.

Miss Paddleford, despite the Secret Service, has ferreted her way into the White House recipe files and has reproduced the specific plans for five of Mrs. Kennedy's weapons for peace. Like "broiled fish a la Grecque."

Because of national security, Miss Paddleford is necessarily vague as to exactly how achieve peace. I assume she must pore over Mrs. Kennedy employs these weapons to her husband's diplomatic dispatches before announcing the evening's menu.

"So Austrian elements are flirting with the Comintern," she will say thoughtfully. "Never mind, I shall cement Austro-American bonds tonight with a strawberry mousse." Or: "Aha, De Gaulle is threatening NATO, is he? Hand me a quarter cup of leek strips and I shall brew some consumme Julienne."

Of course, the question arises: What is Mr. Kennedy doing for peace in our time? I hate to tell you. Miss Paddleford dismisses his contribution in a paragraph. "Mr. Kennedy," she says, "is a soup drinker." And New England fish chowder, at that.

But there are hints of worse. For Mrs. Kennedy's two strong right arms are her French chef and Italian assistant chef. Absolutely indispensable to world peace. And "perhaps," says Miss Paddleford darkly, "these two ambitious chefs find their most difficult task is to reproduce the Kennedy's favorite New England dishes, and do it without a continental flair."

Not even a pinch of tarragon in the New England boiled dinner? It could drive a French chef mad. And who in the White House demands New England boiled dinners? Not Mrs. Kennedy. But let us not talk of impeachment. Yet.

So hats off to Mrs. Kennedy for sparking the world's interest in food. It's about time as two-thirds of the world goes to bed hungry each night. Some say this is due to a shortage of bread.

Nonsense. Let them, I say, eat strawberry mousse.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Sept. 20, 1962]

OUR MAN HOPPE: IN DEFENSE OF MR. KENNEDY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

I thing it's terribly unfair. Every supposedly respectable newspaper in the country is dragging up this 20-year-old unsubstantiated scandal involving Mr. Kennedy and this beautiful girl, Miss Durie Malcolm.

And what's most unfair is that all the papers are saying the same thing: headlines claiming Mr. Kennedy and Miss Malcolm weren't even legally married at the time. No wonder it's a scandal.

You'd thing just one single responsible publication would rush to Mr. Kennedy's defense and say they were, too, lawfully and morally wed. But, no sir. Every paper flatly says the same thing; there isn't one shred of evidence to show the young couple was ever joined in legal matrimony.

But let's be fair, is there one shred of evidence to show they weren't? If I were Mr. Kennedy, I'd sue.

Even so, you have to hand it to the American press. The whole unsubstantiated-scandal illustrates how polished we of the American press have become in the difficult technique of not publishing unsubstantiated scandal.

As you know, no respectable newspaper ever publishes unsubstantiated scandal It merely publishes the news that other newspapers are publishing unsubstantiated scandal. So every paper worth its ad rate avoids like the plague breaking a scandal. Because this would be yellow journalism.

The current case is a highwater mark in this technique. Because nobody broke this scandal. Absolutely nobody. True, the Washington Post was first on the streets. But it wasn't breaking the story. Heaven forbid. It was merely breaking the story that Newsweek was going to break the story.

So then, of course, the national wire services broke the story that the Washington Post had broken the story that Newsweek was going to break the story. And I assume Newsweek's story will be about how the wire services broke the story that the Post broke the story that Newsweek—and so on. So you certainly can't accuse the American press of yellow journalism.

But, yellow or not, the technique is most unfair to Mr. Kennedy. Whom can he sue? Besides, I think Mr. Kennedy is not only an honest and intelligent President, but a very respectable one, these days. So what if he weren't married way back then? What's that got to do with Cuba or Berlin?

The scandal's bound to hurt his image, though, I just wish I could come up with an old marriage certificate to help him out.

The best I can do for his image, I suppose, is to start a new television series called "Just Plain John's Other Wife" This will—hold it. Some people are saying I've got the whole thing backwards. And it would only be a scandal if he and Miss Malcolm were married at the time. But it wouldn't be a scandal if they weren't. Nonsense.

Our national morality hasn't dipped that low. Besides, this would mean the American press had broken the story that the Post had broken the story that Newsweek was going to break the story that there wasn't any story. And that's ridiculous.

Why, that would be like me breaking the story denying that Senator GOLDWATER beats his wife. Come to thing of it, next time he's in town I'll have to ask him.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Sept. 21, 1962]

OUR MAN HOPPE: TED PROVES ANYBODY CAN BE A SENATOR

(By Arthur Hoppe)

"Have you seen the Massachusetts election results?" cried my good friend, Assistant District Attorney Edward M. (Teddy) Plchsvwck, bursting in and sailing his snap-brimmed fedora ceilingward in glee.

"So what did they prove," I said. "They prove," he said, hand over heart, "that in this great land of opportunity, even a humble assistant district attorney can aspire to the grandeur of the U.S. Senate."

"True," I said. "I knew that sooner or later," said Mr. Plchsvwck nobly, "the voters would recognize how well qualified for national and international leadership being an assistant district attorney makes you. And now that they have recognized this in Massachusetts, I am confident they will recognize it here. I feel it is thus my duty to toss my hat in the ring."

Mr. Plchsvwck was going to run for Senator? "No," he said, modestly lowering his eyes, "I am merely going to run for Governor. I wish to begin in a small way."

"Most commendable," I said. "Actually," he said, "I have been closely following the Massachusetts campaign and I have more than enough qualifications for the U.S. Senate."

Such as? "Take my lengthy career in public service. I have been an assistant district attorney a full 16 months, which is 45 days longer than necessary. True, my advanced years might be a handicap as I am already 32, or 2 years over age. But I'm sure the voters can be convinced this is evidence of increasing maturity rather than encroaching senility, don't you?"

"Without question," I said. But had Mr. Plchsvwck cheated in school? "Cheat" he snapped indignantly. "I not only cribbed my way to a solid D-minus average, but I ran the biggest hashish ring in Greater Pomona. While only a sophomore. And speak not about prissy touch football. I dragged down $50 a week as stanch right tackle for the Pismo Beach Junior Chamber Panthers, for 6 long years."

I said I had to admit he appeared highly qualified as to experience, morality, intelligence and vigor. But in politics you have to be practical. What about his family? "That's where I really shine," said Mr. Plchsvwck, really shining. "I've got 14 brothers and 11 sisters. All of them registered voters."

"Grand," I said. But what did his oldest brother do? "Jack? Jack's got a good, solid job and nobody hates him. He drives a garbage truck. And, best, everybody in the family is already employed."

If anything, I said, Mr. Plchsvwck appeared overly qualified, even for the Senate. "Confidentially," he said, "in view of the Massachusetts returns, I am thinking of skipping all those minor posts and stepping directly into the Presidency. As soon as there is an opening."

Confidentially, in view of the Massachusetts returns, he should live so long.

G.O.P. Team Needs Slogan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, politics sometimes cause us a great deal of anguish and pain especially when as Democrats we are bombarded regularly and mightily by the traditional Republican press.

There are other times, rare, admittedly, but nevertheless welcomed, when a good solid Republic press will revolt at the ineptness and silliness of their own chosen people.

Such an incident took place in the City of Brotherly Love, that ancient citadel of Republicanism now the great fortress of democracy spelled with a capital D.

The Philadelphia Inquirer, long a friend of the Republican cause, no matter how forlorn its cause may have been, has finally and publicly admitted that the Grand Old Party has reached a new low in political strategy.

Faithful Democratic workers can be forgiven for chuckling a little over their scrapple and eggs when they read the following feature story this morning, September 24.

This morning the sun shone brightly, the winds were fair, and the climate warmer and cheery. The old Inquirer had turned its guns away from city hall and let loose a barrage toward the Union League with its lone soldier; standing solitary guard with his plugged rifle.

Thanks for our good day, Mr. Inquirer, for the following faithful reporting:

GOP TEAM NEEDS SLOGAN

(By Harold J. Wiegand)

If you have been wondering how large numbers of Philadelphians will be induced to vote Republican instead of Democratic in the November election, the answer is simple:

They will be reminded that they are downtrodden.

This is the wonderful prescription for Republican success brought to Philadelphia by a traveling big city team sent here by the GOP National Committee.

Members of this team are supposed to be specialists on capturing the urban vote for the Republican Party. Their record has been none too good, but this has not kept them from hopping from city to city, happily telling local GOP workers how to repair their dented machines.

Thus, Edward Derwinsky, a member of the troupe, solemnly bade a gathering of Republican committeemen in the Bellevue-Stratford the other day to "invade Democratic areas and remind the people that they are downtrodden."

Some careless citizens may have forgotten that they are downtrodden. Others may never have known it. This is a defect, in the eyes of the GOP campaign experts, that should be remedied at once. It would be a terrible shame, and almost un-American, not to realize that somebody is making a doormat out of you.

Mr. Derwinsky, who hails from Chicago and is therefore qualified to tell Philadelphians what to do, is even prepared to cope with citizens who don't think they are oppressed at all and who don't want to be rescued by the Republican Party.

The thing to do, he told the local committeemen, is to blame everything on the Democrats.

If the voter is sore about the price of bread going up: blame the Democrats' farm program. If something irritates a voter about his local, State or Federal Governments: it has to be the fault of the Democrats; doesn't it?

The weather? The poor performance of the Phillies? Traffic tieups? An overdone steak? A ketchup bottle that won't pour?

You're downtrodden, see? So vote for Scranton.

Now it must be admitted that Wilbur Hamilton and Billy Meehan, who run the rusty antique known as the Philadelphia Republican organization, are badly in need of all the help and advice they can get. Their unenviable task is to cut down the Democratic majority in Philadelphia to the point where the statewide election could be saved for Scranton. Judging from their past performances, this assignment would seem utterly beyond their capabilities.

If someone would come along with a magic slogan like "A chicken in every pot and a car in every garage" or "Tippecanoe and Tyler too," Wilbur and Billy would probably welcome him with open arms. They could hold torchlight parades, with transparencies showing a bull elephant on one side and maybe a picture of William McKinley on the other, and really drum up a hell-for-leather campaign in the Grand Old Party style.

They would probably try almost anything at this stage to gain Republican votes, short of resigning from the city committee and allowing more capable and more respected leadership to take over.

But to make the keynote of their campaign a call to all good Philadelphians to rise from their downtrodden state and vote Republican, as the national committee team has urged, is too fantastic even for them to accept.

Can you imagine a flag with legend "Don't tread on me!" draped over the headquarters of the Scranton-for-Governor campaign?

If this is the best the national committee can do to recapture the big cities for the GOP, it should disband its team of urban experts and send Mr. Derwinsky back to Chicago, where there are quite a lot of Democrats he can talk to.

The Massachusetts Primaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appears in the National Review for October 2. The article points out in a humorous manner the tremendous change in the American people that has taken place in this 20th century. Oh, yes, we always loved a parade, but

now we must have our kings, our queens, our princes and our courtiers. Yes, indeed, there has been a great change—but is it progress?

The article follows:

THE MASSACHUSETTS PRIMARIES

Teddy Kennedy beat Ed McCormack 2 to 1 in the Democratic primary, and George Lodge beat Laurence Curtis. Only a pedant would quibble over the victors' qualifications. The big question these days is: Who has the name?

Nobody cares who cheated at college. Nobody blushes at public or private delinquencies. Nobody asks for proof of competence. Why, Maj. John Eisenhower is a cinch for Senator from Kansas the day he quits the brass and buys a quarter-acre of Abilene. Henry Cabot Lodge's little boy, any little Rockefeller, and John Fitzgerald Kennedy's little brothers, are all supremely qualified for public office ipso facto, a priori, in vacuo, ad aeternam, and ad nauseam—the name.

We want kings; we shall have kings. And queens, princes, courtiers. It has been otherwise here; once we showed some devotion to ideas, principles, law, substance, meaning, policy, direction, consequences. Voters aren't voting that way any more. Give 'em that big name, the glitter, give 'em their king. De Gaulle is France; Nkrumah is god; Kennedy is king. Castro, Sukarno, Nehru, Nasser, Khrushchev—it reads like the age of the giant ego. They are in, and that means they are all. And you better damn well get out of their way. Shut up, Roger Blough, and you there, Dr. Fred Annis: businessmen are sons of bitches; and doctors, fascists.

Okay. But there are 600 hundred men in Congress, and they can't all be kings, and they don't all want to be courtiers. That looks like our best chance to make a stand against monarchy, as the Fathers used to call it. Congressmen have pride, and we should not let them deny it.

Remaking the Image of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Montgomery Advertiser and written by one of the most outstanding jurists of our times, Judge Walter B. Jones, one of the South's leading spokesmen:

OFF THE BENCH: REMAKING THE IMAGE OF AMERICA

(By Judge Walter B. Jones)

"Just Friends and Brave Enemies," is the title of a book published by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. The theme of the book is "Our Image Abroad." Attorney General Kennedy does not like our image abroad and he never will like it until we give up our Constitution, our customs, and our traditions and put our country on a level with the Congo and the Afro-Asian bloc. The Kennedy book plays up what he calls the "crucial question of civil rights." If you read his book, you will think that this is the only question in the world.

Kennedy visited several foreign countries earlier this year and he says that in all the countries visited he was asked "about the violation of civil rights in the United States." As a result of his brief tour abroad, and his conversations with a few crackpots in each country and listening to the question asked him, Kennedy comes up with the absurd prediction that America's position in the world will be affected by the way we treat "freedom riders or sit-ins or any others who are struggling for equality." Presumably he speaks for his brother, President Kennedy.

Continuing in the book, the Attorney General says that, "if major progress is not made in these purely domestic areas now and in the next decade, our world position will be seriously shaken." This Kennedy conclusion is strained, forced, and without any real facts to base it on.

The writer doubts seriously if many foreigners have ever heard of freedom riders, or racists who want to sit-in where they are not wanted. Of course, "freedom riders" is an unhappy use of the term. These rabble-rousers, white and Negroes, who seek to go into a community and stir up racial trouble are people who are not interested in any freedom ride, unless it be freedom on their part to violate and hold in utter contempt the laws and customs of the communities where they visit as troublemakers. Scores of the so-called freedom riders were paid so much a day by organizations at the North who wished to disturb racial relations in the South.

These people had no standing in their own community and all on earth they are is included in the term "rabble-rousers." As far as sit-ins are concerned, no person has the legal or moral right to go into a private place of business where he is not wanted, or where he is not invited, and where his presence is offensive.

Right-thinking people in America are nauseated and fed up with all the talk about what sort of image the United States presents to other nations of the world. Those who are always denouncing their home country and are worrying about the image we make to foreign nations might well turn their thoughts to other countries and the image they make for America. Of course, the only image the Afro-Asian countries and other countries have of the United States is the rich old uncle with millions and millions of dollars to be given to their country. These people want the world with a fence around it and Uncle Sam ceases to present a good image when he cuts off the flow of American dollars to foreign countries.

Foreign aid is based on the tragic idea that you can buy the friendships of foreign nations. Practically every country in the world is the beneficiary of the dollars of the American taxpayer. To list all of these countries would be to name 90 percent of the nations of the world.

Some of the people who would remake the image of America want us to change our way of life so that we might look well in the eyes of the savages in the Congo, brutes who hardly know what civilization is and who daily pass their time with murder, robbery, and rapine of white people. None of these Negroes in the Congo ever heard of civil rights.

So instead of the Kennedys, the Lyndon Johnsons, the Cellers, the Javits, the Humphreys, and others criticizing our country they might take a look at the rest of the world. I note that in the Congo about a year ago the Deputy Prime Minister ate his own grandchild. Maybe the Congo, instead of worrying about the American image could do something to improve its image. Take Liberia, into which country America has poured millions of dollars, they still sell their own people into slavery. They do not permit any white man to hold office or to own real estate in Liberia. Take Liechtenstein—this little principality has a bad image for people who believe in self-government because it is ruled by hereditary princes of the House of Liechtenstein and there is no real freedom there. Take Ghana—its image could be rebuilt. There is no freedom whatever there and to differ with the blacks who run the government is to either be sent into exile or kept in prison for years without a trial. Spain, Portugal, Yugoslavia—certainly the United States should not try to pattern after them. Yugoslavia, like Russia, permits only one political party and they do not permit a free press.

So, when the people Attorney General Kennedy visited in West New Guinea in Jogjakarta, or Abidjan, or Montevideo criticized the United States and wanted us to remake our image to be like theirs, they just suggested that the United States be a big fool.

I wonder if these people who are so dissatisfied with the American Constitution and Government, the American people and the American way of life, could not find something good in America. What other country in the world enjoys the prosperity and the freedom that we have? Is not the right of free speech, the right of a free press, the right to worship God according to the dictates of your own conscience, the right of trial by jury some kind of image that other countries might follow? Instead of remaking the image of America, Bobby Kennedy, the President, and others might do a little image, remaking beyond the United States, but that wouldn't get votes in the United States.

Khrushchev's Enemies Inside Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very worthwhile article entitled "Khrushchev's Enemies Inside Russia," written by the Honorable Allen W. Dulles, former Director, Central Intelligence Agency, and published in This Week magazine of September 23, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KHRUSHCHEV'S ENEMIES INSIDE RUSSIA

(By Allen W. Dulles, former Director, Central Intelligence Agency)

(NOTE.—The man who knows the Kremlin's problems better than any other American tells how Russia is changing—from within.)

WASHINGTON.—I have come away from 10 years of intensive study of communism and all its works, a confirmed optimist. I believe that the Communist position is becoming more and more vulnerable.

I am not speaking now so much in a military sense, though certainly overall the free world has a military superiority.

I am speaking rather of the manifold vulnerabilities and weaknesses that the system is showing, of the fact that some of the steam has gone out of the early evangelical, fanatical drive of communism.

STALIN'S RECORD OF TERROR

And it is a tarnished thing. It can never really live down Stalin's record of terror. Khrushchev may talk of burying us. The facts are that he must not only bury Stalinism, but also his own association with the Stalinist terror.

He must try to bury the world's deepening realization that conditions of life under communism are below those which prevail generally in the free industrialized countries of the West.

He must try to bury the implications of the massive flight from communism which, despite walls and barriers, has been taking place over the years from Eastern Europe, Communist China and even from Cuba.

He must try to bury the fact that the Marxist theory of the inevitable and self-generated collapse of capitalism has been proved false; that the free society is everywhere exhibiting superior powers of self-regeneration, and that the dreariness of the Communist world is made more evident each passing day by contrast with the rising social, cultural and spiritual opportunities of our free society.

He must try to bury the fact that communism is running out of credible political issues; and that today the only expanding imperialism, the only still agressive colonialism, are those deployed under the Red flag.

My confidence in the future is also based on the increasing evidence from inside Russia that the revolution is failing to convert its grandsons—the rising educated generation, twice removed from Lenin and the Bolsheviks.

We know more about the true feelings of the people of Russia individually nowadays. Given a free and safe opportunity to do so, they will almost unfailingly demonstrate a basic friendliness toward us and toward the West generally. The regime has told them little that is truthful about life in America and in the West. But the educated Russian has learned enough in other ways to have the yearning to gain for himself some of the advantages—and not alone the material advantages—which he associates with the western way of life.

And, believe me, they do not want to take the eastern way. Their troubles with Communist China are not exclusively political. Individually and collectively, they haven't liked the Chinese Communists.

I grant that the Russian people themselves today have no direct say in the decisions of their Government. Nevertheless, it is my impression that there is slowly building up inside Russia a latent pressure for more freedom, for a fairer sharing of the produce of their labor than the system now allows. Life in the Communist world is drab compared to our own.

No one, I believe, is more sensitive to the readings of the public pulse than is Khrushchev himself. More than once he seems to have taken account of the people's temper, something Stalin rarely did. As an earthy example of this, when Khrushchev let Benny Goodman into Russia, it was not because he likes jazz music. He doesn't—but many of his people do.

HOLD HIM TO HIS CHALLENGE

And finally let us recall that Khrushchev claims that he wants a peaceful competition between communism and all its works and our Western civilization. But he dare not, in my judgment, risk any real confrontation between the two systems.

In any event let us steadily seek it. Let us hold him to his challenge. Let us do all we can to bring about an honest weighing of the value of the two systems. Let their economy be compared with ours, their culture with ours, their basic philosophy of life with ours, in every significant field of human endeavor.

I have no doubt as to the outcome.

These are certain of the conclusions I presented in an address to the American Bar Association at its 85th annual meeting at San Francisco. I'm glad to have this opportunity to present them also for the consideration of a wider audience. I trust they will help toward a better appreciation of where we and the Soviet Union stand today.

Recent Soviet accomplishments in space do not, in my opinion, affect these conclusions. The high competence of the Soviets in the field of science and technology has long been recognized, as well as their ability to put into orbit larger space vehicles than we can today. But far more important to world peace and security than the opening up of outer space would be for the Communists to open their closed society to the human freedoms we enjoy.

Realistic Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Daily News editorially comments on Allen Drury's latest book, called "A Shade of Difference," which I hope to have the pleasure of reading as soon as possible.

In my opinion Allen Drury has proven he has the courage of his convictions. During the run of his play, "Advise and Consent," there was liberal pressure to have him change the script but he remained firm.

He writes with conviction and I commend the following editorial to all:

BETTER THAN "ADVISE AND CONSENT"

Three years ago, a longtime Washington newspaper correspondent published a smash-hit novel which many readers and critics considered one of the best pieces of major fiction ever written about the U.S. Government.

That book was "Advise and Consent," later turned into a successful Broadway play, and then into watered-down movie by Otto Preminger. It is now a pleasure to notify the readers that "Advise and Consent," in our opinion, has been outdone by the same author in a new novel published a few days ago.

The new arrival is "A Shade of Difference," by Allen Drury; Doubleday & Co., Inc., Garden City, N.Y.; 603 pages, $6.95.

This is a sequel to "Advise and Consent," with many of the same characters proceeding a few miles farther down the roads of their respective lives and meeting with remarkable experiences on the way.

The principal characters are listed at the beginning—a convenience to the reader which, as we were saying in this space recently, we think ought to be a standard feature in all U.S. novels published from here on.

We believe "A Shade of Difference" is better written and even more dramatic than "Advise and Consent."

But the reason why we think the book is worth a column of news editorial space is that it deals with two important problems which face the American people today and promise to trouble them for some time to come.

UNITED NATIONS AND DESEGREGATION

The first of these is our membership in the United Nations, as affected by the recent entry into that organization of numerous small, half-busted, and extremely proud new nations.

The second is the problem of getting rid of race segregation in our own country with the least possible friction, violence, and injustice to both whites and Negroes.

Much of the action occurs at the U.N.'s big headquarters in East Midtown Manhattan.

As his story gallops along, Mr. Drury succeeds in showing the reader what a colossal bind the United States has got itself into as a leading member and principal bankroller of the U.N.

We're wide open there to insults, nose thumbings and shin kicks from every little pipsqueak nation that envies our wealth and power. What happens to us in that respect in "A Shade of Difference" shouldn't, to use the old World War II expression, happen to Hitler.

Mr. Drury doesn't try to force a solution of this problem on his readers. He merely states it, in full and from all angles and with great storytelling skill, for them to ponder.

He is equally astute in his analysis of the desegregation problem and all the extremely human hatreds, jealousies, loyalties and idealisms that are bound up with it.

In the course of the book, the reader comes to know intimately an admirable Negro Congressman, a contemptible professional Negro agitator, their opposite numbers on the white side of the integration argument, and, for good measure, an African native leader who is a combination of Patrice Lumumba, Kwame Nkrumah, and Jomo Kenyatta and then some.

THE LIBERALS WON'T LIKE IT

Here again, Drury shows no race prejudices that we can detect.

He spreads the desegregation challenge before his readers so interestingly that it is hard to lay the book down, and so illuminatingly that we believe any American who reads "A Shade of Difference" will be able to think more intelligently about racial matters from that time forward.

Our advice would be to pay no attention to a lot of liberal columnists and book reviewers who we expect will be tearing their curls out by the roots and trying to murder this book as soon as they find out what is in it.

"A Shade of Difference," like "Advise and Consent," walks all over a choice assortment of these people's pet corns, prejudices, and fixed ideas. Naturally they will detest it.

But for Americans who want to learn more about what makes their beloved country tick these days, we think "A Shade of Difference" is must reading.

Educational Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House the article by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr. entitled "Education Principles." Mr. Reuter, research director of the American Federation of Teachers, is a conscientious student of the problems that face us in the field of education. It is my privilege from time to time to commend to my fellow colleagues and the audience of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his articles which are constantly searching out new approaches and offering new solutions to the ever-increasing problems in education.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I therefore, am happy to include the following article which contains pertinent

suggestions toward the constructive answers for the needs of American education:

EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLES

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., research director, American Federation of Teachers)

The American Congress will soon adjourn and a new one will convene next January. Many educational issues have yet to be solved and current Members of Congress should be thinking in terms of how they can improve the educational product in the years ahead.

Below are four educational principles that should be carefully considered by the Congress in 1963, and the current Members may well want to consider these during the intervening period, on a personal basis:

I. IMPROVEMENT OF PERSONNEL RELATIONS IN THE SCHOOLS

My study entitled "Personnel Relations for Teachers," indicates many of the issues here. Under conclusions, the following 26 points are recommended:

1. A single salary schedule unencumbered by merit rating and based upon training and experience for all teachers.
2. Equal pay for equal work.
3. Collective bargaining agreement between the teachers and the board of education of the school district.
4. An extracurricular activities program optional for teachers, but providing extra pay for those teachers who so elect.
5. Severance pay of at least 5 days for each year of service.
6. Duty-free lunch period of at least 30 minutes.
7. Health insurance program financed by the board of education of the school district.
8. Sabbatical leave granted, at least, every 7th year of service, for study, travel, or other professional reasons, with no less than full pay for a half school year or half pay for an academic year, and with full right to return to the same position without penalty of any kind.
9. Sick leave of at least 10 days a year, accumulative to 200 days.
10. Military leave provision for teachers.
11. Maternity leave provision for teachers.
12. Paid personal leave annually of at least 5 days.
13. Sundry leave provision for teachers.
14. Right of teachers to seek public office and to obtain adequate leave for such service.
15. Retirement programs that provide for Federal social security for teachers desiring these benefits.
16. Observation of all State and National holidays.
17. No loyalty oath requirement.
18. Tenure laws (job security) for all teachers.
19. A school day not to exceed 5½ hours of assigned duties.
20. Complete freedom for teachers in selecting their professional organizations.
21. Application blanks free of reference to professional organizations, race, or religion.
22. Textbook evaluation in consultation with teachers.
23. Certification based on general education and a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university.
24. Maximum class size of 25 students.
25. Curriculum that provides a well-rounded education, with constant revision in accordance with the previously established collective bargaining agreement.
26. Continuation of the traditional school year.

II. IMPROVEMENT OF FISCAL POLICIES OF THE SCHOOLS

My study entitled "Fiscal Independence versus Fiscal Dependence of School Boards," indicates many of the issues here. Under conclusions, the following 9 points are recommended:

1. School districts should be fiscally independent.
2. School districts should operate under general laws.
3. School districts should cooperate with the city and/or county government in using their facilities for school elections.
4. School boards should have the authority to levy the school tax and this action should not be subject to review by other officials.
5. School boards should have the authority to issue school bonds and the percent of the maximum bonded indebtedness of the district should be 15 to 20 percent of the assessed valuation.
6. School board members should be elected by the general public, and the term of office should be between 4 and 6 years.
7. School levies and bond issues should require only a majority vote.
8. School levies should not have a maximum statutory ceiling, nor should periodic referendums be required to retain levies.
9. School employees who are noncertified should be under a city and/or county civil service system.

III. IMPROVEMENT OF CLASS SIZE IN THE SCHOOLS

My study entitled "The Limitation of Class Size," indicates many of the issues here. Under conclusions and recommendations, the 10 points enumerated:

1. That many studies of class size conducted by authorities in the field indicate the urgent need for smaller classes in order to provide all youth with quality education.
2. That these studies indicate the necessity of smaller classes in order to maintain high staff morale.
3. That most teachers and administrators favor small classes.
4. That these studies indicate some progress has been made in reducing class size, but that few schools have planned for small classes as a part of their educational philosophy.
5. That of the 120,304 classes studied, there was a student population of more than 4 million, and this represented all areas of the Nation and both elementary and secondary schools, and about 10 percent of the students.
6. That of the 120,304 classes studied, there was the following division as to number of students:

Classes with 25 or more	93,775
Classes with 30 or more	66,206
Classes with 35 or more	29,539
Classes with 40 or more	9,417
Classes with 50 or more	1,236

7. That each category in Number 6 should be extended tenfold to approximate the entire enrollment of American yotuh in public education.
8. That the class size ceiling of 25 students in a classroom is sound policy and is a step in the direction of quality education.
9. That steps should be taken at once in planning the total needs of public education based on a class size ceiling of 25 students per classroom so as to insure all American youth adequate and equal educational opportunities. This would currently increase the classroom shortage by at least 130,000.
10. That the public should be informed of the actual need for classrooms and teachers based on a class size ceiling of 25 students per classroom.

IV. IMPROVEMENT OF TEXTBOOK SELECTION IN THE SCHOOLS

My study entitled "Reforms Needed in the Selection of Textbooks," indicates many of the issues here. Under conclusions and recommendations, 16 points are enumerated:

1. That textbooks have played an important part in the history of American education and will continue to do so in the future.
2. That textbooks have gone through a series of evolutions, and more change is necessary in the years ahead.
3. That free textbooks are an essential part of public education.
4. That there are current weaknesses in textbook selection in some American schools.
5. That the American Federation of Teachers is keenly concerned with the textbook issue. This concern has been expressed in the various areas of adequate textbooks for the public schools, quality textbooks for all children, textbooks selected in a democratic fashion by the teacher, and textbooks that tell a complete story of American heritage.
6. That private printing of textbooks is superior, as a concept, to State printing.
7. That continued progress should be made in readability of textbooks.
8. That greater effort should be made to secure competent teachers as authors of future textbooks.
9. That greater effort should be made to encourage teachers to provide educational leadership via the textbooks they author.
10. That textbook publishers should continue to make necessary reforms in their publications.
11. That textbook publishers should resist uniformity of textbooks throughout the Nation.
12. That textboks should lead in curricular reforms.
13. That textboks should contain all types of issues, including controversial ones.
14. That greater effort should be stressed as to the need of the textbook content, rather than the ability of the book to sell.
15. That the textboks should be recommended by the teachers who teach the subject, and the teachers have a voice in the final selection.
16. That where the State type of selection exists, that it be repealed and that each local district select its textbooks.

If each Member of Congress is willing to discuss these four educational principles with the voters back home, I feel confident that constructive educational legislation will be forthcoming in 1963.

Mrs. Jud Collier, Leader for Good Government in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, "Good Politics Is Good Housekeeping for the Community," was the theme of Mrs. Jud Collier, of Mumford, Tex., at the recent Texas State Democratic Convention in El Paso, Tex.

Mrs. Collier is entitled to speak with authority in political matters, and she is listened to with respect in Texas. Singlehandedly she organized the Texas Democratic Women's State Committee. Mrs. Jud Collier is president of that group.

By its activities she has proved the truth of her theme that "Good Politics Is Good Housekeeping for the Community." Inside her party and out, Mrs. Collier has fought for honor, integrity, political morality, and governmental progress. For years she has battled against corruption in office in Texas and in the Nation.

Her organization is a true example of democracy in action. It is a true grassroots movement. It was not organized by the parent party; it was organized directly, by Mrs. Collier and other ladies, by the people themselves, without call from any party leaders. On the contrary, it was organized years ago against party leaders who put self and pelf above their country's welfare.

Mrs. Jud Collier's Texas Democratic Women's State Committee was organized to put the country's interest above any politician's interest, and that is what she and they have done. No other person or group can give them orders; they meet and decide on Democratic programs for the good of their State and country, and they work for those programs. They mold public opinion; they create and consolidate opinion for the common good. They are and they represent a true grassroots movement in the best traditions of the purest American democracy.

Texas and the Nation need more leaders like Mrs. Jud Collier, and Texas and the Nation need more active participation in politics by the good housekeepers of the Nation. Good housekeeping in the home, translated into good politics at the local and State level, means good government at the national level.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the El Paso Herald-Post of Tuesday, September 18, 1962, entitled "Women Urged To Take Active Role in Politics."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN URGED TO TAKE ACTIVE ROLE IN POLITICS—GOOD CITIZENSHIP DEMANDS INTEREST, SAYS STATE LEADER

Women have an important place in politics because politics is just "good housekeeping for the community."

This is the opinion of a lady—naturally—and a Democrat—strongly. She is Mrs. Jud Collier, delegate from Mumford in the 11th Senatorial District and State chairman of the Texas Democratic Women's State Committee.

"You've got to be interested in politics if you're interested in good citizenship," says Mrs. Collier, who is warmly enthusiastic on the topic.

Mrs. Collier got her first taste of politics when she decided to get a farm road for her community. Today, she is as justly proud of Farm Highway 50 as if she had paved it by hand.

Mrs. Collier learned politics at the grassroots level. When her daughter was ready for school Mrs. Collier decided the community needed more than two teachers. So she ran for president of the school board and was elected.

Over the years the school grew from two to five teachers, then seven, and finally, to a fine independent school district.

Mrs. Collier, also served her community as postmaster in 1938:

"I considered running for county commissioner, too," she confided, "but I was postmaster at the time and decided against it for this reason."

Her husband is the postmaster, and when he retires this month, her daughter will take over as acting postmaster. But neither is as active in politics as Mrs. Collier.

"A delegation of women is attending the Democratic convention here as observers for the Democratic Women's State Committee," she said. "We are also here as duly accredited delegates from our respective counties.

"In the past there has been abuse of the rules of conduct as set down in the Texas Election Code. We've been assured that this convention will be conducted with fairness and respect to nominees of the Senatorial district for the executive committee."

Mrs. Collier's eyes twinkled as she remarked, "Of course there's going to be a basis. There always is—but no real split. The Republicans are working like beavers and we've all got to work harder to beat them."

She praised the work of Mrs. Hardy Miller, who is in charge of the El Paso County Hotel Paso del Norte.

Democratic Women's Committee desk at

"I hope all Democratic women will take as much interest and work as hard as she has," Mrs. Collier said.

Minute Editorial, 105 Years Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, our mission here today is the ever-present one of trying to decide what is best for the country. I contend that trying to keep our U.S. Treasury in the black makes more sense than squandering it on a hundred and one nations across the seven seas. The advocates of foreign aid insist that without this constant outlay we might lose all our friends to the Socialist doctrine and the collectivist powers. I maintain that even with nearly a hundred billions of our taxpayers' money we have failed quite noticeably to keep them solidly on our side.

Right now ships flying the flags of our so-called foreign friends are delivering goods including war-making supplies to Moscow-controlled Cuba. That problem is close to home, and must be effectively dealt with and soon.

The troubles of the world continue without abatement. We deplore the situation today just as we did 105 years ago. To relate the present world picture to that of more than a century ago, Mr. Speaker, I conclude these brief remarks by citing a short piece which appeared in the Guthrie Center, Iowa, Guthrian for September 18, 1962. Editor Gonzales entitles it "Minute Editorial, 105 Years Old." I think it will intrigue my colleagues for its coincidence, but I fear the design is far too serious to be amusing:

MINUTE EDITORIAL, 105 YEARS OLD

"It is a gloomy moment in history. Not for many years—not in the lifetime of most men who read this paper—has there been so much grave and deep apprehension; never has the future seemed so incalculable as at this time—in France the political caldron seethes and bubbles with uncertainty; Russia hangs as usual, like a cloud, dark, and silent upon the horizons of Europe; while all the energies, resources, and influences of the British Empire are sorely tried.

"It is a solemn moment and no man can feel an indifference—which happily, no man pretends to feel—in the issue of events of our own troubles no man sees the end."

When was it written? October 10, 1957. in Harper's Weekly.

Vice President's Speech on President's Commission on Status of Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the President's Commission on Status of Women is a hard-working Commission, meets frequently, and by report time next year a great deal of pertinent information will have been collected.

The Vice President of the United States spoke to a group of people in connection with the President's Commission on the Status of Women, particularly employment opportunities for women in private industry, and I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON BEFORE A CONFERENCE OF THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 24, 1962

I have watched with interest and admiration all the things which this Commission has done and I want to congratulate the members for wasting no time in getting started in a solid and purposeful way.

No problem can be licked—no great progress made—by Washington alone. That is why you are here today, and we appreciate your taking the time and expense to come.

I consider the work of this Commission to be really trail-blazing.

We have spent so many years ignoring the reality that it is difficult even to find elementary facts and figures. For the first time, they are now being assembled in a purposeful manner that can lead to purposeful action.

Certainly no one more clearly exemplifies the capabilities and the pioneering spirit of the American woman then does Mrs. Roosevelt. She has been called the First Lady of the World, and her leadership of this Commission offers a guiding light everywhere.

If all of our problems were due solely to evil men and evil women, a solution would be simple. Good people in this world outnumber bad people overwhelmingly.

Unfortunately, most of our problems arise out of ignorance—slothfulness—and a desire to avoid change, even when the world around us is changing at a rapid rate. I think this is what is happening in terms of the problem of equal opportunity for women.

One of the major revolutions of the 20th century has been a revolution in the pattern of living of women. In our grandfather's day, the average working age of the career girl was 26. Today, it is 40.

Between those two figures lies a fantastic change in the whole fabric of our society.

Modern technology has created new patterns of production which rely much more

upon brains and nimbleness than upon brawn and endurance.

At the same time, the traditional arts and crafts which made the housewife of half a century ago a skilled technician—dishwasher, baker, seamstress, nurse, laundress, often even teacher—have disappeared.

This means that we have a far greater market for brains and ability in the world of economic production and we have also, at the same time, created the supply to fill that demand. But somehow we have failed to bring the two together—our productive system that needs more brains and skill and the women who have the brains and skill to supply the need.

It is a mistake to think that this is a question of viciousness or prejudice—even though many men long nostalgically for the grandmother who could do everything from sewing up a rip in his britches to teaching him to read and write. The real cause is that we have not faced up to the changes that have taken place in one lifetime.

I have a daughter who has just entered college. It does not take a crystal ball to forecast the probable course of her life.

She will graduate from college into the labor market. Somewhere along the line, she will probably decide that there is something to life other than an office. Like most women, she will be in and out of the economic process. But according to the experts, she has a life expectancy of 70 years. And no matter how she manages her own life, she will probably have more time to devote to the economic process than to simply stay at home and take care of a family. She will need to know, not only how to be a good homemaker, but perhaps at some time a breadwinner, and at all times a participating member of society.

Children do grow up. Children do leave home—as inevitably as summer follows the spring—and fall follows the summer.

Therefore, it will be important to my daughter, and to all our daughters, that she have an opportunity to make use of whatever skills she has learned—and it is equally important to society that it have the opportunity of making use of her skills.

Somehow, someway, we must find a method by which this talent may not be lost or grow stale. If we have enough brains to send a sophisticated communications system hurtling within 10,000 miles of Venus, surely we have the brains to organize a society in such a way that talent will not be wasted.

Furthermore, I think we have to consider a simple justice. No governmental or social program will ever succeed that leaves justice out of consideration.

One of the oldest injunctions of the wiseman is that the laborer is worthy of his hire. I, for one, am weary of systems which differentiate between compensation for work well done for any reason other than merit.

We live in a never, never land if we believe that this is still a society in which women who work are merely supplementing income from male relatives. The reality of our society today is that we need the productive talents of every single person. We must abolish discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin. We must retrain those workers who have been caught in the eddies of technological unemployment. We must find ways and means of using our people of middle age who have many productive years ahead of them.

And we must find forms of social and economic organization that will elimininate sex as a barrier to the fulfillment of talent and capacity.

To solve this problem of discrimination because of sex is going to require some adjustments and changes. But they are adjustments and changes that must be made because they will enhance the prosperity and the security of our country.

We must realize that few women will spend their entire adult lifetime behind a desk, in a laboratory, or on a production line. But it is worth some time and some effort to take advantage of the many years of work that are open to us.

And let us be unmistakably clear. Equal employment opportunity is not a luxury in which we indulge out of a fuzzy-headed motive.

It has become, not only a question of justice, which alone should be enough, but a question of grim and urgent necessity.

Some time ago I made a very careful and painstaking survey of space installations on the west coast. I visited the great universities where the basic research is being performed. I visited the factories where they are making the rockets and the payloads. I visited the centers where the cool, clear-eyed test pilots are making the first tentative thrusts outside of the atmospheric envelope around the earth. Everywhere I heard the same story: "We need more brains."

Right now, it is a question of competition between the Government and private industry for the physicists, the biologists, the mathematicians, the astrophysicists, the metallurgists, and the systems managers. But I talked to some men who speculated—convincingly—that within a 3- or 4-year period we would have to start rationing brains just as we rationed coffee during World War II.

The only difference is that if we had run out of coffee, many people would have been uncomfortable. If we run out of brains, the whole world may lose its freedom. I don't believe that we are at the stage yet where we must ration brains. I think before we reach that stage that there are resources which we have not tapped—but which can be tapped.

As Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, I am trying to tap some of these resources which have not been used for reasons of ancestry, irrelevant to merit.

There is a Senate committee which is attempting to find means of tapping resources which are now denied to us because of unrealistic considerations of age.

We have passed the Manpower Retraining and Development Act which is attempting to do something about those who have been fired by a machine.

And you have the responsibility of finding ways and means of tapping the resources of half of our society that may be closed to use because of outmoded customs and habits.

There is one other point that I would like to make in this regard. The slogan "equality of opportunity" can no longer, and will no longer, serve as a mask for social injustice. We are past that stage of history.

Anatole France once said, "The law, in its equal majesty, forbids both the rich and the poor to sleep under bridges."

Similarly, there was a time when equality of opportunity meant the right to exploit women by working them 16 to 18 hours a day in sweatshops at substandard wages.

We are not going to return to those times. That is not involved in the work which you are doing.

What we are seeking is justice and prosperity. And this can only be found through assuring opportunity to all of our people.

I am not going to say that a woman can do a job better than a man (except for motherhood) just because she is a woman any more than I am going to say that a man can do a better job than a woman, except for fatherhood, because he is a man. But I am going to say that everyone should have the opportunity to compete for a job on the sole basis of merit—and when that is our single test, we can be certain of the survival of our way of life.

This has become apparent not only to us but to people all over the world.

The Reza Shah or Iran did not walk his wife and female relatives though the streets of Iran without veils because he thought it was a clever innovation. He did it to tell his people that they should begin removing the veil from the vote—so women could become active in the life of their country.

President Atsburk did not invoke the vote and compulsory education for women in Turkey out of whim. He did so because he realized that women were sorely needed for Turkey to gain its true place in the sun.

Throughout the Middle East, I found women playing an increasing role in national life and yet, this is the area where, traditionally, women have been at the very bottom of the ladder.

One of the byproducts which the free world is inheriting from this progress of women in the Middle East in the impetus they have given to social reform in their own countries. This is crucial in that part of the world that sits on the rim of the Soviet Union.

One of the most important weapons that we have in the cold war struggle is the continuing evidence that social reform is more of a reality on our side of the Iron Curtain.

But above all, in this world in which we live, we are engaged in a struggle to demonstrate which way of life affords the best hope and the best promise for the individual human being. To the individual, the most important thing is fulfillment—fulfillment of his or her capacity to serve.

In all that we do, we are going to face a very harsh judge—the judge of history.

We shall be known for our ability to bring the greatest good to the greatest number. We shall be judged for our capacity to adapt ourselves to the changing facts of the world and to the changing circumstances of history.

I do not think that you have come here today to devise ways and means for extending special privilege or for creating new vested interests. I do think you have come here to solve a problem which presents us with an injustice and with a disruptive force in our national life.

You have excellent leadership, dedicated workers, and the backing of your government. I wish you every success and I am ready to help you whenever I am called upon.

Priceless Books Presented to Southern Methodist University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there has been presented to Texas' great Southern Methodist University a magnificent collection of 206 books, all printed before the year 1500, and worth millions of dollars.

No collection of incunabula comparable in size and importance of this gift to Southern Methodist University has changed hands in the 20th century.

The gift to this Texas school was made by Mr. J. S. Bridwell, a Wichita Falls oilman and rancher and benefactor of Southern Methodist University, and Frank V. DeBellis of San Francisco, well known for his cultural interests.

One of the books, St. Augustine's "City of God," was printed in 1467, only about 14 years after printing was developed by Gutenberg.

The addition of this rare collection to a Texas institution is a magnificent demonstration of the increasing cultural awareness and development in Texas and the Southwest.

The Dallas News, in an article September 20, 1962, quoted Dr. Willis Tate, president of Southern Methodist University, as stating that this gift is "one of the most important things ever to happen to Southern Methodist University."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Dallas News of September 20, 1962, captioned "Priceless books donated to Southern Methodist University," and another article of the same date, captioned "Receipt of Book Collection Remarkable Tribute to Southern Methodist University," and an editorial from the Dallas News of Saturday, September 22, 1962, captioned "Southern Methodist University Book Gift."

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Sept. 20, 1962]

PRE-1500 WORKS—PRICELESS BOOKS DONATED TO SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY

(By Jack Castleman)

Southern Methodist University has been given 206 books printed before the year 1500—the first time such a major collection has changed hands in the 20th century.

The rare collection—containing many books printed before Columbus discovered the New World—was given to the Perkins School of Theology by J. S. Bridwell, Wichita Falls rancher and long-time benefactor of the seminary, and Frank V. DeBellis, a San Francisco cultural leader who assembled the collection.

Dr. Willis Tate, Southern Methodist University president, called the gift "one of the most important things ever to happen to Southern Methodist University."

The books will be known as the Bridwell-DeBellis Collection of 15th-Century Printing and will be on public display September 27 and 28.

The university will officially mark its reception of the gift with an academic festival, "The Renewal of Man," September 27 when both Bridwell and DeBellis will be honored.

University officials gave no estimate of the collection's value other than "priceless."

The value of the books—many which could not be replaced—is difficult to appraise though their worth would run into millions of dollars.

The importance of the collection can be measured in these terms:

One book, St. Augustine's "City of God," was printed in 1467—only 14 years after Gutenberg introduced printing.

Seven of the books appear to be the only complete copies in North America.

Eighty-three of the books are first printings.

Forty-nine of the books are held by as few as one other library and not more than five other libraries in North America.

The collection makes the Perkins Library the largest repository of 15th century printing between the east and west coasts.

The collection is certain to enhance Southern Methodist University's efforts to develop its master plan for a first-rate university as the books—all in remarkable shape—are invaluable research tools.

Decherd Turner, Perkins librarian, said the collection will form a cornerstone of knowledge previous impossible to provide.

The books cover a number of subjects including classical texts, humanism, theology and science.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Sept. 20, 1962]

RECEIPT OF BOOK COLLECTION REMARKABLE TRIBUTE TO SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY

(By Jack Castleman)

The designation of Southern Methodist University to receive a collection of books printed in the 15th century is a milestone in the life of the university.

Further, it is a remarkable tribute to the young university and its backers, for such collections almost always go to much older institutions or well-heeled libraries or private collectors.

The 206 books—all printed before 1500—were given to the Perkins School of Theology by J. S. Bridwell, Wichita Falls rancher, and Frank V. DeBellis, of San Francisco, who assembled the collection.

Pointing up the importance of the collection is the fact that one book—St. Augustine's "City of God"—was printed in 1467—only 14 years after Gutenberg developed printing.

To formally mark the reception of the gift, Southern Methodist University will hold an academic festival, "The Renewal of Man," September 27.

Two of the Nation's outstanding scholars, Dr. Curt F. Buhler and Dr. Myron P. Gilmore, will be guest speakers.

The outstanding authority on 15th century printing, Dr. Buhler is keeper of the printed books at the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York.

Dr. Gilmore is professor of history at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Bridwell and DeBellis will be honored with a dinner as part of the festival.

On both September 27 and September 28, 200 items in the collection will be on public display from 8 a.m. to 11 p.m.

Dr. Willis Tate, president of Southern Methodist University, called the collection one of the most important things ever to happen to the university.

"This collection gives us a foundation of knowledge and wisdom for all other studies in the university by providing cornerstones of culture practically impossible to come by.

"We feel more than fortunate that the wisdom and generosity of Mr. DeBellis and Mr. Bridwell which have brought this collection to this university.

"With it comes a high responsibility, and we shall keep and use this remarkable collection well. * * * It is somewhat as if we had added such names as St. Augustine, Euclid, Apuleius, Cicero, Dante, Nicolous de Lyra, Petrach and Boccaccio to our faculty."

The gifts come to Southern Methodist University at a most opportune time as the university is in the midst of a program to develop a first-rate institution of higher learning.

These early writings will be valuable research tools and will greatly advance Southern Methodist Universities academic research.

From any aspect, the collection is impressive.

Prof. Decherd H. Turner, Jr., Perkins librarian, called the gift a breakthrough beyond the 18th century.

"A young school usually has to start building on the third or fourth story. Suddenly, we are now on the ground floor," Turner said.

Material printed before the 18th century is often difficult it not impossible to obtain except through collections such as this.

The books—which have survived 400 years of wear and tear—are in remarkably good shape. The pages, which were printed a page at a time and then hung up to dry, are on very heavy paper.

Many of the books are beautifully illustrated—all done by hand. On some of the books, the printers left instructions for artists to paint in initial letters.

"The artists often weren't too careful," Turner said as he pointed to a wrong letter painted in.

Though the period covers less than 50 years, one can see great advances made in printing as books published near 1500 are illustrated with woodblock cuts.

Though objects of treasure, the books will not be kept under glass but will be used by graduate students and faculty.

The texts—written in either Latin or Italian—cover such subjects as medicine, science, theology and the humanities.

Turner said the books open up a "new frontier in Protestant theological education." Traditionally, it started with 1517 when Martin Luther broke away from the Roman Catholic Church.

"We can quite seriously now concern ourselves with the years from 1467 to 1517."

The collection makes Southern Methodist University the largest repository of 15th century books between the east and west coasts.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Sept. 22, 1962]

SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY BOOK GIFT

Acquisition by Southern Methodist University's Bridwell Library of the priceless Bridwell-DeBellis collection of 15th century printing is one of the longest strides made by the university in its accelerating progress toward first-ranking status.

The farsighted gift made by Wichita Falls rancher J. S. Bridwell and San Francisco Bibliophile Frank V. DeBellis—who assembled the collection—has profound meaning for the cultural advancement of Dallas and the Southwest: With this significant gesture, the city becomes repository for one of the largest collections of its kind in America.

Thus, scholars from all over the world will add Dallas to their research itinerary. They will come here to study the 7 of the 206 items in the collection which are the only complete copies known to exist in North America; or the 49 volumes found in only a half handful of other libraries on the continent, and the 83 books that are first printings.

Enrichment of Southern Methodist University's campus cultural atmosphere—already vibrating with construction of a fine-arts center, plus other facets of a master plan for attainment of excellence in all areas—is incalculable.

The administration of President Willis Tate has given Southern Methodist University a new vigor and excellence. He has become an outstanding figure in education, and the Dallas institution is meeting its challenges with proper vision.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is an eye opener to note how Great Britain's socialized medicine is working

out. In today's New York Herald Tribune Tom Lambert tells us how much care the doctors use on their individual patients:

OH, DOCTOR, PLEASE

(By Tom Lambert)

Britain's exasperated Medical Defense Union, which assists doctors in lawsuits, pleaded again yesterday with hospitals and doctors to halt mixups in which wrong patients are operated on—or right patients operated on for wrong ailments.

The plea seems unlikely to afford much mental comfort to Britons awaiting surgery.

The MDU said the following mixups occurred last year:

"Due to a mental aberration," a doctor who had been treating an 81-year-old woman for a fractured left femur (thigh bone) operated on her right femur.

A doctor performed a hernia operation on a 4-year-old boy who had been admitted to a hospital for removal of a cyst on his knee.

Because of a nurse's dereliction, a patient who had been taken to surgery for removal of his second left toe came out with his second right toe amputated.

An anesthetist injected a patient with surgical spirit instead of a local anesthetic.

A doctor intending to swab a man's arm with alcohol sluiced him down with formic acid.

The MDU issued a comparable "be careful" plea last year to doctors and hospitals here, noting then that a surgical mixup can be a "haunting reproach to the surgeon." The plea obviously was not heeded fully.

As it did last year, the MDU called on doctors again to visit patients in their rooms before operating on them, and called on hospitals to identify patients with discs or labels before they are wheeled into surgery.

Doctors should summon patients to the operating table by name and number, the MDU said, and not call for "the patient from such and such a ward."

Career of Director of Legal Affairs, Organization of American States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I extended my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to include an address before the Inter-American Bar Association by F. V. Garcia-Amador, Director, Department of Legal Affairs, Organization of American States. Since then I have received numerous favorable comments. In view of the interest in this distinguished gentleman, and his important role in hemispheric affairs, I know my colleagues will be interested in the following sketch of his background and of his career:

F. V. GARCIA-AMADOR

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

1. Doctor of laws and of political sciences (University of Havana).
2. Master of arts (Columbia University).
3. Master of laws (Harvard University).
4. Doctor of philosophy (Columbia University).

ACADEMIC RECORD

1. Former professor of international law of the Inter-American University (1944–46, Panama).
2. Idem of the University of Villanueva (Havana, 1956–57).
3. Idem of the University of Havana (1959–60).
4. Lecturer at the Académie de Droit International (The Hague, 1958).
5. Occasional Lectures at the Institut Universitaire de Hautes Etudes Internationaux (Geneva), Escuela de Funcionarios Internacionales (Madrid), Universidad de San Marcos (Lima), etc.
6. Visiting scholar, international legal studies program, Harvard Law School (1960–61).

PUBLICATIONS

Books

"El Proceso Internacional Panamericano" (La Habana, 1943).

"La Explotación y Conservacion de las Riquezas del Mar" (La Habana, 1956).

"The Exploitation and Conservation of the Resources of the Sea, a Study of Contemporary International Law" (The Hague, 1959).

"Introducción al Estudio del Derecho Internacional Contemporáneo" (Madrid, 1959).

Other publications

Reports (6) on international responsibility, in his capacity as special rapporteur of the United Nations International Law Commissions (U.N. docs., published from 1956 to 1961).

A number of articles in United States, European, and Latin American legal periodicals.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Legal Official, U.N. Secretariat (1948–49).

Member of the Inter-American Judicial Committee (Rio de Janeiro, 1949).

Member and President (1956) U.N. International Law Commission, elected by the General Assembly in 1953, and reelected in 1956, for a total period of 8 years.

Legal Counsel of the Cuban Foreign Ministry and Ambassador-at-large-from 1950 to July 1960.

Deputy Representative of Cuba to the U.N. Security Council, and President of its Committee of Experts (1950).

Representative to five regular sessions of the General Assembly, and President of its Legal Committee (1954).

Delegate to the X Inter-American Conference (Caracas, 1954) and the fifth meeting of consultation of the Foreign Ministers (Santiago de Chile, 1959).

Representative to the first four meetings of the Inter-American Council of Jurists (1950 to 1959).

Delegate to the U.N. Fishery Conservation Conference (and Deputy President thereof, Rome, 1955); and to the first and second U.N. Conferences on the Law of the Sea (Geneva, 1958, and 1960, respectively).

Adviser, Department of Legal Affairs, Organization of American States (from October 1961).

Director, Department of Legal Officers, Organization of American States (from August 1, 1962).

For Cuba, Move Against Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly impressed with a timely editorial from the pen of Malcolm B. Johnson which appeared in the Tallahassee Democrat of Wednesday, September 19. I concur wholeheartedly in his position. He has suggested a course of action which should prove much more effective than the present policy of attempting to kill the heads of the Hydra singly.

The editorial follows:

FOR CUBA, MOVE AGAINST RUSSIA

Florida's Senator GEORGE SMATHERS proposes in Senate resolutions that the United States move against Cuba by recognizing a government-in-exile dedicated to invasion and that we seek a NATO-type force among Western Hemisphere nations to help free the island from its captors.

These proposals sound sensible to us. So do many of the other suggestions made by Members of Congress in response to pleas from an angry nation discouraged by the timidity of our national administration.

But aren't such moves, directed against the Castro government and the island he occupies, merely sideshow action—necessary, but preliminary? Isn't it time for us to move into the center ring and take over?

Castro is a puppet, a yapping puppy unworthy of the indignation—much less the alarms—of Americans. The real villain is Soviet Russia. If Russia were not meddling in this situation, we Americans wouldn't care any more about which dictators controlled that island than we have cared about a hundred other little Latin American tyrants.

So let's go further than talk about blockading or invading that island, and turn our attention directly to the primary menace—Communist Russia.

There are ways to deal with Red Russia, short of shooting, that, for some elusive reason, we have not taken.

Let us treat Russia like the carrier of an evil, contagious disease she is. Shun her. Move to put her under quarantine.

From the floor of the United Nations and through the forum of the world's free press, let us scorn her. Every day, let us move against her with resolution, and with action. Every day, let us read a new indictment against her for her countless transgressions.

Stop selling her anything. Stop buying anything from her. Stop letting her people and her officials come among us to spy and to lie about us. Call on our allies and those other nations which profess love of freedom and morality to join us.

Move for her expulsion from the United Nations for numerous U.N. Charter violations and lapses of obligation. (The record is there.)

Make it known to the world, without question, that we are ready to sever all diplomatic and economic relations with Russia and her allies. Hound her out of the society of decent nations. The Communist world cannot stand such censure.

Oh, certainly, we will find timidity among our allies and the neutrals we finance in the U.N., and even in NATO.

It is far past time for us to test their professed desires for liberty and right. Let them decide whether to stand with us, or to lie down with the forces of evil, blackmail, and tyranny.

If such action results in breaking up the United Nations, so be it. We'll save money, and in the process avoid being caught in further embarrassing kangaroo court proceedings where we must humble ourselves to grovel for supporting votes of upstart pigmy nations.

Let us find out—right now, before lifting another finger for foreign aid—where our helpfulness has found grateful friendship.

The whole world knows this situation in Cuba is a test of our determination to resist the advances of communism—a clearer test of the will of the United States than Berlin, or Laos, or Korea.

Although some of our allies would desert us, others would stand; but we are strong enough to stand alone, and we could stand better without any false friends to depend on. Russia can't, yet count on such support from even her own satellites.

So let's throw down the gauntlet. Now. In Washington, and in the U.N. General Assembly meeting in New York.

No person, no nation, ever gained anything worthwhile by pussyfooting and compromising to avoid coming to grips with an evil force that constantly abused good intentions to grow stronger and bolder.

Trial of Criminal Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, recently there have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of statements by Members of the Congress concerning a pending criminal prosecution in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida in which the defendants, James R. Hoffa and Robert E. McCarthy, are charged with fraud by mail, telegraph, and telephone. I have confidence that the Federal court in Florida will set the case down for trial and will grant to the two defendants the speedy trial to which they are entitled under the sixth amendment. While I believe quite strongly that criminal cases should be tried in the courtroom, and not in the newspapers or in the Congress, the following facts concerning case No. 1282-61 Southern District of Florida, United States against Hoffa and McCarthy, seem worth setting forth.

The record will disclose that the Government first asked for a trial date under an earlier indictment in March 1961. On June 25, 1962, the defendants argued that they could not go to trial on September 10, 1962, because one of their attorneys was involved in other litigation on that date. Judge Lieb ordered the defendants to be prepared for trial on October 15, 1962.

According to record the defendants in this case have not always appeared to be as ready, willing and able to go to trial as they would now seem to want to make the people believe. Witness the fact that the defendants have filed 40 motions in the case. The defendants have filed appeals to the Supreme Court on two of these motions and the Supreme Court cannot even commence to consider these appeals until next month at the earliest.

In the most recent hearing in this case on August 20, 1962, when the matter of the trial date was discussed, there was read into the record an affidavit from the personal physician of the defendant McCarthy which read in part as follows:

Mr. McCarthy has * * * a grave condition in any instance (which) by extension can be fatal. In fact, it very often is. I have continued to treat Mr. McCarthy for this condition to date * * * exposure to any excitement or unusual situations would only serve to worsen Mr. McCarthy's prognosis. Assuming that Mr. McCarthy was exposed to a trial of any protracted length involving signal intensity at this time or any time within the next 120 days, it is my professional opinion that such an ordeal would involve a serious sequel to his immediate condition which might well result in total future incapacition or a fatality.

It would appear from this evidence that defendant McCarthy could not have gone to trial at the date suggested by defense counsel. This is, however, a matter which the court should decide and a matter which the court did decide.

The real basis for the court's decision not to try this case on the date previously set, October 15, 1962, appears to lie neither with the defendants or the Government but rather with an action taken by Congress. It is for this reason that I as a member of the Judiciary Committee of this House, which considered the legislation involved feel obliged to set the record straight.

On July 30, 1962, Public Law 87-562 became law. It created a new middle judicial district in Florida, which had previously been divided into a northern and a southern district. The new district will come into existence on October 28. The case of United States against Hoffa and McCarthy is now in the Tampa division of the southern district, to which it had been removed by order of court. At the present time the Tampa division is in the southern district, but after October 28, some of its counties will be in the new middle district, and others will remain in the southern district.

The new middle district of Florida will be the first new judicial district created by the Congress in 35 years. Its creation will bring to the courts a number of problems of transition, including the question of what should be done with untried cases and cases which might, if started before October 28, not be completed by the date that the new district is created.

The judges of the southern district met concerning these problems, and determined as a matter of judicial administration that southern district cases which fall in the new district should be recalendared in the new district October 29 if their trial could not be completed prior to that date. This was in my opinion a wise decision, avoiding the possibility that doubts might be cast on the validity of convictions in cases where the trial was started in one district and completed in another. U.S. against Hoffa and McCarthy was but one of a number of cases which were affected by this decision.

Too Partisan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ryan Leader of September 20, 1962, by Editor J. T. Daniel, concerning the partisan cries on Communist Cuba:

TOO PARTISAN
(By J. T. Daniel)

When wars were of the conventional type, rifles, cannons, tanks, airplanes, and other weapons of destruction, they were terrifying. But in this day of missiles, atom and hydrogen bombs, they are horrible and annihilating.

This being true, it would seem that men of any sense of responsibility for the safety of their own lives and those of their countrymen would at least try to refrain from inflaming the minds of the people.

The United States of America is a democracy. And a democracy is much different to a dictatorship. In a democracy, its rulers must listen to the voice of the people, or they will be defeated at the next election. This is not true in a dictatorship. A dictator is not subject to the whims of pleasure groups. Public sentiment is not so important in a dictatorship. Khrushchev can rave and rant all he pleases without building a war sentiment that will force him to start to shooting. In the United States this is different.

The people of the United States are rather suspectible to warlike propaganda. And when politicians and others try to inflame public sentiment here about Russia's disregard for the Monroe Doctrine, they should be honest and tell the American people that the Truman doctrine of 1947 actually supplanted the Monroe Doctrine. If it hadn't, we would not have our guns pointed at Khrushchev's head in all the countries of Europe surrounding him. The Monroe Doctrine prohibited this.

If people are given the facts they will not become the victims of a war frenzy that will force a big war. Heedlessly, recklessly, and wantonly some men seem to be so obsessed by a desire for partisan gain they would risk blowing themselves, the American people, Cuba, and the Russians off the face of the earth, just to try to make votes.

It is time the American people woke up to the dangers of such a course of action. They should tell the hotheads in and out of Congress to keep their big mouths shut. It is no time to become spooky and do something foolish because a bewhiskered addlepated Cuban mouse happens to take a wild run across the international stage.

A Tribute to County ASC Committeemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WM. J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, last week this body approved the farm bill as reported by the conferees. We believe this bill will do much toward solving our farm problems, but I had hoped that we could have passed long-term legislation which would have been effective for 1963 and thereafter, and would have given farmers more time to make plans.

In an effort to ascertain what farmers wanted in the way of farm legislation, if any, we conducted a poll earlier in the year. The response, in our opinion, was excellent for out of 25,000 questionnaires mailed out, we received back about one-fourth completed returns. We will have to say though, we were greatly surprised at the many varied opinions as to what

farm legislation should or should not accomplish. The majority of those who completed the questionnaires, favored some type of farm program, and each of us know that even if a program were excellent in every particular, if there is no one to carry out the program, it would be worthless, or of very little value.

One of the questions asked on this survey was, "Do you favor farmer-elected committees as the best means of administering farm programs on the local level?" After compilation had been made of the returned completed questionnaires, we found that 84.3 farmers favored the county elected committees, 9 percent did not, and 6.7 percent had no opinion.

Today, I rise to pay tribute to these dedicated men who give of their time and energy in behalf of their neighbors and indirectly to the Nation as a whole. Those consecrated men in the Fourth Missouri District, are chosen by their fellow farmers to make the necessary decisions, to explain and to generally supervise the administration of the farm programs at the county level.

Our country is blessed with an overabundance, and each of us should give thanks each night before we close our eyes that we live in America where overabundance and not starvation is one of our major problems. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, regardless of what kind of farm program is finally adopted, it will not work—it cannot succeed, unless we encourage our farmers to supervise themselves to administer these farm programs by those chosen from their own ranks.

I am a firm believer that the family farm is the great symbol of freedom and free enterprise. And I believe that we owe the family farm a great debt of gratitude for its contribution to our American heritage. In our deliberation I say again, I hope we will not forget the people, the individuals, the folks who carry out or administer our farm programs on the county level. It is a privilege to salute you, our county ASC committeemen, dedicated to the cause of better farming, and devoted in your efforts for the improvement of farm income and the contentment of our people who would perpetuate the family farm.

Cuba Lifeline Can Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the recent action by the Government of West Germany in restricting German-flag ships from taking part in the Cuban Russian buildup deserves the praise of all of us who have been seeking the halt to such activities by our friends in the free world.

Now that West Germany has led the way, it is hoped that all others who have been involved in this traffic will follow with like action.

Victor Riesel is one of those who can justly take credit for this first break in the Cuban supply line. His disclosures of those involved have been fully documented with the names of ships and their flags. He has pointed out time and again that this trade could be stopped, if we would insist that it be stopped. When action was not forthcoming he pointed out the facts for the American public.

In a recent article, Mr. Riesel points out that some shipping firms are making millions of dollars from the United States by carrying American cargo across the world; and yet these same ships not only supply Cuba but Communist China as well.

Thus, not only do the foreign vessels strengthen our enemies, but they weaken the United States by depriving our seamen of jobs and our shipping firms of profits, as Mr. Riesel points out.

Because of the importance of the information contained in this article, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

CUBA LIFELINE CAN BE CUT

(By Victor Riesel)

NEW YORK.—Cuba's waterborne supply lines can be cracked with the stroke of a pen.

What's needed is a Presidential directive shutting U.S. ports to vessels and ship-chartering companies which deal with the enemy. This means a blacklist. Why not?

There are many foreign firms now making millions of dollars from the U.S. Government itself by carrying heavy tonnage of Federal cargo across the world. And yet these same ships—lists of which any Federal agency can get along this waterfront—not only supply Cuba, but Communist China, Russia, Poland, and even weird Albania. This the foreign-flag ships often embark on immediately after delivering American cargo abroad.

Thus, not only do the foreign vessels strengthen our enemies, but they weaken the United States by depriving our seamen of jobs and our shipping firms of profits.

Tankers of our NATO Allies, for example, have been running Soviet oil to Cuba for many, many months now—long before the Soviet landings on the island needled some of us into an outcry over the current merchant fleet supplied to the Soviet bloc by nations to which we have been giving billions of dollars.

Those tankers are chartered by the Russians because the Soviet ministry of the maritime fleet is short of these big floating fuel tanks. The tankers, owned by Greek and British firms, or by complex companies operating under Panamanian, Liberian, and Honduran flags, first deliver the Russian oil to Havana. Then the empty tankers put into U.S. ports for profitable cargoes.

This may be cut down some day. The Soviets have just completed the *Bucharest*. This is the fifth in a series of huge tankers which they call "Peking-type vessels." They have been built in the Leningrad "Baltic shipyards." So desperately does Cuba need this fuel that it has become traditional for the Soviet ministry to put its new tankers immediately into the Cuban run. But still there are not enough. Yet ships of our "friends" continue to help them.

And then there are the ship operators who get business from the American Government because of our efforts to feed a hungry non-Communist world. There is a Federal directive which states that only 50 percent of our shipments of surplus foods to needy nations must be shipped in U.S. "bottoms." So, to lend a hand and a dollar to freighters of friendly nations, we give them the cargo job.

Many of these foreign-flag ships carry grain to the Orient. Sometimes to India. Sometimes to Africa or the Near East. Then they steam into the China Sea and the Pacific. There they shuttle back and forth for the Peiping Communist Government. In Hong Kong recently I talked to masters and mates of such ships.

They discolsed that after handling some of the "Chi-com" business they heave back to Europe's Communist bloc ports. There they load up with heavy cargoes for Cuba. Of course, they carry armaments. But almost as vital are the vast quantities of prefabricated factories and plants, machine tools, spare parts, steel mill sections, and electronic equipment.

These will create a Soviet-type industrial system in Cuba. In a few years it will begin producting for export to the South American market—thereby undermining local producers and therefore chances for recovery amongst our Alliance for Progress allies.

After the NATO nation ships unload in Cuban ports they have only one chance for a new payload there. That is sugar. But sabotage and sheer inefficiency have slashed the harvesting of this crop. So there is only enough for part of the chartered supply fleet. The ones who get the loads then steam to Russia and Poland or through the Panama Canal to China. But all the other vessels face going back light.

Thus many of them, after dropping their Red cargoes in Cuba, head for the United States to make certain they can pick up a paying shipment and thus make a profit from both sides.

There are waterfront union leaders here who say they have evidence that the Yugoslav merchant fleet is running cargo for the Communist bloc. This cargo, they say, is mostly military. It comes from the Czech munition-making complex built around the famed Skoda works. Waterfront experts here report that Yugoslav ships regularly put into Havana.

Furthermore, the union leaders assert bluntly—sometimes in anger fully peppered with sailor's language—that the State Department has all this information. And that it has had it for some time.

Why then does everybody in official circles seem so surprised these days?

Why not blacklist those ships which make a dollar out of trading with enemies who already are shooting at American soldiers, sailors and airmen? Why not?

Senator Johnston Merits Reelection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very fine editorial from the Winnsboro, S.C., News & Herald of Thursday, September 20, 1962, which I commend to every citizen of my State who is interested in the continuation of good government.

The article is as follows:

SENATOR JOHNSTON MERITS REELECTION

Bill Workman is among the finest journalists one could meet in a day's journey between sunrise and sunset on the 21st of June. He is a gentleman, a scholar, an author, and—to his credit—he is probably not a judge of good whiskey because, like his opponent, he is a teetotaler.

The News & Herald wishes him exceedingly well in every respect save one: we want him to remain in the newspaper fraternity and serve his people there—not in the U.S. Senate, from a standing start. The ink looks good on his fingers and, as he will probably recall, his onetime chief, the late Dr. W. W. Ball, longtime editor of the Charleston News & Courier, avowed that newsmen had no business running for public office, because, for one thing, they sacrifice their objectivity. And, in Dr. Ball's lexicon, there was no higher profession than that of a journalist.

Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, in our opinion, has earned the right to reelection to a fourth term. His 18 years' experience is an asset to the people of South Carolina and will become increasingly so during the next 6. Patently, the Republican press in Columbia is missing no trick, either in news or editorial columns or in cartoons, in a determined effort to see that Senator JOHNSTON is defeated, but, we believe, this is another case of a lost cause. Characteristically, the Columbia Record, in one of its too, too clever cartoons titled "The Little People's Coloring Book," compares the Palmetto State's senior Senator to "Captain Kangaroo," disparages his ability, acumen, decorum and voting record in this and other extreme ways. Ofttimes, however, he who laughs last, laughs longest, and our inexpert guess is that these self-styled big, journals may find that much-maligned OLIN is, after all, "the little people's man," come election day.

One concedes that Senator JOHNSTON is no silver-tongued orator, the likes of William Jennings Bryan, and he is not a Woodrow Wilson-type scholar and grammarian, either. But, since when has this become a political crime? Not one in a million of us have such attributes and few people can aspire to be as literate as those masters of the "big word"—when a little one would serve 'em better—who write for the GOP press in South Carolina. On occasions too numerous to catalog, these papers delight in downgrading both President and Senator, when it suits their political progaganda purposes.

Neither is Senator JOHNSTON the ultraliberal that his enemies try to paint him. Often he worked and voted against excessive spending and waste in foreign and domestic programs; he is, perhaps, ultraconservative on the race question, but his views here probably reflect those of a majority of his constituents. If he can be accurately tagged a "liberal" or "progressive" in any field—and such labels really have little meaning—it is in his votes and views on labor legislation and, from our vantage point in a minor managerial post, we cannot conscientiously say he is wrong. Labor, in South Carolina and in other parts of the Nation, has not precisely been living high on the hog of late—due to considerable unemployment and part-time jobs—and if labor has a moderate friend in Washington who is aware of its needs, who can raise legitimate objection? Senator JOHNSTON, in our view, is not radical even in the labor field and he kowtows to no overbearing, unscrupulous labor bosses.

It is, of course, understandable that the rank and file likes the senior Senator and the stands he takes because he came up through the ranks, himself. He worked in the mills to earn money for his education.

House Resolution 211: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286 to 3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CLARINDA, IOWA,
August 24, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned members of We the People Study Group acknowledge our support of House Resolution 211 for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. We feel that exposure to the world of the captive nations situation constitutes a great potential weapon against the Communist conspiracy. We therefore urge you to do all in your power to activate this bill now before the House Rules Committee and to effect its adoption by the Congress.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Harold Witthoft, Mrs. Martin Mier, Una Coie, Mrs. Ross Miller, Clarinda, Iowa; Mrs. John Bicknese, Wheatland, Iowa; Mrs. Jessie F. Shambaugh, Mrs. Herb J. Sunderman, Herb J. Sunderman, Harold Witthoft, Mrs. Floyd Wagoner, Floyd Wagoner, Laura Edmonds, Mr. and Mrs. T. E. Stickelman, Mr. and Mrs. Darrell Damewood, Mr. and Mrs. Jake Stimson, Clarinda, Iowa.

AUGUST 28, 1962.

DEAR FRIEND OF LITHUANIA: Congratulations on your efforts for Lithuania and the other captive, colonial nations of the U.S.S.R. Let us hope that free elections can be held there someday.

Sincerely,

A. D. YUKNIS.

NORTHBROOK, ILL.,
August 27, 1962.

Hon. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: Thank you for so clearly pointing out, in your speech of August 8, the startling contrast between President Kennedy's proclamation of Captive Nations Week 1962, and the congressional resolution of 1959.

For some time I have been following the attempts to establish a House Committee on Captive Nations. This would provide a sorely needed encouragement to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, as well as putting their slavemasters on notice that we have not abandoned these peoples to perpetual slavery. And yet the attitude of Secretary of State Rusk and the State Department is that we must not do anything which might antagonize the Communists. This same thinking has motivated the President's weak Captive Nations Week declaration.

I am thankful that we have men such as yourself in the Senate, who realize the folly of trying to be nice to the Communists.

Sincerely,

Mrs. STEPHEN KRAYCHY.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: Please keep up the fight for a Captive Nations Committee.

MARY M. KRAYCHY.

BREMERTON CAPTIVE NATIONS COUNCIL,
Bremerton, Wash., September 3, 1962.

Re Report of 1962 activities in relation to Captive Nations Week and House Resolution 211.

1. Lectured in Seattle, Bellingham, and Tacoma on the captive nations concept and the working procedures of a captive nations organization, providing guidelines for operational methods and activities.

2. At the Kitsap County Republican Central Committee Convention, we proposed, from the floor, a plank stipulating support of the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations as set forth in House Resolution 211, now pending in the U.S. House of Representatives. The proposed plank was debated and adopted.

3. Participated in the public meeting at the Seattle Chamber of Commerce building on Monday of Captive Nations Week, at which time we presented and read the annual proclamation by the Honorable H. O. Domstad, mayor of the city of Bremerton.

4. Printed and distributed 10,000 copies of a document entitled "The Third Week in July." This paper included the text of Public Law 86-90, President Eisenhower's 1959 Captive Nations Week proclamation, and President Kennedy's 1961 proclamation.

5. At the request of the Washington State Republican Central Committee Convention, we supplied 50 copies of a statement explaining the proposed establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations, a sheet setting forth the elements and extent of support for this legislation, and copies of "The Third Week in July." (The plank, identical to that adopted in Kitsap County, passed through the platform committee without debate; and was adopted by the convention, again without debate.)

6. At our suggestion, the Bremerton Chamber of Commerce studied the question of the proposed bill, House Resolution 211, and as a result of this inquiry into the matter, did pass and forward to Representative FLOOD a resolution in support of the House

measure and the resultant special committee embodied therein.

The Bremerton Captive Nations Council takes pleasure in commending the owners of local stores who took the initiative by presenting pertinent window displays during the week, the several ministers who saw fit to hold special services, the Bremerton Chamber of Commerce for its cooperation and interest in House Resolution 211, the many individuals here and in Washington, D.C., who labored to make the State observance a success, and Mayor Domstad and Governor Rosellini for their moving and heartfelt proclamations.

JAMES K. MORGAN,
Chairman.

Problems of the Domestic Lumber Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this Congress who has worked long and hard to assist in the solution of American lumber problems, particularly in my Northwest area, and who has had the privilege of working with the administration in this effort, I would like to present some replies to recent charges made on the floor of this House that "the economy of our lumber communities is being seriously disrupted by the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and the administration."

The lumber industry has not yet come back from the serious deterioration which has been growing year by year for the past several. There are problems to be met and no one knows it better than any Member of Congress from the west coast; however, I feel this administration has attempted to work with us. It has been serious and attentive to the problem and while there is, as I repeat, a long way yet to go, particularly with reference to the Canadian problem, I do feel a statement of the facts is now in order.

Because of the number of allegations which have been made from time to time, I would like to take this opportunity to respond to each of them in turn.

The first which I wish to consider is the President's lumber economy announcement of July 26. The charge has been made that nothing has been done to implement any of the six points in that announcement. Those acquainted with the situation know otherwise, and I wish to bring those not acquainted with the situation up to date.

First. The initiation of negotiations with Canada concerning the amount of softwood lumber imported into the United States.

A delegation consisting of officials of the Department of State, Commerce, and Interior, and their advisers, met with Canadian officials on August 28–29.

Commenting on the discussions, Daniel L. Goldy, Administrator of the Department of Commerce's Business and Defense Services Administration, and adviser to the U.S. delegation, had this to say:

> The U.S. representatives, as a result of the discussions with Canadian representatives, were afforded an opportunity to present clearly the full range of grievances adversely affecting the U.S. softwood lumber industry. It was apparent to all present that the message was received and understood.

NLMA Executive Vice President Mortimer B. Doyle, expressed U.S. lumber industry gratification at the progress made in Ottawa, saying:

> We are encouraged that the preliminary discussions by the Canadian and United States Governments of the critical problem of excessive imports of Canadian softwood lumber resulted in agreement to undertake further discussion.
>
> We are sure that when the situation is fully explored, and all facts examined, the two Governments and their respective lumber industries will agree to affirmative action providing a friendly and practical solution of the problem.

A second meeting with the Canadians is scheduled to take place in October, and it is my earnest hope that industry technicians will be available to assist our negotiations.

Second. The submission of a request to the Congress for additional funds for forest development roads and trails program to assure the prompt harvest of national forest timber.

While statements have been made that the Department of Agriculture, and specifically the Forest Service, does not intend to use the appropriated access roads funds for the purpose of roads and trails into timber areas unless they are forced to do so. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I am advised that authorization for additional funds will come from the Biennial Federal Aid Highway Act. The appropriation bill under this act which is now in conference shows substantial increases for roads for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 as well as an extra $20 million for the 1963 fiscal year. In addition, 10 percent of national forest gross receipts are allocated for timber access roads. The regular Forest Service appropriation provides from $2 to $5 million for roads. Another potential source of money for access roads is the public works program, which amounts to $900 million.

Although the money made available under these appropriations is specifically designated for multiple-purpose roads, I have been assured that the U.S. Forest Service intends to use more than 95 percent of the total amount for timber access roads.

The Forest Service is keenly aware of the log supply problem and is interested, I am sure, in making the full allowable cut available. This is evidenced by the fact that in the major western regions—Forest Service regions 1, 5, and 6, consisting of Washington, Oregon, California, Northern Idaho, and Montana—the Forest Service sold 2,937 million board feet of timber during the second quarter 1962, compared with 1,660 board feet during the second quarter of 1961. Furthermore, the average appraised price of the timber sold in 1962 was $8.90 per thousand board feet compared to $10.02 in 1961.

Third. The amendment of the intercoastal shipping laws to permit use of foreign vessels when those conditions exist which indicate severe hardship to American shippers. This amendment will reduce the handicaps suffered by American producers in the intercoastal shipment of lumber.

The claim has been made that legislation modifying the Jones Act for the benefit of the Pacific Northwest lumber industry "would be passed if the administration would only lend just tacit assistance." The fact that step 3 of the President's announcement of July 26 specifically called for amendment of the intercoastal shipping laws is evidence not only of tacit but expressed approval.

Those of us interested in really helping this segment of the lumber industry should unite behind the legislation which provides for a subsidy to American-flag vessels transporting lumber, which would enable ship operators to offer rates to U.S. lumber shippers comparable to rates available to Canadian lumber shippers. This is what is proposed in my bill—H.R. 9820—and Senator Magnuson's bill—S. 2737.

Some of our southern colleagues may be opposed to any modification of the Jones Act because the southern pine lumber industry fears an increase in competition in the Eastern market from U.S. Pacific coast lumber.

To this I would reply that historical records show that the combined waterborne shipments from the United States and Canada to the U.S. Atlantic coast remained relatively stable during the period 1952–61, ranging from a low of 1.3 billion board feet in 1952 to a high of 1.6 billion board feet in 1953. However, our concern, and we hope it is also the concern of our southern colleagues, is that British Columbia's participation in these shipments spiralled from 17.4 percent in 1952 to 65 percent for the period January–June 1962. Each of us should be anxious to see this market restored to the U.S. lumber industry.

Fourth. An immediate increase in allowable cuts which will make available 150 million board feet on the lands managed by the Department of the Interior.

If we are to be of help to the domestic lumber industry, we must be fully informed as to each remedial action taken by the administration. It does not benefit the lumber industry to scream that nothing of value is being done. I make specific reference to the charge that the Department of the Interior failed to act in response to the President's request to increase the annual allowable cut by 150 million board feet of timber on the lands managed by that Department. The Department of the Interior immediately acted upon the President's request and the lumber industry was most pleased by this action.

I quote from Random Lengths of September 10, 1962:

> Recently a relatively important and pace setting revision in forest management planning was accomplished by the Bureau of Land Management on the O. & C. lands in western Oregon. As a result, the allowable

cut on this relatively small forest acreage was increased about 15 percent.

Fifth. The establishment of a preference for American products in the purchase of lumber by the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and other Federal departments and agencies. This could be particularly significant in connection with the various aspects of the AID program.

Perhaps we can be of greatest assistance to our lumber industry insisting that the U.S. Government patronize the domestic lumber industry.

I understand that agencies throughout Government have tried to follow this policy; for example, the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1962 awarded 95 percent of its lumber procurement contracts to domestic small business firms. However, the Department of Defense has no means of assuring that the lumber obtained from these small business firms was all of domestic origin. I believe that we should look into all Government procurement with the thought of encouraging the procurement of 100 percent domestically produced lumber.

Under the Armed Services Procurement Regulations, the Canadian lumber industry is given equal opportunity to bid on U.S. military purchase contracts. We should request the Department of Defense to review its policy and amend its regulations to limit purchases to U.S.-produced lumber.

In response to this point in the President's program, the Agency for International Development has instructed its oversea offices to review their lumber procurement programs with respect to species and countries of origin with a view toward purchasing from the United States to the maximum degree. However, I am convinced that we should prevail upon AID to go much further. Our lumber and lumber fabricating industries are geared to produce high-quality, low-price houses for world markets, particularly for the substantial Latin American housing market for which U.S. financial assistance has been made available. I believe that those acquainted with the current situation in our lumber industry will agree with me that the benefits of this trade should accrue to the domestic lumber industry rather than to its foreign competitors.

Sixth. Increased attention to loan applications filed with the Small Business Administration and the Area Redevelopment Administration by lumber mills in order to enable them to upgrade their production and better compete with imported lumber products.

I know of no instance where a small lumber firm, qualified to receive and in need of financial assistance, has been refused help by either the Small Business Administration or the Area Redevelopment Administration. This statement is made to correct the erroneous remark that such requests for assistance have fallen on deaf ears.

Both the Small Business Administration and Area Redevelopment Administration have been alerted to the President's interest within this area. I know these agencies are anxious to make their total facilities available to lumber and wood products industries and to process such applications with the utmost speed.

Loans under these programs, according to my information, will be made to upgrade production of existing facilities and obtain better utilization of raw materials, including wood residue, and manpower. For example, loans will be considered for the addition of dry kilns, chippers and debarkers, resaws and remanufacturing equipment, and establishment of particle board and hardboard plants.

I am also advised that loans will be used to establish new facilities in areas where raw materials are now underutilized. Loans will not be used to create new primary capacity in areas where a shortage of logs exists or where the log supply would not support the new and already established plants on a sustained-yield basis.

A number of loans in this field have been approved by both the Small Business Administration and Area Redevelopment Administration and several applications are being considered. However, action on the part of either the Small Business Administration or Area Redevelopment Administration is dependent upon specific requests from firms in need of financial assistance.

Just last month permanent year-round jobs were created for 80 workers in a new plywood plant at Chehalis, Wash., in my own district, as a result of a $140,000 ARA industrial loan made to Cowlitz Forest Products, Inc.

REVIEW OF FOREST SERVICE ALLOWABLE CUTS

I would like to comment on another statement to the effect that the Forest Service does not offer sufficient timber for sale and that which is offered is put up at a price which the small operator cannot meet. This statement was obviously made without knowledge of recent changes in the timber sales policy of the Forest Service. I recognize that the potential obtainable goal has not been reached, but we must all recognize that substantial advancements have been made. Furthermore, I have been advised that additional improvements are soon to be announced.

Secretary Freeman has appointed a committee headed by a professor from the Forestry Department of the University of Michigan assisted by the most competent employees in the Forest Service, who are experts in the particular study area, to formulate a report to the President reviewing allowable cut determinations. This report, in response to the President's request, will be submitted to the President on October 15.

While we cannot prejudge the conclusions of the report, I am told that recommendations will be made, such as shorter rotation periods, which will increase the allowable cut. Such action will place more national forest timber on the market and consequently lower the price of stumpage, thereby placing the domestic lumber industry in a more competitive position.

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

I understand that there will be a continuing review of the problems of the lumber industry. Since the President's directive, an interagency committee, which has the full support and endorsement of the heads of all departments and agencies, has been active.

At the Ottawa Conference, the latter part of August, the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, State, and Interior were represented. In addition, consultations were held with knowledgeable principals in all concerned departments and agencies and with industrial leaders. I have been assured that there is every intention to maintain this committee on an active status in order to benefit from its advice in preparing for future meetings with the Canadians, and in implementing other parts of the President's program.

IMPORT QUOTA

Certain of my colleagues have criticized the President for his failure to establish an import quota on softwood lumber. These same individuals were equally critical of the fact that the first Ottawa Lumber Conference did not result in the establishment of a quota.

It must be pointed out that the President has taken the only actions open to him with respect to the imposition of import quotas.

The President has authority to impose quotas only (a) under the Agriculture Act of 1956, as amended, by section 204 providing there is a voluntary agreement between the countries concerned and (b) under the escape clause provision section 7, or the national security clause section 8 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. He has taken all feasible steps under these alternatives.

As you know, he has requested the Tariff Commission to complete as expeditiously as possible consideration of the application filed by west coast lumber interests for an escape clause investigation. The Commission has scheduled hearings to begin on October 2. He has also instructed the concerned Governmental departments to initiate negotiations with Canada concerning the amount of softwood lumber imported into the United States. It is in this connection that the President has authority to impose an import quota under the Agriculture Act of 1956, as amended.

BUSINESS TRIPS AND TRADE MISSIONS

We are all familiar with the national export expansion program of this administration. In this connection, the Department of Commerce has and continues to work closely with the domestic lumber industry in promoting business trips and trade missions abroad for the expansion of lumber export markets. Currently, I have learned, preparations are underway for a privately financed business trip of five lumber industry executives scheduled for October 5 to 11 to the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, and Italy. The Department of Commerce has handled the necessary preparatory work and will furnish an "advance" man to arrange, through our Foreign Service posts, meetings with principal lumber importers, lumber-using industrial and residential contractors, and wood household and office furniture manufacturers.

Work also is underway relative to a softwood lumber trade mission scheduled for spring of 1963. This specialized trade mission, which will be financed by the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, is tentatively scheduled to visit potential softwood lumber markets in Europe, Australia, and Japan. The Department of Commerce is working closely with this industrial segment to assure the success of the trade mission, which is directed toward expanding existing markets and creating new markets for U.S. softwood lumber abroad.

We in the Congress should do all in our power to enhance the opportunities of the lumber industry to expand its trade in world markets. Along this line, I have introduced a bill to exclude cargo which is lumber from conference agreements under the Shipping Act, 1916, and from certain tariff filing requirements under such act. An identical bill has been introduced by Senator MAGNUSON. This proposed legislation would enable the lumber industry to compete more effectively with Canada in world markets.

I also urge your support of the bill, S. 3517, which would apply 50 percent of the duties on lumber and other forest products which would amount to $7½ million, to promoting new markets for the industry. This bill has passed the Senate and its companion, H.R. 12472, which I introduced should be passed by the House.

In closing, I would like to quote from one of our western timber companies who says:

Many creditable gains have been made by the forest industries through legislative efforts in 1962. The outstanding gains are in creating unity within a big but loosely hung industry and in developing better acquaintance with the Congress. This helps create a foundation upon which much progress can be anticipated.

Our lumber communities' welfare, our national lumber welfare, need every ounce of our assistance.

Nikola Petkov—15th Anniversary Observance of His Execution by Bulgarian Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 21, 1962

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, since the end of the last war many stouthearted and outspoken champions of freedom and democracy have been betrayed, blackmailed, and treacherously murdered or executed by Communist tyrants. Only by silencing and liquidating their actual and potential opponents have Communist leaders attained power, only through such foul and treacherous methods they have managed to stay in power in Communist-dominated countries in Europe.

Nikola Petkov, as a great popular and democratic leader in Bulgarian politics, had emerged as the bravest champion of democracy towards the end of the last war. He headed the powerful Agrarian Party and hoped to set up a democratic government in postwar Bulgaria. Of course he had no illusions about the difficulties he was to encounter in this constructive task; he knew that Communists and their friends were his formidable and deadly opponents, but he felt that as long as he could count on the support of the majority of his countrymen in a fair and honestly conducted election, he was certain of success. For 2 years this gallant son of the Bulgarian people fought the forces of communism, showing his unshakable faith in free and democratic way of life. In June 1947, when the Communist regime was firmly established there, he was blackmailed, arrested, tried on trumped-up charges of treason, and then executed on September 27. In observing the 15th anniversary of Nikola Petkov's treacherous execution by Communists, we pay tribute to the memory of this gallant Bulgarian leader, a true fighter for the cause of freedom and democracy.

U.N. Is Seen as U.S. Foe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Yorkville Enquirer, York, S.C., of September 20, 1962:

U.N. IS SEEN AS U.S. FOE

(By Rose White)

Last Friday, Americans learned that the U.S. House of Representatives had approved the purchase of up to $100 million in United Nations bonds. This legislation will now go before the House-Senate conference where the differences between the House and Senate will be ironed out.

Of the 104 member nations of the U.N., 66 are in arrears on payment of their Congo account, and 56 on their Gaza strip assessments.

A vital question seems to be, "Has the United Nations, in its role as peacemaker, really succeeded?"

Lord Beaverbrook, a noted British publisher has said, "Here in New York City, you Americans have the biggest fifth column in the world—the United Nations."

The late Senator Taft declared, "The United Nations has become a trap. Let's go it alone."

Winston Churchill, of worldwide fame, says, "Don't pay attention to the U.N."

A quick look at the U.N. record book will show exactly why these statements were made:

Trygve Lie, longtime Secretary General of the United Nations, stated flatly that there was a secret agreement between Alger Hiss and Molotov to the effect that the head of the United Nations should always be a Communist. That agreement has never been broken, and a succession of Communists have filled that post, the present one being Mr. Arkadev. As a consequence of this treasonous agreement, this country lost its first military engagement in Korea at a cost of 145,000 American casualties and more than $20 billion to say nothing of the honor and prestige of this Nation. This was the first war in which we engaged, not as the United States, but as the United Nations force, although we contributed 90 percent of the men and money.

How very convenient this was to the Communists to have one of their own men as head of the U.N. military staff, who reviewed all orders going from the Pentagon to General MacArthur and gave them to the enemy before MacArthur received them.

The enemy, which consisted of the Red Communist army, Russian equipment, and fliers, was driven back to the Yalu River and given sanctuary on the other side. General MacArthur could have made short order of the enemy had he been permitted to pursue them. We were sold the U.N. on a promise of peace, but what we failed to realize was, this peace was on Communist terms.

The United Nations has not even passed a resolution of condemnation or censorship against Russia for its Hungarian blood bath, but stood by and helped to betray those courageous Hungarian freedom fighters into the hands of Russia. Those brave lovers of liberty fought in the streets with sticks and stones while the red blood of freedom flowed beneath Russian tanks and machineguns.

The United Nations could not even get a censorship resolution against India for its military invasion of Portuguese enclaves. In fact, the U.N. has passed no resolution of condemnation against Russia or any of its satellites or against the so-called neutral countries, but busies itself with resolutions of condemnation against our own allies such as Portugal, Holland, and France.

The United Nations actually sent troops into the Congo to prevent self-determination of a civilized and Christian province which wanted no part of a Communist-controlled Congo. This action in Katanga is beyond comprehension.

We can, by retaining our membership in the U.N. look to see the United States condemned for having a naval base at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba. You say this is fantastic? The same 66 votes which threw France out of its legal position in Bizerte can vote the United States out of Guantánamo Bay.

Make no mistake, communism is dedicated to the destruction of freedom in the world.

William Z. Foster, former head of the Communist Party in the United States of America, stated, "the final aim of the Communist international is to overthrow world capitalism and replace it with world communism—all the capitalist parties—Democratic, Republican, Socialist, Progressive—will be liquidated. Studies will be revolutionized, being cleansed of religious, patriotic, and other features of the bourgeois ideology."

Last week, the FBI made public the case of espionage by Soviet citizens in the U.N. These two citizens had paid a New York politician $3,000 to give them secret information and make pro-Russian speeches. The politician, Richard Flink, worked with the FBI to help uncover the illegal activities. Both spies have left the country. How many more remain?

Former President Herbert Hoover recently told the American people that "we must realize that the United Nations has failed to give us even a remote hope of lasting peace. Instead, it adds to the dangers of wars which now surrounds us for it contains the disintegrating forces of the Communist nations in its membership. The time is here when, if the free nations are to survive, they must have a new and stronger worldwide organization. It should include only those who are willing to stand up and fight for their freedom."

Higher Education in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting article issued by the New England Board of Higher Education:

The development of streptomycin, the conquest of rickets and pellagra, technical assistance teams to underdeveloped countries, the first educational television station, the low price of poultry—these are but a sampling of the impact of the land-grant movement.

Now celebrating their first century, the land-grant colleges are helping to achieve the goal that Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont, set for them of "the wider dissemination of knowledge." Today they enroll 20 percent of the Nation's college students, award 40 percent of the doctoral degrees, provide about half of the country's Regular and Reserve Armed Forces officers, undertake research projects costing millions, and train much of the Nation's scientific manpower.

Until the middle of the 19th century, American higher education remained resolutely classical. Few students went to college, and then only those entering what Morrill called the "sedentary" professions of law, medicine, the ministry, and teaching. Yet agitation was increasing for institutions that would provide an education that "will be useful," as one writer put it, "not a piano, French, Spanish or flower daub education."

Morrill's Land-Grant Act of 1862 remade American higher education. To promote both "the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes," it awarded 30,000 acres of public land (or scrip if land was not available) for each State's Members of Congress to support "at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts."

In New England, Massachusetts allotted a third of its land-grant income to assist the new Massachusetts Institute of Technology and two-thirds to create a Massachusetts Agricultural College (now the University of Massachusetts).

Elsewhere in the region, Brown University, Dartmouth College, and Yale's Sheffield Scientific School received early land-grant support; but following the Second Morrill Act of 1890—which gave each State up to $25,000 a year to aid the struggling colleges—Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Connecticut assigned the funds to State institutions. Since then, the region's seven land-grant institutions have included MIT and the six State Universities.

Established to meet the Nation's need for agricultural and engineering education, the land-grant colleges for the first time made the new scientific and vocational subjects equal with the traditional liberal arts; and in addition to teaching, they accepted two other tasks; research and extension service. Moreover they held that every willing American was entitled to some form of higher education at public expense, and they demonstrated how the Federal Government could aid this effort without controlling education.

In New England, the land-grant universities, long neglected, have come of age. In 1957 the University of Rhode Island was finally authorized to grant the Ph. D.; in 1961 Connecticut authorized a State medical-dental school; and this summer Massachusetts laid plans for a medical school and gave the university its long-awaited fiscal autonomy.

The land-grant movement has not only changed the course of higher education in New England and across America; now its influence is felt overseas. New European colleges are following American patterns, and those in the new countries of Asia and Africa are adopting the land-grant philosophy, in Paul A. Miller's words, "that all work is dignified and relevant and that intelligence is as widespread among the common people as it is within the elite." In sum, the land-grant goal of the wider dissemination of knowledge through teaching, research, and extension is spreading around the globe.

Many New Englanders know that their State universities will test soil samples or provide information on garden care. Few, however, are aware of the multitude of projects at their universities' agricultural and engineering experiment stations.

Last year, for instance, at Rhode Island's agricultural station, 28 full-time scientists plus parttime researchers and graduate assistants were working on 67 Federal and 40 non-Federal projects. Seventy projects were in progress in Vermont, and 75 in Connecticut. Their scope ranged from the development of new forage crops to studies of animal genetics, plant diseases, and population trends.

In 1875 Connecticut helped Wilber Atwater create the first American agricultural experiment station at Wesleyan University, and by 1887 Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont had established similar stations. In that year the Hatch Act granted each State $15,000 annually to support research stations as part of its land-grant college, and by 1955 Federal contributions to agricultural research had reached $19.5 million a year. In addition without Federal aid engineering stations similar to the agricultural stations have been formed at the Universities of Connecticut, Maine, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

The contribution of the agricultural experiment stations to the American consumer can be seen from two projects in poultry science. One, a University of Maine study 50 years ago of inheritance factors in egg production, keyed the development of the Nation's table egg industry. The other, a series of Connecticut studies during the 1930's, revolutionized broiler, turkey, and egg production by providing the basis for high-energy poultry rations.

Besides their plant and animal research, the agricultural experiment land use and resource development, and in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture they are providing research for the rural area development program, designed to accelerate economic growth in low-income rural communities.

Local problems often prompt research. Massachusetts has set up a separate research station in East Wareham to aid its cranberry indusrty, and the Connecticut station is studying adjustment problems caused by the declining market for shade-grown tobacco.

One fact reported by the Department of Agriculture points up the benefits from these stations. If farmers still used 1940 methods, the extra cost of $13 billion a year would be passed onto consumers, adding over $5 a week to every family's grocery bill. But the bill for all agricultural research over the past 100 years comes to less than $6 billion. Research, in short, has been a bargain, and in the years ahead it will prove an even bigger bargain.

Eleanor Roosevelt Reports on Progress of President's Commission on Status of Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, public understanding of the special problems which confront working women is one of the objectives of the President's Commission on the Status of Women. As a member of the Commission, I am pleased to report to the Senate that significant strides have been made toward this goal during 7 months in which the Commission has been functioning.

The Commission has achieved clarification of Federal Government policies so that women in the Federal service shall have equal employment opportunity. President Kennedy has issued a directive that appointment or promotion in the Federal career service shall be made without regard to sex. The Commission's subcommittees are working on a variety of subjects which affect the 24 million women in America's labor force, such as equal pay for equal work, and the special tax problems of working women.

A short time ago, the able and beloved Chairman of the Commission, the Honorable Eleanor Roosevelt, delivered an interim report to President Kennedy on the progress which has been achieved in this important field. Mrs. Roosevelt's wise guidance and unstinting energy have been major factors in the achievements made so far by the Commission.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the Labor Day statement of Mrs. Roosevelt about the Commission's work and an exchange of correspondence between Mrs. Roosevelt and President Kennedy.

There being no objection, the statement and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR DAY STATEMENT BY MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT, CHAIRMAN, THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

On behalf of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, I feel it is appropriate on this Labor Day to acknowledge our appreciation of two groups of American women. As Chairman of the Commission, I send grateful greeting to the 24 million women who comprise one-third of our total work force and to the millions of our working men's wives, many of whom are numbered among our 24 million working women.

Since early colonial days, American women have shouldered their workloads alongside American men. Our country's present abundance stems from the partnership of our men and our women in creating a strong economy in a free society.

The President's Commission on the Status of Women is concerned that the opportunity to contribute to our dynamic society be extended without discrimination to all citizens. This opportunity will become even more attainable as we expand our economy to meet the challenge of the times.

MRS. ROOSEVELT'S REPORT AND PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S REPLY ON THE PROGRESS OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

(NOTE.—On August 26, 1920, the then Secretary of State of the United States, Bainbridge Colby, issued a proclamation certifying final adoption of the 19th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Just 8 days earlier, after a legislative battle and close vote in the Tennessee House of Representatives, Tennessee had ratified the 19th amendment to become the 36th ratifying State of the necessary two-thirds of the 48 States. Thus, 26 million women of voting age became enfranchised in this country.

(In 1962 on the weekend of the 42d anniversary of that momentous event—an event that enabled this Nation's women to become voting citizens, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Chairman of the President's Commission on the Status of Women which was created by President John F. Kennedy in December 1961, sent the President a letter and progress report on the work of the Commission and received from the President a letter of reply. The exchange of correspondence and the progress report follow:)

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN,
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1962.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with great satisfaction that we submit the attached report and some of the thinking of the President's Commission on the Status of Women.

The Commission has asked me to tell you that we are undertaking the responsibility you have placed upon us, aware of its significance and confident that more rapid progress can indeed be made toward full partnership of women in our American democracy.

Respectfully,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
August 25, 1962.

Mrs. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT,
Chairman, President's Commission on the Status of Women, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ROOSEVELT: I was very pleased to receive your report on the work of my Commission on the Status of Women, which you head, and I commend you and the other members of the Commission for the work done so far.

You can be especially pleased with the advances you have brought about by opening increased opportunities for women in the Federal service and in the higher ranks of our Armed Forces. These are but two examples of the areas you are attacking where this type of discrimination has prevented the full use of talents and skills.

It will be 42 years tomorrow since women gained the right to participate fully in the governing of our country through the right to vote. It is appropriate on this date, therefore, that we take note of the progress made and the distance to be traveled to achieve full equality for all of our citizens.

Please accept my thanks for the important part you are playing in this difficult task. I know that the Commission will continue to make a beneficial contribution to our society.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

PROGRESS REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT ON THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

In appreciation of the responsibility placed upon us and of the support you have given us, we now have the honor of submitting this report to you on the first 6 months of our activities as members of the President's Commission on the Status of Women.

August 26 will mark the 42d year since the ratification of the 19th amendment. This, we believe, is an especially appropriate time, therefore, to report to you.

Our experience fully confirms the wisdom of your decision to establish the Commission. Our work, even at this early stage, has aroused widespread interest both here in the United States and abroad. We are confident that we shall, in the end, make significant advances toward a more general understanding of women's progress and problems.

Our work has already produced important results. We have reinforced the notable efforts of Chairman John W. Macy, of the Civil Service Commission, to carry out your objectives in making the Federal service an example of both the feasibility and the benefits of a vigorous policy of equal employment opportunity.

During our Hyde Park meeting on June 16 and 17, we were especially gratified to receive your letter conveying the opinion of the Attorney General that the President has authority to regulate whether a position in the career service may be filled by men only or by women only or by qualified members of either sex, followed by your directive that appointment or promotion in the Federal career service shall be made without regard to sex. These actions will be of the greatest assistance to Chairman Macy in furthering the removal of barriers to the employment of women in the Federal service, an effort which has already produced major results.

The Department of Defense is giving sympathetic attention to our recent recommendation that they eliminate separate statutory restrictions on the number of colonels/captains and lieutenant colonels/commanders in the women's components of the Armed Forces. You have already approved H.R. 4783 which corrects an inequity regarding service of women in the Spars.

The Commission has planned a representative conference on September 24 to consider various approaches intended to promote equal employment opportunities for women in companies with Federal Government contracts.

These actions have resulted from interim reports by committees established to review progress and make recommendations as needed for constructive action in the six areas specified in your executive order. The seven committees include more than 70 representative persons in addition to Commission members, one of whom serves as chairman for each committee. The enthusiastic and illuminating contributions of these people, who come largely from important organizations or are experts in the fields under analysis, are of great aid and encouragement to the Commission.

The committees, which are to complete their final reports by May 1, 1963, are being assisted by our own small staff and by appropriate Government agencies. We are grateful to the cooperating departments for their collaboration and for the financial assistance they have given us.

EQUAL PAY, MINIMUM WAGE PRINCIPLES ENDORSED

As you directed, we have been seeking the cooperation of a wide variety of individuals and civilian groups and are requesting information from the States on their laws and experience, especially in the areas of civil and political rights, property and family relationships and protective labor legislation. We have endorsed the principle of Federal and State minimum wage legislation and its further extension to both men and women. We have also endorsed the principle of equal pay.

We are at a point in history when the capacities of all our citizens must be developed and used. Although people generally agree that women have basic rights which should be respected and fostered as part of our Nation's commitment to equality, freedom, and democracy, many attitudes and institutions have not yet responded fully to changing conditions. Even legal provisions affecting civil, political, and property rights have lagged badly in some areas.

You have asked for constructive action. This is our emphasis. In focusing on women's needs, we are face to face with basic problems of modern society, and measures we are considering will, we believe, benefit the entire community.

Better services and protection for families will strengthen home life and promote good family relationships upon which the general welfare of the Nation rests.

IMPROVED EDUCATION NEEDED AT ALL AGES

Expanded community activities, both paid and volunteer, to rear the young, heal the sick, and cherish the aged will aid those who give as well as those who receive, and will bring our entire Nation closer to realizing its ideals. Improved education at all ages will help to reveal our full human talents and release the creative abilities needed to end poverty and build understanding among people of all continents.

The right to contribute fully on the basis of individual choice and ability can be exercised with dignity in many ways—in the home, through volunteer work, through private and Government employment. Aware of the realities of today's world, women—and men—can better plan to carry out the family and community responsibilities which they consider important.

Many women must work outside the home to support themselves and their families and to satisfy other needs. For those women who desire and seek employment, genuine equality of economic opportunity requires that they be judged and rewarded on the basis of what they show themselves able to do. We cannot consider our economy sound if women who have a contribution to make are not fully enabled to do so.

The Commission's success in contributing to the full partnership of women will depend in no small measure on expanding opportunities for all our people. A rapidly rising national output is the strongest weapon against substandard jobs, poverty-stricken homes, and barren lives.

A wider range of areas will, of course, be covered in our final recommendations next year, as requested in your Executive order and statement of December 14, 1961.

Helium Conservation: An Ideal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the long-range program in which industry and Government are working together to save helium now lost when natural gases containing it are burned as fuel is one of the most forward-looking and commendable efforts ever made in the field of conservation.

When the Federal Government acts to curb waste of a limited, irreplaceable resource, esential to the Nation's scientific and industrial progress, such action surely can be called worthwhile. When the Government's program also manages to attract private capital at private risk,

creates many new jobs for industry, stimulates the national economy, and brings rapid advances in technology, it can even be termed praiseworthy. But when this same program is so conceived and carried out that it accomplishes all of these things and also pays for itself in the process, then it must inevitably be rated close to ideal.

The helium-conservation program is destined to achieve this, and more. It is my conviction, to, that the program is providing for the world an outstanding example of how industry and Government can cooperate in an enterprise that is beneficial to both, and to the entire Nation as well.

Consider what has already been accomplished.

Enabling legislation for the helium-conservation program was enacted by the 86th Congress in September 1960; however, funds for the program did not become available until August 3 of the folowing year. On August 15—only 12 days later—Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall announced approval of the first long-term helium-purchase contract between the Department's Bureau of Mines and the Helex Co., a subsidiary of Northern Natural Gas Co.

Within 90 days, three additional helium-purchase agreements had been negotiated and approved, with Cities Service Helex, Inc., National Helium Corp.—a Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.—National Distillers & Chemical Corp. subsidiary—and Phillips Petroleum Co. The four 22-year agreements to date have obligated all of the Bureau's purchasing authority, originally limited by Congress to $47.5 million worth of helium a year.

At about the time these remarks are being made—that is, in little more than a year from the date of the first contract—helium from the Helex Co.'s new extraction plant at Bushton, Kans., will be on its way to the Cliffside gasfield, operated by the Bureau of Mines at Amarillo, Tex., some 350 miles away. There, the helium conserved by the program will be stored underground until it is needed to meet future demands.

Building and equipping a multi-million-dollar installation at Bushton in a matter of months is remarkable enough, but is only one of a series of well-timed and carefully coordinated steps that have brought helium conservation to the verge of reality in a fantastically short time.

Besides the Helex plant at Bushton, four other helium-extraction plants are being built—and will be maintained and operated—by private industry under the contracts approved thus far. Work is well along on all of these installations, as their scheduled operation dates indicate. Two of the plants, under construction for Phillips, in Sherman County, and Dumas, Tex., are expected to begin delivering helium in December. The National Helium Corp. plant near Liberal, Kans., and the one being built by Cities Service Helex at Ulysses, Kans., are both due to go on stream next March.

To get the crude helium from these five industrial plants to the Cliffside gasfield with minimum delay and expense, the Bureau of Mines arranged for construction of a 430-mile pipeline system running north from Cliffside to a terminus near Bushton. This line, designed by William Bros. of Tulsa, Okla., and built under two construction schedules by Groninger & King of Pampa, Tex., and R. H. Fulton & Co., of Lubbock, Tex., is all but complete. The main section already has been laid and is ready to receive helium from the Bushton plant. Laterals that will connect the mainline to the other new plants are being installed while I am speaking. Between October 1961, when the design-engineering firm was selected, and mid-July 1962, when the main section of the line was completed, the Bureau advertised and awarded more than 90 contracts totaling over $4.2 million, on items ranging from telemetering and flow-recording equipment to pipeline wrapping, paint, and milepost markets. These were in addition to the two construction contracts.

The speed with which the helium-conservation program has moved forward is a tribute to the care that was taken in planning it. The Department of the Interior realized, for example, that the price of helium would have to be increased to make the program self-liquidating. Accordingly, the price of the element f.o.b. the Bureau's plants was raised from $19 per thousand cubic feet to $35. This price, calculated on the basis of present and anticipated demand, will enable the Bureau to pay back in 25 years, with interest, all funds that must be borrowed from the Treasury to purchase helium during the early years of the conservation program. Thus, the users of helium will pay the costs involved in insuring the continued availability of this valuable substance.

Foresight has characterized the helium-conservation program from its inception. It was foresight that made the Department and Members of Congress from helium areas recognize the urgent need for prompt action to conserve the relatively small percentages of helium being lost in natural gases serving fuel markets. After all, the helium content of these gases average only about one-half of 1 percent, and the Government's own helium plants in the Southwest already are producing more than enough to satisfy present requirements. Where, then, was the justification for a large-scale conservation effort?

The answer, of course, is that half of 1 percent of the billions of cubic feet of helium-bearing gas now produced annually is an impressive figure—representing waste of approximately 4 billion cubic feet a year, or more than 9 times the amount of helium we now consume. And demand for helium has been increasing rapidly ever since World War II, with no end to the upward trend in sight. In fact, essential uses for helium in electronics, nuclear energy, missiles and space exploration, and the growing field of cryogenics research promise to increase further the Nation's requirements.

It was obvious that unless conservation began quickly, helium requirements could be expected to exceed supply as early as 1985. Hence, immediate efforts were instituted to formulate legislation to meet the problem. The entire matter was originally heard by the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I was chairman. The impressive facts that had been gathered together caused an awakening in the Congress as to the need for conservation of such an essential resource. There was one strong school of thought to the effect that helium, wherever found, should be taken over by the Government under the exercise of the right of eminent domain. This was based primarily upon the theory that helium would become an indispensable element in our defense structure and the space exploration activities. Nevertheless, those of us who have long supported the basic free enterprise theory were successful in defeating moves to make this an all-Government project. The development of the oil and gas business to its present world-leadership position is due to the exercise of private initiative and not Government ownership. Therefore, it is logical to assume that the proper development of our helium resources can be accomplished through the same route.

Experience in the helium-conservation program has refuted irrevocably those who would malign the natural gas industry as self-interested and hungry for profits. The program has been implemented more rapidly, more efficiently, and at less cost to the taxpayer than would have been possible had the Federal Government attempted to go it alone.

Under contracts negotiated by the Bureau of Mines, the dynamic capabilities of a free industry in a free economy have come into full play. Five private helium-extraction plants, incorporating technological advances undreamed of at the start of the program, are now nearing completion in less time than it would have taken the Government to build one installation had it been forced to tackle the job by itself.

This can be illustrated with a single example of the technological innovations that have been stimulated by the cooperative program: the helium plants built by Bureau of Mines during World War II utilized multiple-extraction units that could process only 2½ million cubic feet of helium-bearing natural gas daily. The Bureau's newest plant, which began operating at Keyes, Okla., only 3 years ago in 1959, has three extraction units each capable of processing gas at the rate of 25 million cubic feet a day. In contrast, the private plants now in construction are designed to process between 400 and 500 million cubic feet of gas daily in a single extraction unit.

I want to emphasize here that some of this advanced technology is so new that it is virtually untried on a commercial scale. Of course, the companies incorporating it are confident that it will work; but if by any chance it does not, the companies themselves must invest whatever additional money is needed to make it work. They are taking the risk, not the Government. Under the present contracts, the Government guarantees only to pay a fixed price—negotiated

separately with each company and depending on the helium content of the gas and the difficulty of extracting it—for the helium it receives.

Another advantage has been realized by having industry participate in the conservation effort. The terms of the purchase agreements now in effect provide private companies with maximum incentive to make adjustments in their natural gas operations that will enable them to process as much helium-bearing gas as possible. Pipeline systems, for instance, might well be worth modifying if such modifications would mean increased efficiency in extracting helium for sale to the Government. In this way, the fullest possible conservation of helium has been encouraged.

Many side benefits also have accrued from the program. Hundreds of new jobs have been created, not only in the companies participating directly in helium conservation, but also in industries supplying structural materials and equipment for the new industrial plants. The scientific and technological progress resulting from the program can be expected to lead to additional improvements in processing and transporting natural gas and, possibly, to economic extraction of larger quantities of such desired products as propane, butane, and ethane. Moreover, removal of inert helium—nitrogen, which is used in the low-temperature helium-extraction process—automatically increases the capacity of pipelines to transport burnable hydrocarbons. Finally, gas consumers no longer will have to pay for the transmission and distribution of a substance that has no value as a fuel.

Of course, helium could have been conserved without the gas industry's help. The Bureau of Mines could have paid the companies for the helium in fuel gases and then built its own plants to extract the element, under arrangements similar to those now governing helium production at four of the Bureau's five helium installations. However, such a course would not have achieved the program's objective—to obtain maximum conservation at minimum cost to the taxpayer.

To attempt to save the quantities of helium that will be conserved through Government-industry cooperation, the Bureau would have had to expand its staff enormously. Even then, the Government could hardly hope to amass and concentrate efficiently the manpower and other resources that industry has poured into the program.

From the very beginning, the most vital factor in helium conservation has been time. With every day that passed, more than 10 million cubic feet of an indispensable resource was being lost forever to the atmosphere. The saving of time has been industry's major contribution to the program. By cutting drastically the time that would have been required to get the conservation effort moving, industry has made it possible to conserve even more helium than was originally considered possible. Furthermore, this saving has been accomplished at an extremely low cost.

While much pride can be taken in the fact that great progress has been made over a relatively short period of time, it should be pointed out that the job is not finished, nor is it near completion. In the early analyses of the current situation, the Department of the Interior proposed the conservation of 52 billion cubic feet of helium in addition to meeting current demand to 1985. Of this total, about 41½ billion cubic feet will be saved at plants operating under purchase contracts already in effect. This means that 10½ billion cubic feet remain to be conserved; perhaps even more if progress to date is any indication. So, our efforts must continue to the end that this country will not be caught short because of waste and lack of foresight.

Recent Reforms in Judicial Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very enlightening article by Judge Sterry R. Waterman, of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, who is now a vice president of the American Judicature Society:

RECENT REFORMS IN JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION

(By Sterry R. Waterman)

In the summer of 1906 Roscoe Pound, then a young Nebraska lawyer, made a speech to the American Bar Association on "The Causes of Popular Dissatisfaction With the Administration of Justice."

In the fall of 1912 Herbert Harley, a young Michigan lawyer, sent his "circular letter concerning the administration of justice" to some 200 of the leading judges, law teachers, and lawyers in the Nation.

The speech analyzed the reasons behind some of the failures in the administration of justice of the time, suggested cures, advocated reform. It became, to use John H. Wigmore's words, the "catechism for all progressive lawyers and judges." As Arthur T. Vanderbilt has rightly said, it "should be required reading once a year for every judge, practicing lawyer, and law student on the day he returns from his summer vacation."

The letter called for organized leadership by the legal profession so as to achieve the needed reform and the writer proposed that a national organization be founded for "energizing and elevating the administration of justice." This letter of 50 years ago led to the founding shortly thereafter of the American Judicature Society—to promote the efficient administration of justice.

Most of the judicial reform in America may be traced to these two beginnings.

Dean Wigmore's assessment of Pound's speech needs no embellishment. Glenn Winters' description of the activities of the American Judicature Society under the leadership of Herbert Harley, together with the excerpts from Vanderbilt's "The Challenge of Law Reform" reprinted in this first of the golden anniversary issues of the Journal of the American Judicature Society, include most of the major reforms achieved prior to the last decade. It remains for me only to note briefly some of the dimensions of the improvements in the administration of justice during the past dozen years.

Even a superficial review of recent reforms in judicial administration reveals two significant developments. First, one is impressed by the extent of the knowledgeable interest in the field and the breadth and variety of enthusiastic leadership. It is good to note that these recent needed changes have not been brought about by just a few dedicated, determined and talent men or by a minimum number of organized groups working against wide-spread professional inertia. On the contrary, responsibility for reform has been accepted as a professional responsibility. Many improvements have been initiated by court rule; judges and associations of judges working as groups have effected substantial changes; law schools and their faculties have assumed new roles of leadership; more and more State and local bar associations and their committees have joined with the American Judicature Society in spearheading a growing movement toward more efficient administration of justice.

Second, one finds that these reforms are of many different kinds and have been made at many different levels. There has been internal correction within existing judicial structures. There have also been replacements of obsolete structures and the discarding of outworn functions These advances have occurred in magistrate's courts and in courts of last resort—wherever justice is administered. Since 1951 traffic courts have been the object of nationwide concern. Minor court reform has been achieved in many jurisdictions. Following the leadership of New Jersey and Delaware, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in 1952 adopted a unified court system that has become a model of efficient judicial administration. In following years major court reorganizations were secured in Florida, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. In 1956 Alaska adopted its State constitution containing a judicial article that provided for a unified State court system. In 1960 Arizona joined the growing number of States with unified courts. New York scored a smashing victory for State court reform last year. In the past dozen years more court reorganization has taken place than ever before in our history, and this year in November the voters of at least five more States will pass on major court reorganization proposals.

All of these procedural and administrative reforms are too numerous to list, but any representative sample of them demonstrates how significant the achievements are. A large number of States have enacted new rules of civil and criminal procedure comparable to the Federal rules. Many State supreme courts have made significant advances through the use of their ruling-making powers. The Federal courts have continued to improve their procedural and administrative operations. Representative samples are California's mandatory civil pretrial procedure, and the first use, in 1955, of a certificate of readiness in a Federal court. As one would also expect, there has been a comparable growth during this time in the number of court administrators, and a steady increase in the use by courts of sound administrative practices. The superior court of Los Angeles is representative of many other State and metropolitan courts where enlightened administrators have made drastic advances both in practice-procedural and in intracourt techniques.

THE INSTITUTE OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION

Since its founding in 1952 one cannot overstate the importance of the Institute of Judicial Administration in this field. Not

only has the institute pioneered in supplying modern research methods for the resolution of court problems, but it has also shown law schools and their faculties how to assume active leadership in court reform and how to include the field of judicial administration in their curriculums as a serious subject for instruction and research. In addition, no other single organization has done so much to bring the problem of court congestion and delay to the attention of the courts, the legal profession, and the public.

Not all the progress has been made in modernizing judicial structures and functions. It is a delight to observe stimulating advances in the choice of judicial personnel. In the last 5 years the selection and tenure of State judges have received more attention than at any time since 1940 when Missouri then led the way. Alaska included merit selection and tenure for all of its State judges in its new constitution. Kansas placed its supreme court under the same plan in 1958. Iowa became the first State, by constitutional revision, to place all of its State judges under such a plan just 2 months ago. Many States have passed legislation requiring that minor courts be competently staffed. The terms of many judicial offices have been lengthened in many States. Responsible participation by our professional associations in the selection of judges has shown a marked increase. Following the lead of the Committee on Federal Judiciary of the American Bar Association, many State and local bar associations have assumed more active roles than they formerly chose to assume.

JUDICIAL ORGANIZATIONS

The organization of judicial councils and judicial conferences has been accelerated following the 1953 recommendations of the Conference of Chief Justices. Adequate compensation, and basic retirement and pension provisions for all judges received an imptus in 1954 when Federal judges received their long overdue salary increases. The following year judicial salary increases were enacted in 27 States and, according to a recent survey (45 J. Amer. Jud. Soc. 231–264, March 1962) all but 2 States have raised salaries since 1952. Too, more effective techniques for the discipline and removal of judges have been recently devised, such as the model legislation in this field that was adopted in California in 1960.

What may become the most important recent achievement of all is the extent to which the organized bench and bar have started to bring the crises in judicial administration to the attention of the American public. In contrast to the negative response of the bar to Pound's 1906 speech, the current warnings of Chief Justice Warren, Justice Brennan, and other knowledgeable students of judicial administration have been welcomed by most of the bench and bar. Spearheaded by the National Conference on Judicial Selection and Court Administration initiated in 1959 by the American Judicature Society and cosponsored by the Institute of Judicial Administration and the American Bar Association, the movement to enlist the Nation's leaders and the general public in the effort to improve the administration of justice culminated last year in the formation of the Joint Committee for Effective Administration of Justice under the chairmanship of Justice Tom C. Clark. The report of the first conferences and seminars for judges and year's work (46 J. Amer. Jud. Soc. 5–41, July 1962) promises well.

Due to the efforts of the society, the institute, and others, the attention of the Nation's press to the problems of judicial selection and of court organization and administration has increased. Articles in magazines of national circulation such as Fortune's "The Crisis in the Courts" that appeared last December, television documentaries, and other programs, have produced a growing, if yet partial, public awareness that our courts face serious problems demanding effective solutions.

This all too brief and episodic review of some of the steps taken in the past few years suggests that we are only just now beginning to move with purpose toward a realization of Pound's 1906 hopes.

Whether these hopes are to be realized during the next few years will depend upon how seriously the bench and bar of this Nation assume their professional responsibility, the responsibility that Pound, Harley, Vanderbilt, and others influenced by them, accepted with so much dedication. These men took the giant steps. Ours is the opportunity to make their dreams come true.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week as we in the House provide the President with standby authorization to call up Reserves, and pass an overdue, but watered-down resolution dealing with the Communist enslavement of Cuba, a constructive review of our foreign policy posture is certainly in order.

Such a review is found in an article by the nationally syndicated columnist, Marguerite Higgins, in the Chicago Sun-Times of today, Monday, September 24, which is a frank, dramatic and sound analysis of our recent foreign policy gyrations. Under leave granted I insert the article entitled "Foreign Policy 'Realism' Gives Rise to Doubts" in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FOREIGN POLICY "REALISM" GIVES RISE TO DOUBTS

(By Marguerite Higgins)

NEW YORK.—Said the Latin American: "If the United States were to do something effective to checkmate Soviet intervention in Cuba, my government would congratulate you privately and lacerate you publicly."

This quotation, noted on a brief visit to the United Nations, was not offered as a scientific sampling of opinion. Still it did not deviate from roughly similar sentiments expressed along Embassy Row in Washington.

Therefore it raised some interesting questions about the "new realism" in U.S. foreign policy that Chester Bowles, apparently speaking with White House blessing, recently expounded in a speech denouncing those who wish to do something about Cuba.

According to Bowles, the new realism is founded on the contention that if the United States did something about Cuba it would "undercut our influence in world affairs, blacken our reputation in the United Nations, forfeit our traditional claim to moral leadership * * * set the stage for sweeping Soviet victories in the critically important fields of diplomacy and politics * * * and a lessening of our influence in world affairs."

AN URGENT QUESTION IS INSPIRED

If this truly represents the New Frontier's assumptions, then the questions needs urgently to be put: Does unwillingness to apply U.S. power effectively in Cuba and elsewhere save us from the dire consequences outlined by Bowles?

To put it another way: Does inaction heighten our influence in world affairs, whiten our reputation in the United Nations, and enhance our traditional claim to moral leadership?

Since the New Frontier has taken to labeling its critics in foreign affairs as rash, hotheaded, and trigger-happy, it would be appropriate to introduce some views on the uses of American power of a diplomat who has never been known to be anything but cool—and even pragmatic.

He is Robert Murphy, former Under Secretary of State, who in a commencement address at Boston University reported on a visit to Latin America during and after the Bay of Pigs.

Said Murphy: "I was in Brazil at the time of the Cuban operation. I was a bit startled to be told that the reason the United States failed to intervene openly in Cuba was bebecause our Government feared it would provoke war between the U.S.S.R. and the United States. I found little or no recognition of the consistent effort our Government has loyally made through the years to adhere to a policy of nonintervention."

So, if Murphy is a good reporter, U.S. willingness to use its power got the worst of all possible verdicts:

Murphy based his views on the uses of U.S. power on these observations: "We must take at face value the threat of world conquest * * * we are faced with a continuing situation of probe and thrust.

"I can only suggest power and more especially American determination to use power intelligently and, if necessary, ruthlessly. I am not sure which is more important, the possession of adequate sources of power, or the determination to use even a lesser amount of power. If the opponent is convinced that there is a national will to use available power, his behavior alters in proportion to that determination.

SEES A FEAR OF RISK

"There is little evidence that the Sino-Soviet leadership believes we are determined to use our power."

"One of the principles to which we have been firmly attached is the collective approach to international questions," Murphy continued, "but again I feel that we have gone too far in our pursuit of a basically sound idea of resorting to the collective approach indiscriminately.

"At times, I believe we do this because of reluctance to face up to a risk on our own national account. Leaning on a collectivity that includes many weak inexperienced and frankly selfish nations leads us into situations where we are reduced to the lowest common denominator. * * * Therefore we have no alternative to asserting our independent national will and judgment, letting our associates as well as our opponents know that on issues involving our fundamental national security we are capable of going our own way."

Thus, according to the old realism of Murphy, the United States of America, which holds in its own destiny the decline or survival of freedom in our time, should not be deterred from doing anything necessary to that survival because other nations refuse to hold its hand.

Space Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am highly privileged to insert

in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by my colleague and member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York, before the Pan American Management Club on September 11, 1962, at Cape Canaveral, Fla.

This speech indicates the depth to which Mr. ANFUSO has gone in the matter of our space effort:

It is most appropriate that I should speak to you tonight about our national space program, why it is important to us as a nation, and the progress which we have made toward achieving our goals in space.

It is appropriate, first of all, because of my special knowledge of the program, by virtue of my service on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology. It is appropriate, also because of the emphasis given it this week by the tour of space installations being made by the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, the head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Director of the Budget.

Finally, it is appropriate because of the important role which the State of Florida has in this program.

Our space program is very new, although imaginative people have been writing about space exploration for many years. About 100 years ago, for example, Jules Verne, who might be described as the father of science fiction, wrote a novel entitled "From the Earth to the Moon."

In that novel Verne described a space adventure which, while not accurate in all of its details, was prophetic on at least one point.

The space ship was launched from the east coast of Florida.

A century later this rocket launching site has caught the attention of the world. Later this month, when we undertake the next step in our manned exploration of space, the eyes of the free world will be riveted on Cape Canaveral. In years to come, as we advance toward exploration of the moon and other planets, Florida will remain the focal point of world attention.

The U.S. efforts in the manned exploration of space—represented in the missions of Shepard, Carpenter, and Glenn—have made the country most aware of this aspect of the space program. It is best known, too, because it has as its goal the landing of men on the moon before the end of the decade, and this daring and dramatic objective is one which cannot fail to capture the imagination.

We have heard the Apollo, or moon program called a race and a stunt. I wonder if the people who think this way haven't failed to grasp the true significance of the most prodigious adventure in human history. But the true nature of all expeditions, of all new knowledge, has been misunderstood throughout history.

Greek mythology offers us the earliest and perhaps the best example of this point. These legends that have been handed down by word of mouth and by different authors in different time periods have perhaps become distorted. But their importance lies in the fact that, without them, we would know little or nothing about an important period in the development of our own culture.

To me, the story of Jason's search for the Golden Fleece holds many a pertinent lesson for us, lessons that should be applied to our own mission to send man to the moon.

Jason and his Argonauts found their Golden Fleece, but they found it only after many years of searching and after many unscheduled side trips. And in their quest, they found far more than the Golden Fleece.

They uncovered vast new secrets about the world of their day.

They learned how to navigate.

They established new trade routes.

They found the answer to many things other than the location of the Golden Fleece.

And, in the doing, they spread the knowledge and the power of Greece throughout their world.

The lesson is clear. And it doesn't need belaboring. We will get man to the moon. But, in the process, we will also make many side trips and we will discover many things that we didn't plan to learn. And we will widen freemen's knowledge and understanding of his universe along the way.

We are already getting important feedback from the Apollo program.

We are discovering new metals and alloys. Improved automation techniques spew from our advance guidance system technology. We're finding more efficient fuels and engines. Microminiaturization and microcircuitry have wide consumer applications. Self-contained power sources offer whole new fields of industrial effort. Medicine, communications, weather forecasting—literally no phase of our economy and our culture will be unaffected by what we are learning while we try for the moon.

By far the most important bonus from this adventure will be its affect on the human spirit. We can look for Americans to walk with a quicker step and to hold their heads higher. A people who have become a little satiated by the greatest standard of living the world has ever known will be refreshed by the new frontiers we will open. Vaulting ambition will be restored, the kind of ambition that made us great in the first place.

No, the people who look on Apollo as a race or a stunt haven't grasped its real significance. The people who complain of the cost haven't reckoned its benefits.

One thing strikes me as odd. We haven't heard any of these cries from the Soviet Union. It seems to me that the Soviet leaders have a very fine grasp of the significance of space. But what alarms me is that their motive—unlike ours—is sinister. Their primary objective of placing men in orbit around the earth is the eventual dominance of space.

Remember that their vertical launches of animals to altitudes of 60 to 250 nautical miles began in 1949, to determine environmental effects and to develop life support systems. Their second satellite contained a biological specimen, a dog. The majority of their space experiments, unlike ours, have been biological in nature.

While the Russians have propagandized their "peaceful" pursuits of space exploration, and talked at length of going to the moon and the near planets of Mars and Venus—they have continued to concentrate their major effort in the near-earth space, i.e., from 100–300 nautical miles altitude, which leads me to the inevitable conclusion that they aim to control the space around the earth and try to prevent us from going to the moon—and at the same time present a danger to our security here on earth. We must explore this possibility to the fullest extent and see to it that we are not caught asleep.

Our national space program is characterized as a peaceful quest—and, indeed, it is. Our interest is in the extension of man's knowledge and the betterment of man's condition. And it should remain so.

In this respect, in the much shorter period that we have been engaged in space exploration, we have made much greater progress toward our goal of bettering all mankind than have the Russians.

Witness the most recent successful launching of Mariner II.

This feat is impressive not only because of the mysteries which we hope it will unlock about the planet Venus, but because of the remarkable mid-course correction which was performed to permit Mariner II to rendezvous with Venus. This capability, of a nature similar to that which will be required to rendezvous two spacecraft preparatory to a flight to the moon, has yet to be demonstrated by the Soviet Union.

Although it did not receive the worldwide publicity which recent Russian achievements received, it is generally conceded by most of the world's space scientists to be the most brilliant space achievement to date.

I doubt, also, that many Americans, as well as other peoples of the world, realize that in the past 4½ years the United States has successfully launched more than 70 spacecraft—four in orbit around the sun, the others in orbit around the earth. Even fewer would be aware that about 40 of these are still in earth or solar orbit, or that we are still receiving information on our universe form a dozen of them. This is a record we Americans can be proud of, and something which could not have been said less than 5 years ago.

Recognizing, therefore, the very significant contrast between our mission in space and that of the Russians, we must do three things:

1. Convince the world that our venture into space is a peaceful one—to bring back benefits which will create a world of abundance, making war and strife among nations unnecessary. We have the propaganda media, including the Telstar communications satellite, to do this.

2. We must, at all costs, achieve dominance in all phases of space exploration for our own security and that of all peoples of the earth.

3. We must establish freedom in space and invite all nations of the world, having a contribution to make, to join our efforts.

To accomplish all these three things requires an all-out effort on our part—a mobilization of all our resources—sacrifices on the part of Government, business, industry, and labor.

America stands for free enterprise and a free labor movement, but unless we win the battle in which we have been forced to engage in, free enterprise and the labor movement as we know it will be dead in America, and all of us will become slaves of a diabolical force which recognizes no moral values—not even the existence of God.

You, who represent the front line management of the Atlantic missile range, have a great responsibility in this task of assuring the United States of America its rightful supremacy and leadership in space.

I have visited the Atlantic missile range at Cape Canaveral on two previous occasions on behalf of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. On each occasion I devoted part of my attention to the management of this great facility. Based on my reviews, I am convinced that, under the guidance of General Davis, the Pan American organization, under the leadership of your able vice president, Mr. R. S. Mitchell, has rendered an outstanding contribution to our Nation.

This contribution is one that is based on patriotism—the profit motive is decidedly secondary.

The unique relationship of your company with the Air Force here at the Atlantic missile range began over 9 years ago, in July 1953. The milestones that have been passed during this period bear testimony to your efforts.

The milestones that lie ahead present challenges that will dwarf the past. However, you have the talent, the determination, the brainpower, and the ability to reach every goal.

Most of all, you possess a management team—unsurpassed—that is dedicated to the

task of meeting economically, effectively, decisevely and on time all requirements, regardless of obstacles encountered.

The Pan American Management Club, in appreciation of Mr. ANFUSO's effort, passed the following resolution:

Whereas the Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO has shown his intense dedication to country in service in the Mediterranean Theater Office of Strategic Services Operations during World War II; and

Whereas throughout his life, he has combated communism at home and abroad; and

Whereas as member of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the U.S. Congress, he has fought to secure a preeminent position in space for this Nation; and

Whereas, while personally examining the national space efforts, he has made frequent visits to Cape Canaveral and down range stations during many critical launches; and

Whereas his thorough and penetrating studies over the years have proven highly beneficial to our mission: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Pan American Management Club of the guided missiles range division express to the Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO, lawyer, warrior, statesman, space authority, its admiration, respect, and esteem.

In witness whereof the Management Club set its hand and seal this 11th day of September 1962.

E. H. SERVESON, *President.*

Susquehanna River in Pittston Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles A. McCarthy, a historian of my congressional district, has written a highly informative and interesting series of articles on the early history of the Susquehanna River, particularly in the Pittston area. The latest installment in this series appeared in the Pittston Sunday Dispatch yesterday, September 23, and as part of my remarks today I quote the indicated article.

The article follows:

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER IN PITTSTON REGION—MANY SERVED AS TOLLTAKERS AT THE PITTSTON FERRY BRIDGE

(By Charles A. McCarthy)

Tolltakers employed on the Pittston Ferry Bridge were as follows: 1858, H. Litts; 1863, "Old Hoyt"; 1873, James Friant; David Shelly, on duty on April 4, 1878, was taken ill and died on April 25, 1878.

J. H. Andrews, the tolltaker in 1879, left this position on August 19, 1880, to take a job at the Water Street depot newsstand.

H. M. Harding resigned on January 3, 1881, and was succeeded by Jacob Kern, who was named tolltaker on January 13, 1881.

Coray E. Jenkins, who was on duty here in 1888, moved from the borough by 1890. His successor, named in 1890, was George F. Van Tuyle.

Van Tuyle resigned on February 20, 1901. When he moved to Linden Street, West Pittston, on March 25, 1901, John "Doc" Hughes took over as tolltaker.

Hughes remained as toll collector until the bridge was sold to Luzerne County in 1908.

TOLLHOUSE BUILT

An act of the Pennsylvania Legislature, approved on April 23, 1852, permitted the Pittston Ferry Bridge Co. to locate a tollhouse on lands near the eastern end of the bridge.

Accordingly, a tollhouse of stone was constructed on Pittston end of the bridge, on Franklin's Knob, about 100 feet from the river bank.

When the old bridge was replace in 1864, a new tollhouse was erected on the southern side of the Pittston end of the structure.

ADD TENEMENTS

On completion of the iron bridge in 1876, the Pittston Ferry Bridge Co. decided on July 7, 1883, to erect a tenement tollhouse on the upper section of the Pittston end of the bridge, between the trackage of the Lehigh Valley Railroad and the river. Jacob Kern, the toll collector, moved into his new building on March 6, 1884.

The new tollhouse was a two-story brick building. Its upper floor was on a level with the bridge walk and was utilized as an office. A short platform-type walk connected the bridge and the house.

Pedestrians and wagon drivers leaving Pittston for the west side paid a fee to the tolltaker stationed outside and adjacent to the tollhouse.

HOUSED MANY

In addition to the tolltakers and their families, other persons resided there. Henry Vandenburg was listed as a resident in 1890. After the bridge was sold in 1908, John Hughes, maintained a residence in the tollhouse until at least 1913.

Philip Apple's family were listed as living there between 1905 and 1918. Mary E. Leaman was a resident between 1905 and 1911. Thomas Peel's family commenced living here by at least 1918. The structure was razed when the Fort Jenkins Bridge was built.

COMPANY OFFICERS

Officers of the Pittston Ferry Bridge Co. included the following:

Amos York Smith was elected president on December 12, 1865. On January 4, 1869, Daniel Harding was named president, a position he held until his death on April 17, 1880. Others named at this period included: Secretary, Isaac Everitt; treasurer, Daniel Jones; managers: George Miller, J. S. Carpenter, William Schooley, I. C. Shoemaker, D. S. Stark, and Holden Tripp.

J. S. Carpenter was elected president June 30, 1880, as successor to Harding.

The officials named on January 3, 1881, were: President, John S. Carpenter; secretary, C. H. Foster; treasurer, Joseph Hileman, managers, William Schooley, Ferdinand Brune, J. J. Shoemaker, Isaac Everitt, and George Rice.

In May 1886 all of the above officers were again named with the exception of Ferdinand Brune who was succeeded on the board of managers by J. S. Jenkins.

MEETING, 1892

Isaac Everitt was named president at the January 4, 1892, meeting. Charles H. Foster was named secretary, Joseph Hileman, treasurer, and the following were elected to the board of managers: John S. Carpenter, George Johnson, J. I. Shoemaker, and George Rice.

At a meeting held on December 27, 1897, the company declared a dividend of 3 percent, the first such outlay since the iron bridge was erected in 1876.

as president on April 5, 1898.

George Johnson succeeded Isaac Everitt

Joesph H. Glennon offered an option to buy the Ferry Bridge from the company at a reported price of $71 per share on October 16, 1899. The deal fell through.

At a reorganization meeting held on January 7, 1901, Joseph H. Glennon was elected president of the Pittston Ferry Bridge Co. William M. Fay was elected secretary, Joseph Hileman, treasurer, and the board of managers named included: J. H. Andrews, H. J. Luchsinger, Jmes L. Morris, William M. Fay, M. F. Sacks, and R. M. Hughes.

The same set of officers was in charge in June 1907, except that George Van Tuye was listed as successor to H. J. Luchsinger.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of September 22, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

SEPTEMBER 22, 1962.

FOREIGN AID—ITS COST AND DANGERS IT IMPOSES

The House this week approved a foreign aid bill which will cost the taxpayers of this Nation $7,254,852,000, by a vote of 249 for to 144 against. ALGER against. Interesting note: the scheduled time for debate was cut in half, the bill debated and passed in 1 day, Thursday, in order that one of the Democratic leaders could get back to his district for a testimonal dinner on Friday. In that 1 day the House was asked to digest the results of 72 days of hearings by the Appropriations Committee on foreign aid, comprising 9,000 pages of transcript and 3,200 pages of printed hearings. This brief report can only highlight the most basic arguments which are backed up by a wealth of facts and material.

The following 11 points (from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) sum up the status of foreign aid: (1) The appropriations for foreign aid, including interest on the public debt for fiscal 1963 on the money that we have borrowed to give away, and backdoor financing will exceed $12 billion this year. (2) The foreign-aid program is a major factor contributing to the continuing annual increase in our public debt. (3) Foreign aid is primarily responsible for our annual budget deficits. (4) Foreign aid is almost entirely responsible for our balance-of-payments deficit. (5) Foreign aid is responsible to a very large extent for the flight of our disappearing gold reserves to other nations all over the world. (6) The cost of foreign aid is the major reason for our ever-increasing noncompetitive position in world markets. (7) Foreign aid is rapidly depleting our wealth and resources. (8) The claim to the effect that 80 percent of our foreign-aid money is spent in America and thereby creates prosperity is a myth, and a calculated misrepresentation intended to keep the American people supporting the program. Foreign aid contracts are now carefully shuffled out to manufacturers, schools, colleges, universities, workshops, and consultants in the 50 States of the Union, so as to attract support and cause it to appear that this giveaway of our wealth is making our Nation prosperous. (9) The foreign-aid program as presently operated is uncontrolled and uncontrollable. (10) Many of the nations which are recipients of our aid are rapidly losing faith in America's ability to manage its economic and monetary systems. (11) We are, in this bill, setting up the machinery by which to borrow money from former and present aid-recipient nations in order to in-

directly finance the aid program for this year if other means fail.

The debate brought out some very potent specific points on foreign aid which should be considered by every American citizen. We are now giving foreign aid to 101 of the 113 nations of the world. Furthermore, by special permission, we have started aid programs in practically every British possession and territory in the world. The aid programs are not limited to so-called free nations. We are pouring the American taxpayers' wealth into dictatorships, so-called neutral nations, Communist-influenced and Communist-dominated nations, and into outright Communist countries. We have been giving our wealth and earnings for years to people who tax themselves not at all, or at least at far lower rates than we. And many of these nations which not only accept our gifts, but demand more, are no nearer now to self-support than when we started to pay their bills. Foreign aid money is handled so loosely that if we were to use the same procedure in financing domestic programs such as public works, the people would rise in wrath to ridicule the authors of such proposals. Agency witnesses before the Appropriations Committee said they do not know the projects to which they are going to obligate funds until after they get the money. One witness said in fact that the United States kept these matters secret from the recipient countries until after the money had been made available. Fantastic as this sounds it is true.

The military phase of the foreign aid program is not military in the sense that we think of our own Defense Establishment. What it is, primarily, is a State Department military program through which military equipment is being provided to from 65 to 71 nations of the world; and much of it is given to please or appease some potentate, or some ruler of a newly created country. In some cases this is causing resentment such as Thailand's protest against our supplying fighter planes to Cambodia. Another project in this category is the donation of a newly rebuilt air-conditioned yacht for the private use of Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia with staterooms covered with gold-leaf wallpaper. The reconditioning of the airplane tender cost $3,100,000.

The balance-of-payments problem and the outflow of gold is also the direct result of foreign aid. The drain on our gold reserves, much of it through outright purchase of gold with our dollars by foreign nations which have received our aid, is excessive. During the last 11 years the net outflow of gold from the U.S. Treasury has amounted to over $6,305 million. Our gold holdings are currently just above $16 billion. During the same 11 years in which we lost gold, other free world countries increased their holdings by $10,655 million, to just under $24 billion. We require $11.6 billion as gold backing for our domestic dollars by law. We have, therefore, scarcely $5 billion in gold to meet our international obligations and our free world friends now hold short-term dollar assets just under $23 billion redeemable in our gold. In spite of the fact that the executive branch is not able to spend all the money appropriated they have asked for an increase in this year's foreign-aid appropriation. In last year's session of Congress an appropriation of $3.9 billion was approved. The administration was only able to spend $3,198,100,000. Congress appropriated $716,500,000 more than was spent and this amount was transferred to the pipeline. There is enough money now in the pipeline, already appropriated by previous Congresses to continue the foreign-aid program for 25 months without a cent of additional appropriations.

Direct quotes from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD point up the dismal failures of our foreign aid programs and the increasing danger they impose upon us. "The country cannot go along in this fashion and survive. Our national debt in the last 12 months increased by $8 billion. Our governmental expenditures in the last 2 months, the first 2 of this fiscal year, increased by $2 billion," Congressman TABER, of New York. "Cambodia recently bought $3.1 million of our gold; Lebanon purchased $21 million of our gold; Nigeria bought $20 million; Saudi Arabia, $47 million, and Spain $156.2 million. These transactions neither enhance our gold reserve situation nor improve the living conditions in those countries," Congressman HARSHA, of Ohio. (They buy our gold with dollars we give them.) "The gentleman referred to the purchase of television sets for Africa. There were 1,000 23-inch transistorized battery-operated television sets purchased at a cost of $400,000. It was proposed to use them in areas where there is no electrical power supply. So how did they propose to charge the batteries? They were going to charge them with a hand crank, or they were going to get a merry-go-round and charge the batteries by the merry-go-round's operation. The batteries would be charged while the children were playing on the merry-go-round. But in case they did not have a merry-go-round they were going to get one of these squirrel cages, a treadmill affair where the squirrel runs around, to charge the battery while he was running around getting nowhere," Congressman MEADER, of Michigan. "I am convinced that we are being widely oversold as to the prospective results to be obtained from our generous intervention. We give food, fuel, fertilizer, seeds, clothing, raw materials, machinery, development grants and loans, technical services, military hardware, and now even the Peace Corps. Are all these things actually bringing old and the newly emerging nations into our camp to offset the encroachments of communism? I think it is obvious that they are not. Or, do many of them accept our aid on the one hand and then look in the other direction to see what Russia can do for them?" Congressman PASSMAN, of Louisiana. "With this country having a debt of $301 billion, with the interest on that debt desperately close to $10 billion a year, with this country's public and private debts totaling nearly $1.1 trillion, Congress ought to regain its senses and put a stop to these lavish giveaways. * * * I was astounded by the fact that were produced by the committee * * * this Government is spending $6,000 a year on Iraqi students in this country each school year, $6,000 plus a year. * * * I doubt if there are very many Members of the House of Representatives who can afford to spend $6,000 a year on each of his or her children in a university or college in this country," Congressman GROSS, of Iowa.

How does the Kennedy administration get approval for its foreign aid program? Look at the RECORD (p. 19031, Sept. 20, 1962) citing the "seven-point formula used by 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue" to get its program through. "That formula is comprised of the application of prestige, personality, propaganda, persuasion, power, pressure, and maybe, punishment."

In summary the foreign aid program is not in the self-interest of the United States. It drains our wealth, depletes our gold supply, fails to help the people in the countries receiving it, in many cases it actually goes to our enemies and strengthens those governments which have vowed to destroy us, it does not win friends but instead creates ill-will, jealousy and envy, creates unfair competition for American business contributing to loss of jobs by American workers, it is mismanaged, it is reckless, it has led to outright waste and in some cases dishonesty in handling money belonging to the American taxpayers. The least we can do and should do, and I have so urged for the 8 years I have been in Congress, is to stop appropriating any more foreign aid funds until we have had an opportunity to restudy the whole program and to determine where our money should be spent in our own interest, and to develop adequate guidelines for protecting the American taxpayers from being gouged further of their hard-earned tax dollars.

Our Further Retreat in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the President is resigned to doing nothing but watching in Cuba.

Several disturbing observations have been made on the subject, including that of Ted Lewis in the New York Daily News of September 21, and David Lawrence and Marguerite Higgins in today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News, September 21, 1962]

CAPITAL CIRCUS

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, September 20.—A most disturbing aspect of the Cuban crisis was revealed today. It was simply to the effect that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and presumably President Kennedy and the military, are not getting the information they want about conditions inside Cuba.

This alarming fact comes from Rusk himself in an otherwise well-expurgated transcript of his closed-door testimony last Monday before the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees.

The disclosure is astounding. One of the chief lessons which should have been learned from the Bay of Pigs fiasco 17 months ago was that our intelligence reports on the Cuban internal situation were lousy.

It had been presumed then that Kennedy, burned up about the advice he had received before the abortive invasion, had his mind set on clearing up the intelligence mess.

He did name a special committee, including his brother, Robert, the Attorney General, and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, to find out what was wrong in the CIA and come up with a revamping program. This was followed up by naming John McCone, a man of great administrative ability, as CIA Chief to succeed Allen Dulles.

These actions, plus a few changes in top CIA personnel, including the resignation of Richard M. Bissell, were supposed to straighten out the intelligence mess. No longer would the President get stuff from the cloak-and-dagger boys that was unreliable. No longer would our spies in Red Cuba talk to the wrong people and pass back to Washington a prejudiced report—as before the Bay of Pigs—about how the people were ready to explode in revolt once their exiled brothers were on an invasion beachhead.

Well, it is now 17 months later, and here is what two top Cuba policymakers, Rusk and McGeorge Bundy, the President's foreign affairs adviser, have to say under questioning by Chairman RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, of the Senate Armed Service Committee.

HOW CAN WE BE SURE? THE SENATOR WANTS TO KNOW

RUSSELL (questioning Rusk). "What do you think about the quality of the information we have about what is really taking

place inside Cuba? We have been deceived in that area before. We were before the invasion, and I just wondered if we have improved our means of getting our information in Cuba on which we could rest the security of this country."

RUSK (after saying he believed we had good information on Soviet missile sites). "In terms of political information, we do need to get more than we do. We do not have as much information as we should like about the political attitudes and the effect upon the Cuban people of the stringencies which they have been facing in the last several months and to an increasing degree."

RUSSELL (now questioning Bundy). "How can we determine what he (a Soviet specialist) is doing? We get such scanty information over here, how can we tell whether he is teaching them to build a powerline or whether he is teaching them to engage a radar set so as to fire missiles against the United States?"

IT'S ENOUGH TO GIVE AN AMERICAN THE REAL SHIVERS

BUNDY. "I don't think we can be sure of that, Senator."

RUSSELL. "Is there any truth in the news stories that these people (the Russians) live in colonies?"

BUNDY. "Yes, sir. I think they do, sir."

RUSK. "That has been a pretty general pattern throughout the world, particularly when they are in substantial numbers."

The Rusk and Bundy responses should scare the daylights out of some of us peasants, at least. They aren't even positive that the Russians are living in guarded enclaves. Rusk isn't even sure whether or not Khrushchev's technicians are teaching the Castroites how to shoot missiles at the United States.

But Rusk is most sure about one thing—he is not getting hard intelligence guidance about how the Cuban masses feel about their furry fuehrer, Castro. And until this information is supplied on a solid basis, how do you launch another invasion of exiles? Or more important, how do you plan our own invasion without a clear idea of whether the peasants will embrace you or knife you?

Ten miles from the White House, on a wooded hill overlooking the Potomac, is the home base of all our spies, master and otherwise. In this $50 million structure, well guarded with barbed wire from curious Americans, the ways and means of surreptitiously spending $700 million annually of taxpayer funds around the world are decided on. But where is the money going as pertains to Cuba?

OUR SPIES WERE TOO HOITY-TOITY TO TALK TO PEASANTS

Here is a two-bit island, 90 miles from Key West, now fast becoming a fortress citadel of Moscow. It has a shoreline 2,175 miles long with thousands of uninhabited inlets where any one of our highly paid CIA agents, if he could swim, could clamber safely ashore every night in the week. It has a population of 6,750,000 scattered over 44,206 square miles—an area and population about that of Florida.

And yet, 17 months after the Bay of Pigs, our CIA intelligence about what is going on under Castro leaves much to be desired.

Can't any secret agents talk Spanish like native Cubans? Just what is the matter? One guess is as good as another, but it could be that our Cuban operatives are the same old bunch that messed up the Bay of Pigs. And what was really the matter with them then, including our hired operatives among the exiles? They were class conscious. They talked to the wrong people in Cuba, the rich or white-collar workers, not the peasants with dirt in their fingernails.

While Senator RUSSELL and other commitmen were clearly upset about this CIA situation, they were generally satisfied with Rusk's estimate of the reliability of our intelligence concerning Russian arms shipment and missile sites.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Sept. 24, 1962]

ON SOVIET GRAB IN CUBA: WHY DOESN'T UNITED STATES SPEAK UP?

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Time was when a President of the United States didn't hesitate to speak forthrightly and to act in support of the principles of human freedom anywhere in the world. Two Presidents, both Democrats—Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt—led the American people as they made sacrifices for that same basic principle in two world wars.

But today there is a strange silence—even a fear that it is indiscreet or that it's loose talk to urge that America speak and act in behalf of human beings in Cuba or against the cruelty of their oppressors or against the autocratic government in Moscow which is giving military assistance to a tyrannical dictatorship in Havana.

The latest excuse or alibi now given wide currency by advisers of President Kennedy—and fed out to the press here—is that the Monroe Doctrine has been repealed because America entered World War I and World War II. It is averred that the United States, by militarily assisting certain governments in Europe and Asia during the cold war, has forfeited her right to act in behalf of peoples in this hemisphere who have had their freedoms taken from them by Communist imperialism.

If this concept gains strength, it cannot but encourage the Soviets to penetrate with impunity North and South America as well as every other continent. For, in effect, the advocates of this philosophy are saying that this country has not right to interfere with Soviet conquest of Cuba because the United States now has, under the North Atlantic Treaty, military bases in various European countries. This can only mean that America must, therefore, recognize the Soviet occupation not only of Cuba but of the Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Can the Soviets point to a single example of the grant of American military aid that has resulted in any political control by the United States?

RETREAT IN EXPEDIENCY

The whole thing is an illustration of how expediency leads to one retreat after another. For the United States has just announced, through White House and State Department pronouncements, that America's Armed Forces will be used only to repel military attacks on this country or its neighbors. This is a doctrine of isolation reminiscent of the days when prominent Republicans opposed American entry into either of the two World Wars on the grounds that the interests of this country were not directly affected. It was of course, just a means of appealing to pacifistic sentiment.

Twice the dictatorship government in Berlin misconstrued this attitude as an unwillingness on the part of the United States to fight. In the end, the deliberate attack on American rights on the high seas forced this country into World War I in 1917. While it was Japan and not Germany that attacked Pearl Harbor in 1941, the United States accepted the challenge as a direct attack by the Nazi regime as well. Indeed, the United States made its main war effort on the Continent of Europe and in north Africa.

Thus, the United States in two World Wars has refused to narrow the concept of its participation in world affairs to either the Western or Eastern Hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine has not been narrowed. It has been broadened. From 1945 until a few weeks ago, American policy has been worldwide and has been based on the principle that every people has a right to self-determination and that it is the duty of the United States to help rid the world of any sinister force that now may invade only smaller countries but in the end will invade the larger ones as well. Woodrow Wilson said to Congress in 1917 that "the world must be made safe for democracy." It is not safe today for any free government.

SILENCE MISCONSTRUED

The Soviets are talking loud because they think they can bluff America into inaction and silence. Foreign Minister Gromyko's brazen speech at the United Nations a few days ago, charging this country with aggression, is an example of how readily American silence can be misinterpreted. If the U.S. Government continues to make excuses for abandoning the people in a little country 90 miles away, how can it ever be expected either to lift its voice or render any aid to the peoples of the captive countries in Europe and Asia? To draw back into Fortress America and contend that the United States has no obligation to speak out or act in behalf of the Cuban people because this might offend Soviet Russia means that a bigger test under even more dangerous circumstances may come later on at a time when it will be more difficult, more hazardous, and more costly in human lives than it is now.

Today the vocal chords of the U.S. Government have been silenced by a strategy of fear, of hesitancy, and of vacillation, which keeps on emphasizing the totality of the world situation—as if this means that the principles of democracy and the aspirations of peoples at present under the yoke of Communist imperialism have become secondary. Yet this Nation could mobilize—by exhortation of foreign peoples—forces that would inevitably thwart the aims of the aggressors.

War or the threat of war isn't the most powerful weapon in the world today. Moral force plus economic force are even more powerful. But if there is fear even to speak, then, in the end, war comes because the enemy misinterprets silence for timidity and inaction for weakness.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Sept. 24, 1962]

THE NEW REALISM

(By Marguerite Higgins)

UNITED NATIONS.—Said the African diplomat: "Berlin? Cuba? That's not our worry. They are really the white man's burden—so to speak."

Said the Latin American: "If the United States were to do something effective to checkmate Soviet intervention in Cuba, my government would congratulate you privately and lacerate you publicly."

Now these quotations, noted on a visit to the United Nations, are not offered in any pretense that they are a scientific sampling of opinion. Still they do not deviate from roughly similar sentiments expressed along "Embassy Row" in Washington. Therefore, even as a random sampling they raise some interesting questions about the "new realism" in American foreign policy that Chester Bowles, apparently speaking, for once, with White House blessing, has expounded in a recent speech denouncing those who wish to do something about Cuba.

According to Mr. Bowles, the doctrine of the new realism is founded on the contention that if America did something about Cuba it would "undercut our influence in world affairs, blacken our reputation in the United Nations, forfeit our traditional claim to moral leadership * * * set the stage for sweeping Soviet victories in the critically

important fields of diplomacy and politics * * * and a lessening of our influence in world affairs."

If this truly represents the New Frontier's assumptions, then the question needs urgently to be put whether unwillingness to apply American power effectively in Cuba and elsewhere does in fact save us from the dire consequences outlined by Mr. Bowles. To put it another way, Does inaction, as per the new realism, heighten our influence in world affairs, whiten our reputation in the United Nations, and enhance our traditional claim to moral leadership?

Since the New Frontier has taken to labeling its critics in foreign affairs as rash, hotheaded, and trigger-happy, it would seem appropriate, for the purposes of perspective, to introduce some views on the uses of American power of a diplomat who has never been known to be anything but calm, cool—and even pragmatic. He is the former Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy who, in a hitherto unpublished commencement address at Boston University, made a report on a visit to Latin America during and after the abortive invasion of the Bay of Pigs.

Said Mr. Murphy: "I was in Brazil at the time of the Cuban operation. I was a bit startled to be told that the reason the United States failed to intervene openly in Cuba was because our Government feared it would provoke war between the United Socialist Soviet Russia and the United States. I found little or no recognition of the consistent effort our Government has loyally made through the years to adhere to a policy of nonintervention."

So, if Mr. Murphy is a good reporter, the U.S. unwillingness to use its power got the worst of all possible verdicts: our moral leadership, far from being enhanced, yielded to the suspicion that we were merely motivated by fear of Russia.

Mr. Murphy based his views on the uses of American power on these observations: "We must take at face value the threats of world conquest * * *. We are faced with a continuing situation of probe and thrust and the most facile and articulate bourgeois negotiators the West can produce will be unable to deter the Sino-Soviet leadership from this line. So where is our refuge? I can only suggest power and more especially American determination to use power intelligently and, if necessary, ruthlessly.

* * * * *

"One of the principles to which we have been firmly attached is the collective approach to international questions," Mr. Murphy continued. "But again I feel that we have gone too far in our pursuit of a basically sound idea in resorting to the collective approach indiscriminately. There are situations, for example, where we are too ready and eager to merge our national identity in the United Nations. At times I believe we do this because of reluctance to face up to a risk on our own national account. Leaning on a collectivity that includes many weak, inexperienced and frankly selfish nations leads us into situations where we are reduced to the lowest common denominator * * *. Therefore we have no alternative to asserting our independent national will and judgment, letting our associates as well as our opponents know that on issues involving our fundamental national security we are capable of going our own way."

Thus, according to the old realism of Mr. Murphy, the United States of America, which holds in its own destiny the decline or survival of freedom in our time, should not be deterred from doing anything necessary to that survival because other nations refuse to hold its hand.

The Ink Was Badly Faded but the Message Was Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Yorkville Enquirer, York, S.C., of September 20, 1962:

THE INK WAS BADLY FADED BUT THE MESSAGE WAS CLEAR

(By Chuck DeLoach)

(About as apt as anybody could put it, one American, who admits he is sick, recently described how he—and many like him—are bringing on the downfall of this once great Nation. For some time, he sat in his home in San Francisco, read his newspaper, listened to the news over the radio and television, quietly. Inside, however, he felt a gnawing, a burning. Finally, of a day, he seized upon pen and paper and scribbled a letter to the Copley newspapers. What he had to say was soon picked up for editorials by other newspapers around the country, including the Columbia Record and the Greenville News. His letter is must reading for this Nation's "sick".)

I am one of the Americans who heard Mr. Khrushchev tell our Nation that my great-grandchildren will grow up in a Communist world. For some time now that has bothered me. I am not a brave man—not even a big one.

I suppose I would have to admit that I am, among my own neighbors and in my own culture, the typical, average, well-educated, genteel, suburbanite to whom family, the mortgage, and security have been the all-important items.

I am now 50, and soon my wife and I will see the first of our three children married. I paint my own house, repair my own car, grub my own devil grass, and nurse a modest savings account at the Bank of America. I am a law-abiding man on the quiet side, and dissension makes me terrible nervous. Frankly, I am the kind who simply doesn't have it in him to fight anyone ever.

My wife had me cleaning out an old trunk in the storage room the other day, and I ran across the huge old family Bible that I had not thought about for years. My great-grandmother had kept a journal of the trip across the Great Plains with a wagon and oxen when she and great-grandpa were youngsters coming out to settle in California in the great migration. Great-grandma wrote about it as the wild, new land, rich and abundant in mythical proportions.

On the trail she wrote of sickness and hunger, and heat and cold, and dust and thirst, and the deaths and births like beads strung together on a thread of hope of freedom and a land of plenty for their children yet unborn. And when she viewed the new land she wrote in simple word pictures of the cities and farms and schools, and happiness that would some day bloom in the greatness of the vast new land. She wrote of her tomorrow and my today.

The ink was badly faded, but the message was clear. As I read, I began to think about America and being an American and what it all stands for; and I thought about our enemies and what they intend to do to America, to those rich lands and farms, to the cities and the people, to its freedom and its hope.

And, suddenly, I realized that I am a sick American. I mean really sick. I am sick of panaceas and of backing up. I am sick of reactions where there should be initiative. I am sick of bureaucrats who tell me that my enemy is not really my enemy, and that I should live together with murderers and tyrants.

I am sick of government that hasn't the guts to clean traitors out of its own offices. And I'm sick of being a nice, patient guy about it. I am sick of placidly accepting excuses instead of successes; of being a silent gentleman for fear of controversy. I am sick of my country being ridiculed all over the world. I am sick of pink-livered politicians who place personal career above the fate of the flag.

I am sick of 40 years of relentless, creeping, cancerous, communistic godlessness that never once has wavered from its avowed purpose of conquering that flag and seeing it trampled in the mud under Russian boots. I am sick of my genteel desire to stand pat and pray while the enemy advances.

I am sick of educators who teach tolerance of subversion and of clergymen who would have me quail at the specter of battle and turn my cheek in fear of what our enemies might do.

In all honesty, the thing of which I am most sick is the man who let these things come to me—myself.

And by the living God who made me, sir, I am a sick American who intends to get well.

Are there any "sick" Carolinians?

Thoughts on Labor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as each new Labor Day comes and goes on annual schedule, our thoughts naturally turn to comparing working conditions today against the intolerable conditions that existed in long past years.

Gone are the sweat shops and child labor that existed before constructive legislation was enacted to correct these abusive evils and mercenary practices that befell the luckless laborer.

The real drive for recognition of the rights of labor started with the economic depression of 1873, and Peter McGuire, father to the inspiration that created Labor Day, was a forceful component of the small group that led the way to the many substantial gains made by organized labor during the ensuing years.

Much has been written and said about the gains made by organized labor, which gains are principally appreciated by members of the joined labor groups. Would it not be wonderful to know how many others outside the organized labor groups realize and appreciate just how much these hard-earned gains have benefited their respective positions in

life? We should all be grateful for the dedicated life struggle of Peter McGuire in his pioneer efforts to bring into reality the favorable labor conditions as they exist today.

James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL–CIO, has eloquently revived and focused our attention on the meritorious efforts of this great man in his speech at the graveside of Peter McGuire in Camden, N.J., on Labor Day, September 3. I know that Peter McGuire everlastingly sleeps in the knowledge that his efforts were not in vain and that his name will be forever perpetuated in the annals of organized labor.

He may also rest better in the knowledge that the world of the laboring man today is in far better shape than when he entered and departed this earth, and that many of his dreams have become a reality.

May I now, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, include Mr. James B. Carey's 1962 Labor Day speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY JAMES B. CAREY, VICE PRESIDENT AFL–CIO; PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL, RADIO & MACHINE WORKERS, AFL–CIO, AT ANNUAL LABOR DAY CEREMONY AT GRAVE OF PETER MCGUIRE, CAMDEN, N.J., SEPTEMBER 3, 1962

Four score years ago this week Peter J. McGuire's dream came true. Down New York City's fashionable Fifth Avenue, on a bright September morning in 1882, marched more than 30,000 men and women who proudly called themselves cigarmakers, railroad men, printers, blacksmiths, bricklayers, dressmakers, and ironworkers.

But they also called themselves, with even greater pride, something else—unionists—and they sang union songs as they marched down the avenue and into Union Square carrying signs and placards that read: "Labor Will Be United," and "Eight Hours for Work, Eight Hours for Rest, Eight Hours for What We Will."

Peter McGuire's dream, the Nation's first Labor Day, had been proposed by this Camden labor leader, the general secretary of the Carpenters Union, at a meeting of the New York City Central Labor Union 4 months earlier.

Today, 80 years later, we honor Peter McGuire not alone for the inspiration that created Labor Day; we honor him also as one of the truly great leaders in the long and bright history of the American labor movement.

Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, now a Justice-designate of the U.S. Supreme Court, has given me a brief message to present at this Labor Day ceremony. This is his message:

"Peter McGuire, perhaps as much as any man, turned the key that freed the American worker from a life of oppression and hardship. By his untiring activity on behalf of the working men and women he certainly helped them to be free.

"I wonder, though, what Peter McGuire would have to say if he could visit us today, nearly a half-century after his death.

"He would find more people at work in America than lived here when he was alive. He would find them enjoying the highest standard of living the world has ever known. And he would see every sign that the men who run his country's affairs are determined that the future will be safe, peaceful, and prosperous.

"I think Peter McGuire would be proud to be an American in 1962."

We all, I am sure, will agree with Secretary Goldberg. Yes, Peter McGuire would most certainly be proud to be an American in 1962.

I am equally sure that Peter McGuire would be proud in 1962 to be a member of the American labor movement.

He would be proud of its size, because size connotes strength; and Peter McGuire was ahead of his time in believing in the complete organization of all workers. He said, "The interests of the working classes are everywhere identical and we should do all in our power to organize all trades and callings in every city, town, and hamlet in the country."

Peter McGuire would be proud of our labor movement's democracy, because he insisted on internal democracy in the union he founded, the carpenters, and in the American Federation of Labor which he helped to organize in 1886, just 4 years after the first Labor Day.

Peter McGuire would be proud of our labor movement's militancy, because McGuire himself was not only a brilliant and aggressive strike leader; he was a two-fisted fighter for the cause of justice whenever he encountered injustice. The depression that started in 1873 was the most terrible that had ever struck the United States; the unemployed literally starved in Philadelphia and New York. McGuire headed a group of union leaders which met with the New York City Board of Aldermen to demand unemployment relief. There was a heated discussion. McGuire first begged and pleaded with the aldermen. When begging and pleading failed, he threatened (according to a historian) "to throw them out of the window one by one if unemployment relief was not granted."

Peter McGuire would be proud of our labor movement's political action, because far more than any other major labor leader of his time McGuire believed in political action by organized labor. In fact, he spent most of his time from 1876 to 1878 persuading unions to take up political action, and he himself campaigned tirelessly in State and local elections on behalf of the workingman's party.

Peter McGuire would be proud of our labor movement's economic gains, because he himself was probably the most sensational organizer and bargainer of his time. In a single year in St. Louis, McGuire not only organized four large local unions but was able to increase carpenter's wages by 100 percent.

Peter McGuire would be proud of our labor movement's internationalism, because he himself believed devoutly in the internationalism of labor and the brotherhood of workingmen of all countries. Only 2 months after he had founded the Carpenter's Union, McGuire traveled to Europe to participate in an International Socialist Congress.

There is no more appropriate place than here at his grave, 110 years after his birth and 80 years after the first Labor Day, to suggest that Peter McGuire has suffered at the hands of history. The evidence accumulates that he was a more impressive and effective leader of men, a more inspired pioneer of unionism, and a greater genius of organizing, negotiating and strike action than history has generally acknowledged.

Two things, perhaps, have served to dim the picture of his genius and the towering stature of his talents and accomplishments. First, he has become known to millions solely in his role as "father of Labor Day." Second, in his lifetime and afterward he was overshadowed by his close friend and associate Samuel Gompers.

It does not detract from this historic importance of Gompers to note that some historians contend that McGuire was Gompers equal but that the major capabilities of the two men were in different areas of trade union leadership. Thus, Labor Historian Herbert Harris, writing of the AFL's early attitudes and policies, tells us, "In the main they were the ideas of a brilliant Irishman, P. J. McGuire, secretary of the new federation. But he was the braintruster rather than the administrative personality, and the executive direction of the federation fell into the hands of a London-born, Dutch-Jewish cigarmaker named Samuel Gompers."

We know that Gompers himself was one of Peter McGuire's warmest admirers from the time the two met while still in their early teens. Gompers, in his autobiography, recalls how he drifted into the debating club room at Cooper Union, where he and McGuire attended the free classes and lectures. Says Gompers: "I came in contact with young men, many of whom were striving to learn. One of these was Peter J. McGuire, then an alert attractive young Irish-American hungry for information and opportunities to discuss current problems."

Later Gompers described him as "a fiery young orator with a big heart." In the 1880's during the nationwide campaign for the 8-hour day, Gompers wrote, "P. J. McGuire spoke almost continuously. He threw himself into the work with all the enthusiasm and ability that distinguished his leadership."

In this period the newly formed AFL had a major problem with its affiliates, a problem that could have proved fatal to the infant AFL. Many of its affiliates wouldn't stay affiliated. They would join and depart from the federation almost on whimsy, on the merest of excuses, in again, out again.

"Sometimes," wrote Gompers, "I was fighting singlehanded to hold the federated organization together. The only other officer of the federation who felt a real responsibility for the work was P. J. McGuire. The mainstay of his own struggling organization, he found time for the problems and the work of the federation."

If it were for no other reason than this Peter McGuire should go down in American labor history as a major figure; because in Gompers' words, only he and McGuire understood the importance of keeping the AFL effectively federated, only he and McGuire struggled against the periodic fragmentation of the American Federation of Labor.

But for McGuire it must also be said, there were heartaches in this dedication to the labor movement. During the Christmas period of 1873 the unemployment situation became worse. Peter McGuire was probably the outstanding leader, Gompers related, as "the unemployed filled the city's streets and squares and marched to conferences with aldermen and mayor at the city hall."

The press worked itself almost into an insane rage over McGuire. "Then began efforts to thwart the movement by trickery. P. J. McGuire's father was employed in one of the large departments stores. He was an honest hard-working man, accustomed to yield obedience to authority. He was made to feel that Peter was disgracing him by idleness, consorting with unemployed "bums" and freethinkers. One Sunday morning he stood on the steps of the Catholic Church and denounced and disowned his son. The city hall politicians tried to use the incident to break McGuire's spirit. He was tenderhearted and the treatment hurt, but he stood by the cause."

Certain it is that only Samuel Gompers played a greater, a more historically crucial role in the origins and early development of the AFL than did Peter McGuire.

In November 1882, 2 months after the first Labor Day but 4 years before the founding of the American Federation of Labor, Peter McGuire, in an appeal to the federation of trades and labor unions, called in effect for the creation of the AFL.

McGuire said that he "urged not political but industrial unity as the prime object that the federation should aim at."

The federation, he said, should not attempt to antagonize or destroy existing organizations "but by preserving all that is integral in them and by widening their scope so that each, without submerging its individuality, may act with the others in all that concerns them. The benefit of this federation is not only to render monetary and moral assistance in case of strikes or lockouts, but its very existence would lessen the number of these conflicts by causing unscrupulous employers to hesitate before declaring war on employees reinforced by such a body."

Above all else McGuire was vigorously, loudly and relentlessly an advocate of the 8-hour day. He told the federation: "We want an enactment by the workmen themselves that on a given day 8 hours should constitute a day's work, and they ought to enforce it themselves."

This was a militant, even a supermilitant position to take—that labor would win the 8-hour day not through legislation but through its own economic power—but it reflected the mood of the trade union movement of the time. McGuire, for example, was acclaimed when he told a mass meeting, "The way to get the 8-hour day is by organization. In 1868 the United States passed an 8-hour law, and that law has been enforced just twice. If you want an 8-hour law, make it yourself."

The international labor holiday, known as May Day, originated with the struggle for the 8-hour day in the United States, as is well known. But what is not at all well known is that May Day may also have been inspired by Peter McGuire. In 1882 McGuire and his Carpenters Union proposed that May 1, 1886, should be the deadline date for establishment of the 8-hour day.

It is possible, therefore, that Peter J. McGuire can be credited with the inspiration for both the American labor holiday and for the international labor holiday.

Throughout the country on May Day 350,000 workers went on strike for the 8-hour day. More than 40,000 struck in Chicago and an additional 45,000 won a shorter workday without striking. In Detroit, more than 11,000 workers paraded for the 8-hour day.

In short order, the carpenters won an 8-hour day for 46,000 workers in 137 cities and were able to reduce hours from 10 to 9 for 30,000 more. And, proving the appeal of the 8-hour day, they organized 22,000 new members that year compared to 3,000 the previous year.

And so it went in city after city. Sometimes gradually, sometimes like a swiftly rolling snowball, the 8-hour campaign picked up size and strength and speed. Before long it became clear that nothing could stop it.

One reason it could not be stopped was Peter McGuire. He had emerged as one of the most influential leaders of his time. He was one of five union chiefs who issued the call to the AFL's founding convention.

On December 8, 1886, in Columbus, Ohio, it was Peter McGuire who was chosen to convene the founding convention of the AFL. A few minutes later he was elected, by acclamation, temporary secretary of the convention. Dramatically at the end of the AFL's founding convention, McGuire was unanimously elected secretary of the new American labor movement, but immediately resigned because he felt that his duties as general secretary of his own union would prevent him from being an effective secretary of the new AFL. The convention rose, almost as one man, and "unanimously rejected" his resignation.

And so a new career for Peter McGuire began, a career resulting in a partnership with Gompers that kept the AFL from being fragmentized, the new labor movement from being disrupted and destroyed by the affiliates flying off on tangents.

McGuire could not be discouraged, not even by the experience of Congressman Murch who reported on a visit he had made, with a committee, to President Chester Arthur to ask for enforcement of the 8-hour day. The President received them coldly and, history records, when he heard what the committee wanted, he replied: "I do not think the 8-hour law is constitutional, and no power on earth can make me enforce an unconstitutional law."

Secretary of Labor Goldberg is right when he says that, "I think Peter McGuire would be proud to be an American in 1962."

Peter McGuire, as I said earlier, would also be proud in 1962 to be a member of the American labor movement.

He would be proud above all else because he would find that in this 80th anniversary year of the Labor Day he founded, we are renewing the fight for the cause he held most dear—the shorter workweek.

Eighty years after the successful fight was launched for the 8-hour day, we—the grateful inheritors of Peter McGuire's dedicated life and struggles—have pledged ourselves, in 1962, through the labor movement Peter McGuire helped create—to establish the 35-hour week for all American workers.

If Peter McGuire could rejoin us on earth today he might not understand such of our problems as cyclical unemployment and automation.

But he would understand, and join us in the struggle for the shorter workweek; because this was his cause from the beginning.

Therefore, here at his honored resting place on the 80th anniversary of the holiday he created to honor workingmen, we rededicate our labor movement to his cause, the shortening of the laboring man's workweek.

There was a song that was sung by tens of thousands of workers' voices at meetings during the 1880's—meetings that spread from city to city, town to town.

It swelled and lifted and brought workingmen's hearts higher. Peter McGuire found himself in many meetings that sang this song, and we can imagine how his voice led the others so many times in what was called the "Eight-Hour Song." These were the words:

"We mean to make things over;
we're tired of toil for naught
"But bare enough to live on: never an hour for thought.
"We want to feel the sunshine; we want to smell the flowers;
"We're sure that God has willed it, and we mean to have 8 hours.
"We're summoning our forces from shipyard, shop, and mill;
"Eight hours for work, eight hours for rest, eight hours for what we will."

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*---------4000 Mass. Ave.
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N.C*---
Alford, Dale, *Ark*----------
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*----------
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4501 Conn. Ave.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*-----
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N.Y*-----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*---
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*---The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N.J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*----
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*-----
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Barry, Robert R., *N.Y*------3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N.H*---------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Battin, James F., *Mont*----217 Slade Run Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Becker, Frank J., *N.Y*------
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*---
Beermann, Ralph F., *Nebr*--
Belcher, Page, *Okla*--------
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*-------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C*----Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*--------4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*------The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind*-------
Bray, William G., *Ind*------
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*---
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*----
Bromwell, James E., *Iowa*--
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*----------
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Bruce, Donald C., *Ind*------
Buckley, Charles A., *N.Y*---
Burke, Frank W., *Ky*-------
Burke, James A., *Mass*-----
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*-------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-------1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N.J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*-------
Casey, Bob, *Tex*-----------
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*-------The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*---
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*-------
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*-----1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*-----
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*-----
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*------5540 Colfax Ave., Alexandria, Va.
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C*-----2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Corman, James C., *Calif*---
Cramer, William C., *Fla*----6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*-4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*-----
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*-
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*--
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Davis, John W., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William L., *Ill*----
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*-----
Dent, John H., *Pa*---------
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*---
Derounian, Steven B., *N.Y*-
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*---
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*---800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-
Dingell, John D., *Mich*-----
Dole, Robert, *Kans*--------2816 N. Jefferson, Arlington, Va.
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*---
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Dooley, Edwin B., *N.Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*-----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*----------
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*---
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*--1719 New House Office Building
Durno, Edwin R., *Oreg*----
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*------
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*-
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*--
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*---
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*------
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*--
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Findley, Paul, *Ill*----------
Finnegan, Edward R., *Ill*---
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R.I*------1235 New House Office Building
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*-------
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*-------The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* The Congressional
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N.J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garland, Peter A., *Maine*--
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*------
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*---
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*-----
Glenn, Milton W., *N.J*-----Capitol Park Apts., 800 4th St. SW.
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*---200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*---3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*---
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George, *Ala*--------4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*--
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*----
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*--
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*------
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*----
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Harding, Ralph R., *Idaho*--
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*----------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*
Harsha, William H., Jr., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*-------
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N.Y*-----
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*-------
Hemphill, Robert W., *S.C*--
Henderson, David N., *N.C*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill*-----
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*------
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*--
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*----
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*--
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md*---
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*--
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*------
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*-----
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*----
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*-----5906 Harwick Rd.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*-
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y*-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N.Y*--
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------4807 Newport
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*-----
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, David S., *Utah*-------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N.C*------
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*----
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*------
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*--
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn*----
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*-------
Kyl, John, *Iowa*-----------
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*------
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*-----

Appendix

Review of Poetry by Avis Turner French

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], together with a review of the latest edition of poetry by Avis Turner French of Antrim, N.H., written by Mr. Teenus Cheney and published in the Salisbury (N.C.) Post of August 21, 1962.

There being no objection, the statement and review were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COTTON

On August 21, Mr. Teenus Cheney, in the Salisbury, N.C., Post, wrote an excellent review of the latest edition of poetry by a well-known New Hampshire woman, Avis Turner French, of Antrim.

Avis Turner French has attained international recognition for her poetry. Mr. Cheney's review is of her last book entitled "Flickering Lights."

POST SCRIPTS
(By Teenus Cheney)
WISTFUL ECHOES, MOTHER

"A morning in September; golden sunlight;
One cricket's cheery voice, and far apart
Across the hills, the village church bells ringing;
All echo through my heart.
"For I remember one whose soul was bell toned;
Whose absence often brings such lonely tears.
Like distant bells I sometimes hear her calling,
Across the long long years."
—AVIS TURNER FRENCH, Antrim, N.H.

OBONS

For more than a decade Obons' northeasternmost contributor has been Avis Turner French, of Antrim, NH., a lady whose skillful colligation of words in metric measure long has elated the myriad. Her every entry has been of poetic excellencies. Now she has assembled half a hundred of her choicest verses in a stiffback binding and she has given it the title of "Flickering Lights."

It delighted me to note that the Salisbury Post is listed on the acknowledgments page.

This deucedly dexterous woman owns one of the keenest rhythm senses it ever has been my lot to observe. It can be corroborated by glancing at the example above, or by reading any within the pages of this eximious volume. Most of them rhyme, but some do not. Notable among the latter classification is the title poem, on page 35. It veers somewhat from the norm, too, in that it totals nine lines. But—it's beautiful.

The lady writes only in a serious vein, a factor which does nothing but add to the beauty of her lines. Let me give you the first four of poetry, found on page 8:

"I am the ocean touched by sunset gold,
Rose, clouds across the dawn, wild geese in flight,
New snow Christmas Eve, blue distant hills,
Home lights that beacon softly through the night."

Memorials are a favorite topic with her, including one here to Edwin Markham.

Sonnets palpably are among her most prominent assets. While I like them all, I am forced to tenor here a preference for "The Dearest Miracle":

"The deep of God is everywhere to see
In sunset glow, the stars like promises.
Through hymns forever sounding wild and free.
From tides, or wind-swept mountain majesties
While clearly and so cleverly defined.
The arts and science well revealing man.
His growth and depth through magnitude of mind.
According to the great eternal plan.
But finer than all these from out the vast-
The dearest miracle
Let all rejoice.
When loved most tenderly, who learn at last.
That they have looked on God, have heard His voice.
They know creation, mankind, stars and sod
Are for one reason, love, the soul of God."

Another element which adds to the beauty of Avis' writing is that it is foundationed on simplicity, like in "The Little Things":

"I know I shall remember
While I am growing old
How much she loved the starlight,
The sea, the sunset's gold.
The way she had of laughing
Just over little things.
She graced the years with beauty
Because her soul had wings.
I know I shall remember
The songs she sometimes sang.
Her voice was pure as crystal
Like bells that softly rang.
The ways she always kissed me
Was very sweet to know.
She was so dear, my mother
Who loved me long ago."

Space paucities forbid my giving you more. Albeit, I am well convinced that from these bits you can believe readily that Avis Turner French has few equals in the active practice of the poetic arts.

House Resolution 211: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thought and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MAYWOOD, N.J., *August 29, 1962.*
Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept my sincere thanks for the statement which you made on July 16 in the House of Representatives in behalf of the captive nations, among which is Lithuania.

Your efforts are appreciated by Lithuanians everywhere.

Respectfully yours,
DOROTHY DUTKUS.

KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA,
September 9, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your kind remarks concerning the captive nations.

Yours truly,
VETO ANGELIUS.

WORCESTER, MASS.

DEAR SIR: I am very grateful for your statement in behalf of the captive nations on July 16 in the House of Representatives. A statement such as this serves to remind the free world that these countries are still suffering under Communist domination.

With best wishes,
ANN I. KOKERNAK
Mrs. JOHN F. KOKERNAK.

WORCESTER, MASS.

SEPTEMBER 11, 1962.

DEAR DANIEL J. FLOOD: Thank you for your kind remarks concerning captive nations.

Yours truly,
VETO ANGELIUS.

WORCESTER, MASS.

KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA COUNCIL 116,
Worcester, Mass., September 10, 1962.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Thank you very much for your statement in behalf of the captive nations.

I appreciate your efforts in helping us support Lithuania which is among one of the captive nations.

Sincerely yours,

Miss RITA SKAMAROCK.

KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA,

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I wish to thank you very much for your statement of July 16 in behalf of the captive nations. Thank you again.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY GLASTER.

WORCESTER, MASS.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Thank you for mentioning the captive nations on July 16, 1962.

Your support is deeply appreciated.

Gratefully,

Mrs. BARBARA MAZERKA.

Commendation of Radio Free Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a recent special edition of Overseas Report, a newsletter published by Julius Klein Public Relations, Inc., has been devoted to commending the job being done by Radio Free Europe. Quite justifiably, I think, it points out that not enough is known here in the United States about the vital work being performed by this service in the cold war.

Major General Klein, who is known on both sides of the aisle as a dedicated American patriot, recently was escorted on a guided tour of the Radio Free Europe operation in Munich by Maj. Gen. C. Rodney Smith, U.S. Army, retired, a former NATO officer and International Telephone & Telegraph Co. executive who is now director of Radio Free Europe.

In summing up his impressions of Radio Free Europe, General Klein said:

It is my conviction that this radio station deserves the unlimited support of the American people. On my return to the United States, I intend to tell the men and women of America about the tremendous job I have seen performed at this outpost of democracy on the very fringe of totalitarianism.

General Klein continued:

I would like to assure all Americans that Radio Free Europe is an important link between the peoples of the free world and the Iron Curtain countries, in keeping alive their hope and spirit, looking toward the day when they will be liberated and their countries are again free. I found that Radio Free Europe is providing vital communications with the peoples of the Iron Curtain countries—that their programs are enormously appreciated by the Hungarians. They listen to the programs eagerly and comment on them. The programs represent one of the most important links with freedom in their lives.

Elsewhere in Overseas Report it is pointed out that:

BUDAPEST STILL LISTENS

The effectiveness of Radio Free Europe since the abortive Hungarian revolution of 1956 has been questioned in many European circles. It has been said Radio Free Europe hasn't had the confidence of the Hungarian audience ever since it gave the impression it was speaking for the U.S. Government when it talked of military support for any uprising.

The question raised by these critics is impossible to answer. Would the Hungarians have attacked Russian tanks with stones without expectation of American military intervention? History would seem to say "Yes." Throughout the annals of civilization there are stories of the oppressed rising up against the oppressor.

Surely the Hungarians were oppressed just as were the East Germans and the Poznan Poles who rioted before them.

To those who say Radio Free Europe spoke with the authority of Washington we can only point to the radio station's formation in 1950 by private citizens with private donations. There is no connection here with the high councils of American policymaking.

And as for the reports the station has declined in effectiveness among its Hungarian audience, the fact that 48 percent of Hungarians still listen to Radio Free Europe broadcasts at least twice a week is hardly an indication of a loss of effectiveness.

Radio Free Europe is supported solely by private contributions. I think it is vitally important to remind all Americans that by aiding its effectiveness they are making a significant contribution to victory in the cold war, and I congratulate General Klein's organization for having done so.

I ask unanimous consent to have the articles referred to printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Overseas Report, Aug. 10, 1962]

RADIO FREE EUROPE PLANS MAJOR EFFORT FOR WALL'S ANNIVERSARY

The first anniversary of the construction of the Berlin wall, to be noted on August 12, will be marked by a concentration of effort by Radio Free Europe to illustrate the true workings of communism and to tell the peoples of East Europe the true causes of the wall's erection.

For the 18 hours of itsw broadcast day, Radio Free Europe will be using its 20 transmitters and 22 studios at its Munich headquarters to beam news, music, drama, and comedy to the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, as it does every day of the year. On August 12, however, Radio Free Europe will concentrate its efforts on countering the propaganda issued by the Communist monopoly of radio and press.

This is Radio Free Europe's assignment. On July 4, 1950, when the first signal emitted from a Radio Free Europe mobile transmitter in a wooded area near Frankfurt, it was the beginning of a vast attempt to break the monopoly of communications the Communist regimes had imposed in their countries.

With such a monopoly the satellite regimes hoped the captive peoples would lose their identity with the Western free nations; that the memories of the older generation would be deadened and the younger generation would belong to the state.

WINDOW OF TRUTH

The Free Europe Committee, New York parent organization of Radio Free Europe, vowed it would break that monopoly by keeping a "window of truth" open between West and East. The radio station established in southern Germany with funds donated by private citizens has redeemed this promise.

Today Radio Free Europe's daily programs are tailored for the greatest impact on its different listeners in each of the five target countries. For each target nation there is a separate division at Radio Free Europe's Munich offices. Each division has varied programing including 10-minute hourly newscasts, sportscasts, music, drama, comedy, religious, and cultural programs. There is on-the-spot coverage of worldwide events. Programs are aimed at adults and children, farmers, factory workers, and professionals.

Although the radio station is directed by Americans, most of the programing is done by nationals of the five target countries. Each of the national divisions is headed by a well-known exile. Native East Europeans are chosen for their skills as newsmen, commentators, writers, announcers, performers, and specialists in agriculture, business, science, economics, and culture. Besides 190 Americans the Radio Free Europe staff is comprised of 540 persons from the 5 target countries, 520 Germans, 360 Portuguese (Portugal is location of Radio Free Europe transmitters) and 70 from other nations.

To gather the news of the Western and Communist worlds the radio station relies on: Radio Free Europe's central news bureau and bureaus in major cities of Western Europe; Western news agencies such as Reuters, AP, and UPI; Radio Free Europe's New York offices; a special events section; free lance reporters; study of Western and Communist publications; interviews with refugees and travelers from behind the Iron Curtain.

Besides all this, Radio Free Europe has an elaborate system of monitoring East European radio stations. This operation, one of the world's largest, is located near Munich at Schleissheim and keeps tabs on more than 60 Communist radio stations. By knowing what is being said behind the Iron Curtain, Radio Free Europe can comment on, and correct, false information.

The evaluation and analysis departments of each of Radio Free Europe's five divisions carefully scan all material to prevent the use of incorrect data and maintain the station's credibility. New data is checked against Radio Free Europe's file of information in which there are over 7 million entries on people, places, and events.

Once Radio Free Europe's network has assembled and corroborated the raw material for its programs, broadcasts are prepared. Daily discussions earmark each bit of information for its best use—a news program, a dramatic play, a comedy show.

The August 12 programing will be an example of how Radio Free Europe uses special opportunities to unmask the lies of communism. A year ago, when the Berlin wall went up, Radio Free Europe broke the Communist blackout of information on the wall with detailed analysis of what happened and why. Refugees from East Berlin told their personal stories to Radio Free Europe listeners in Eastern Europe.

Another example of the use of a special event was Radio Free Europe's reporting of the 1958 changes in the Rumanian penal code. The unpublished changes made, among other things, "unauthorized contact with foreigners" an offense punishable by death. Rumanians were unaware of this change until Radio Free Europe broadcast the full text.

How successful is Radio Free Europe's efforts? The radio station's audience research department continuously interviews refugees and visitors from the East to learn their listening habits. It has been discovered that:

LISTENERSHIP HIGH

An average of 70 percent of the peoples of the five target countries listen at least occasionally to Radio Free Europe. Of these,

66 percent of Poles, 48 percent of Hungarians, and 35 percent of Bulgars, Czechs, and Rumanians regularly listen to Radio Free Europe at least twice a week.

There are other proofs of listenership. Polish radio and press made only minor references to then Vice President Richard Nixon's Warsaw visit in 1960. Yet thousands of Poles, given the tour route by Radio Free Europe, turned out to cheer the visitor. And when Col. Joseph Swaitlo, a top Polish secret police official defected and gave Radio Free Europe information for over 100 broadcasts, the Polish regime was forced to dissolve its secret police.

As for its future, Radio Free Europe stated in a recent annual report: "So long as the Iron Curtain, a symbol of modern barbarism, continues to divide East from West, so long as the men and women behind it are deprived of a free press and of the right of self-determination—so long will this voice of the free world continue to speak."

GENERAL KLEIN TOURS RADIO FREE EUROPE OPERATIONS

MUNICH.—Maj. Gen. Julius Klein (U.S. Army, retired), noted American soldier and international public relations expert, was given a guided tour of the Radio Free Europe operation in Munich by Maj. Gen. C. Rodney Smith, retired, former NATO officer and International Telephone and Telegraph Co. executive who is currently Radio Free Europe Director.

After a thorough briefing on the freedom network's operations by General Smith, General Klein inspected the five broadcasting departments that transmit program to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. General Klein showed particular interest in Radio Free Europe's techniques of monitoring some 40 Communist radio stations, and in the extensive east European archives maintained at Radio Free Europe headquarters here.

SAW PROGRAM PRODUCED

Other points of interest to General Klein, who is founder of a Chicago broadcasting service, were the master control room connecting 28 transmitters with Radio Free Europe, the production of a program slated for Czechoslovakia and the central newsroom. He also sat in on a policy meeting attended by Bernard Yarrow, executive vice president of Radio Free Europe's parent organization in New York, the Free Europe Committee.

Following the inspection tour General Klein attended a luncheon with General Smith and Mr. Yarrow. Among 10 Radio Free Europe officials present was Hugh Elbot, a friend of General Klein for 20 years, who arranged the general's visit to Munich and the tour of the Radio Free Europe installations here.

In summing up his impressions of Radio Free Europe, General Klein told the luncheon gathering "It is my conviction that this radio station deserves the unlimited support of the American people. On my return to the United States I intend to tell the men and women of America about the tremendous job I have seen performed at this outpost of democracy on the very fringe of totalitarianism."

"Since visiting the Radio Free Europe installations—and after much difficulty—I obtained a visa to go to Budapest just 2 weeks ago. I shall not attempt to go into detail regarding my visit behind the Iron Curtain, or give my impressions gained from several days' stay in Budapest.

"But, I would like to assure all Americans that Radio Free Europe is an important link between the peoples of the free world and the Iron Curtain countries, in keeping alive their hope and spirit, looking toward the day when they will be liberated and their countries are again free.

"I found that Radio Free Europe is providing vital communications with the peoples of the Iron Curtain countries—that their programs are enormously appreciated by the Hungarians. They listen to the broadcasts eagerly and comment on them. The programs represent one of the most important links with freedom in their lives."

Alabama's Largest Oil Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 28, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks for the RECORD, I include therein an article from a wonderful newspaper at Citronelle and Mount Vernon, Ala., called the Call. The headline in this paper—and I think it deserves headlines—is "Oil Fields 7 Years Old Today"—and it says that the local field reaches 30-million-barrel mark.

Well, I wish all of us could think back to 7 years ago, when they brought in that field. Really and truly, as some of our people said, that was the day—the day that the black oil came pouring out—and think now—it reaches 30 million barrels a year. But this wonderful little paper that covers Citronelle and Mount Vernon and all that part of north Mobile County, tells the story in no uncertain terms; and think what it means.

Most of this wonderful feat was caused by the great Gulf operation—that "good Gulf," as they call it. Well, I believe they sold out to some wonderful people—our own men living right there in Mobile, Bart B. Chamberlain and George Jett, of Louisiana, who have made such a wonderful success in the oil business—not only have, but are, in putting down, this very Sunday morning, when I am dictating this on the dictaphone, they are drilling and drilling, day and night; and there is no telling where it is going to end. They have been trying to get oil there as long as I can remember. I had a great partner, J. C. Prine, who went to Heaven a long, long time ago, that used to just keep on telling me we were going to get oil at Citronelle; and he did put down several wells, trying and trying hard; but we didn't go deep enough.

But now, Mr. Speaker, we have that. I would like to say, though, had we not had depletion, these great oil companies—and there are many of them—would not have been able to put on this great development. H. L. Hunt put many wells down there, and so did many other oil companies. I will not try to name them, but I know that Bart Chamberlain and George Jett put one down to, I believe, 20,000 feet—almost 5 miles deep—at Citronelle. All of the wells, of course, are not that deep. They go to about eleven thousand and some-odd feet.

But, as I say, this story in the Citronelle-Mount Vernon Call, that was established way back in 1896, tells the story and tells it well. Had it not been for the depletion that we worked so hard to keep here, we would have never gotten this great development. This well that is only 7 years old has accounted for about two-thirds of all crude oil produced in Alabama since oil was discovered in Gilbertown, Choctaw County, 18 years ago; and some day I believe they will go deeper at Gilbertown and get more oil there; but they, too, are doing wonderfully well with their oilfield there.

Then, we have another oilfield just across the great Tombigbee River, between the Tombigbee River and the Alabama River, owned by Ellis Jordan, a great timber, land, and lumber man there, who is doing wonderfully well. These high waters interfere with him and drown him out ever so often, but that does not stop Ellis Jordan—he goes right on and, as I have said, is doing well.

That gives us four fields in Alabama. Well, you will note that in all, the oilmen from all over this country have spent in development and drilling $68 million—in drilling the 335 wells—and as I see by this article, they only have 7 dry holes. Is that not wonderful? The gross returns have amounted to $82½ million.

I notice that the unit manager, Mr. William L. Horner, of Mobile, estimates that the field could turn out 26,000 barrels of oil every day. That is about $70,000 worth of oil every day, or $25 million in a year—over $2 million every month. Mr. Chamberlain tells me that they have plans for many, many more wells—not only in the proven part of the field, but in other places where their geologist tells them they can expect to find oil.

So, the future up in that Citronelle country and on clear over to the salt dome at McIntosh looks good—very good—for a successful year ahead and for many long years to come. One other article that I was reading, too, I will put in here. It is what some of the Texas people said—and what goes for Texas—and a lot of this work was done by Texas people—goes for us down there in Mobile and Washington Counties. And it says this: "Oilmen—Most Independent Breed of Men." Well, they are, too, and they are wonderful go-getters; they have nerve; they have stamina; they have perseverance; and they have brains and ability; and that is the reason these men in Texas succeeded in bringing in oil, and that is the reason the men at Citronelle, Ala., at Gilbertown, Ala., the Clarke Oil Co., in Clarke County, Ala., and over in Escambia County—they had all of this, too; and we will bring in other fields as long as we have the great leadership we have in the development of our oilfields in Alabama and all over this country.

We in Alabama are very proud of all of the men and the women that have helped make this oil business so successful and so wonderful, and has helped every man, woman, and child in that part of the country.

The articles follow:

[From the Citronelle-Mount Vernon (Ala.) Call, Aug. 16, 1962]

OILFIELD 7 YEARS OLD—LOCAL FIELD REACHES 30-MILLION-BARREL MARK

Alabama's largest oil field, Citronelle, today celebrates it seventh birthday and 30 million barrels of oil following its discovery on August 16, 1955.

The past year oilmen have drilled 56 new producers and 3 dry holes. This was said to be the best drilling year since 1958–59 which recorded 68 wells.

A shutdown killed what would have been a record, except for a collapse in the crude market. The shutdown of 6 weeks had the field producing at half capacity in June and July.

Drilling activity since January 1, has been at a near record rate despite the age of the field. Forty-two wells have been completed as producers, second only to 1957, when 45 wells were recorded in the field.

The most important event since the field's sixth birthday was the actual beginning on the secondary recovery waterflood project.

In January of this year, the secondary recovery project began to hit its stride. The 138 wells jumped their production to 324,848 barrels, or more than half of the field output.

The crumbling market, conditions for Citronelle oil kept the unit from really flexin its arms. In March, the last month of full production, the unit had only 45 percent of the producing wells at Citronelle but accounted for 56 percent of the field's crude output.

Efforts are currently underway for a sizable expansion of the secondary recovery unit.

The field, in its 7 years of operation, has accounted for about two-thirds of all crude produced in Alabama since oil was discovered at Gilbertown 18 years ago.

What Citronelle could produce today is mainly a theoretical problem until the market problem is solved.

In all, oilmen have spent nearly $68 million in drilling the 335 wells and 7 dry holes in the field.

The gross return has been an estimated $62.5 million.

Unit Manager William L. Horner, of Mobile, estimates that the field could turn out 26,000 barrels of oil per day. That's about $70,000 worth of oil a day or $25 million a year.

What does Citronelle's eighth birthday foresee? Citronelleans visualize a successful year ahead.

OILMEN: MOST INDEPENDENT BREED OF MEN

Texans did not discover petroleum. There is unmistakable reference to the substance in the Bible and in ancient Greek and other early writings. Few recall that it was lamp oil Colonel Drake was drilling for at Titusville, Pa.

Not until the turn of the century did man discover more use for petroleum than as a lubricant and fuel. The advent of the automobile and the airplane began the gasoline era. The age of natural gas soon followed.

Texas' claim to petroleum "firstness" is its largest production of any State, its ownership of nearly half of the Nation's underground reserves of both petroleum and gas, but especially its oil manpower.

For oil is not only made of wells, petroleum, gas, and the tremendous industry that has grown in its wake. Oil is men, a strange and different breed of men, daring, driving, and definitive. They seek all the scientific data they can get, but upon hard-learned experience they risk all with a "Yes" or "No" as casual as were the game penny ante. They're as independent a lot as only Texans can be.

Oilmen don't always win. Nearly 90 percent of wildcat wells are dusters, and 75 percent of discoveries have been by go-it-alone independents. In these days of regimentation and edict, it would be to their advantage if these individuals were better organized. They'll fight fiercely as did those in the Alamo or at San Jacinto, but as individually, too.

As one said, "No bureau ever drilled an oil well. Things are bad the way the bright young men are interfering. Things may get a lot worse before they get better." These Texans, who take their dry holes along with their strikes, are playing this hand out, but with an eye on a new shuffle. It is to the welfare of all Texans, the Nation, and the free world to see that they get it. It's that important.

ED MAHER, INC.

Airlines Must Cut Costs To Increase Markets—Wayne W. Parrish Notes Areas Where Revisions Are Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in recent weeks the Nation's airlines and their problems have been much in the news. Not only here in Washington, D.C., but throughout the country, people are cognizant of America's growing dependence on this rapidly expanding mode of transportation, and particularly attuned to its crises.

In his column, "Personal View," in the September issue of Airlift magazine, aviation authority Wayne W. Parrish comments effectively on the current search for means of expanding existing air markets, and the problems which confront that growing industry.

Mr. Parrish notes that airlines are to attract increased percentages of automobile travelers they must do it on the basis of competitive costs. Three vital cost matters which would therefore bear close scrutiny are: Labor, safety, and airports. Only by successfully overcoming difficulties present in each of these areas can air travel fulfill its rich potential for service to the consumer and the economy.

I ask unanimous consent that "Personal View," by Wayne W. Parrish in the the September 1962 issue of Airlift magazine be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANDICAPS: LABOR, FEAR, AND AIRPORTS

The air transport industry is being surfeited with advice and counsel on how to expand its market.

But we note an absence in almost all of the speeches, panels, discussions, and reports, of three important factors which go into operating costs. And it doesn't take even a New Frontier economist to figure out that cost has a very essential bearing on the price of the product or service being offered.

At the moment there is a flurry of interest in winning over to air the automobile user. Market research is being conducted and more is being urged. But the automobile is a vast competitor of air service often on the basis of cost to the user. It would be wise to look first at this whole business of cost.

Here are three vital areas:

1. Labor: A tragic situation has developed by which the unions are eating cancerously at the vitals of the industry by constant, unending demands which go much beyond the national economic trends. Labor strife alone (strikes and threats) has cost high into the millions. Witness as one example the stranglehold which a few hundred flight engineers put on Eastern Air Lines to the exclusion of the rights of thousands of other employees and of the traveling public.

The industry has become a patsy for labor organizations. Threats of strikes and strike deadlines have been in the news headlines almost continuously, thereby losing millions of dollars in advance ticketing for the carriers involved. Pan American, as one example, went through costly deterioration from the flight engineers only to be hit in fast succession by the TWU ground employees. It is a travesty of the times that the very employees wanting to benefit from their demands are so very ready and willing to smear strike threats in the headlines, thus taking business away from the carrier from which they earn their living.

It has been tragic that the trunk airlines have been unable to maintain a solid front. Individually, they have become sitting ducks. Only a handful of managements have stood up and fought against unreasonable demands. Every time there appears to be unity among managements, one airline crumbles and breaks the front.

How can managements turn their thoughts to long-range planning, to market research, to experimentation with lower fares, when labor strife is continuous. When the pressure of one segment eases up, another begins. Labor, and we speak chiefly of those labor operators who have no personal interest whatever in the airlines, but who call the shots as union professionals, is tearing down instead of helping to build. Expansion of the market (and growth in jobs) will continue at a slow rate as long as the present deadly situation continues.

2. Safety: In virtually all of the mass of material on expanding the air market, there is little if any mention of fear. In our opinion fear is not only a continuing major factor among a very large segment of the traveling public, but should not be brushed under the carpet.

We would go so far as to state that fear is a greater factor today—even among those who do fly—than it was several years ago. No matter what the statistics say, the truth is that the headlines and radio news reports have not been very pleasant in the past year, especially in international operations. And let's face the truth of the matter—too many airlines of the world are flying too many hot big jets to too many places.

The jet age came 5 years too soon. It is not the equipment that is at fault, although the operating demands leave too little room for safety margins. It is the pure and simple fact that pilot training, airport facilities, and air navigation aids were not ready. Plus the fact that too many airlines are taking these jets on infrequent schedules to faraway places where crews are not sufficiently familiar with local conditions. A big jet is a demanding vehicle. It has few built-in margins for sluggish reflexes and wrong decisions.

The world airline safety record is good. But it isn't good enough. And if anyone thinks fear has been eliminated from the bulk of the public, he'd better take another look. A great many people travel by air because they have no alternative. How many more trips would they make if fear was not a factor? And how many more customers would there be by the same token? We think there would be quite a few. No program of education is going to cure this one. The only cure is a better safety record and that isn't coming fast enough.

3. Airports: No one has calculated, so far as we know, the enormously increased costs to the airlines in the past few years of the huge monuments to civic pride that have been erected all around the United States and other countries. Certainly new terminals were needed. But most of the new ones represent investments far beyond the needs of today and tomorrow, mostly because of the urge to create the biggest and finest. But let no one think that these monuments of steel, marble, and glass are not having an impact on airline costs, and thereby on fares. They are having plenty, and for all time in the future. So any market research designed to expand the air travel market had best take airport costs into consideration—they are up many, many times over a decade ago, far and away at a greater rate than the national economic trend.

WAYNE W. PARRISH.

Part V: Aid to Dependent Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, in this fifth of a six-part series, Detroit News Reporter Jo Ann Hardee discusses the need for a revised aid-to-dependent-children program which is being urged by many officials.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

"Aid to dependent children (ADC) should be abolished." This is the belief of the man who heads the State program, of welfare officials, of city and county leaders—and of many irate taxpayers.

Some of the latter exclaim that there should be no public assistance for their image of the aid-to-dependent-children recipient: a lazy chiseler or an unwed mother.

COSTS $40 MILLION

Aid to dependent children, which began in the depression as a family-saving program for widows and orphans, now costs $40 million annually in Michigan. In 22 years it has changed to a program which primarily supports divorcees, deserted and separated women, and unwed mothers.

Public criticism has mounted through these years until some disgruntled citizens scream: "Abolish it."

W. J. Maxey, head of aid to dependent children's parent organization, the State department of social welfare, has long been an advocate of ending all aid categories—old age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the disabled, aid to dependent children.

THOSE THAT FAIL

Juvenile Judge James A. Lincoln sees the kinds of cases that irritate the public most—those in which aid to dependent children are neglected or mistreated or become juvenile delinquents.

"I see the worst of aid to dependent children and welfare," he said. "I see those that failed. This is what other courts, the police, and the public see."

Last year the court had 10 percent of its neglect petitions brought by aid to dependent children. Consistently less than 10 percent of its delinquency cases involved aid to dependent children.

"Go ahead and abolish the program," he said. "Then you can spend the money on law enforcement because you'll need it.

"When aid to dependent children, welfare, and community leaders say they want to abolish the program, they mean in its present form.

"The program has outlived its usefulness, its original intent. The character of the caseload has changed while the law has remanied static," said Maxey.

He applauds the recent change in the Federal law placing emphasis on rehabilitation rather than relief.

But Maxey would go a step further.

HAS NEW PLAN

"The only eligibility requirement for any aid program should be need. My staff spends more time deciding in which little cubbyhole of public assistance a case should go than it does at anything else."

Maxey wants one general assistance program financed by Federal, State, and local funds, run under State supervision. He believes such a program, in addition to administrative savings, would stop the aid to dependent children welfare merry-go-round.

He says the Wayne County aid to dependent children gets 60 to 70 percent of its 16,394 cases from the welfare departments of Detroit and the county as soon as technical eligibility is reached.

For example: A woman has been separated 6 months, she has lived in Michigan 1 year, it has been 1 year since the birth of her illegitimate child.

His estimate is borne out by welfare sources.

ONE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED CUT YEARLY

Cases cut off aid to dependent children rolls are likely to wind up at city and county welfare offices at a rate of nearly 1,700 yearly. Those who believe that welfare does a better investigation job welcome this opportunity for these departments to ferret out fraud.

In addition to ending this merry-go-round, critics say a general assistance program would eliminate a bad feature of aid to dependent children—placing a premium on the absence of the father. Some welfare experts think this fosters illegitimacy and hinders reconciliation of separated couples.

A 1960 survey of aid to dependent children in Chicago concluded: "Aid to dependent children is not the basic cause of family breakup. However, it probably precipitates desertion in cases where the father is unable to support his family."

CALLED FIRST STEP

"Only if all families with needy children were given assistance, regardless of the status of the parent, would this reason for family breakup be averted."

With aid to dependent children of unemployed fathers (ADC–U), Congress last year initiated such a program. Observers also believe aid to dependent children of unemployed fathers is the first step toward eliminating aid categories and installing a Federal-State-local general assistance program.

First passed in 1961 as a year-long emergency measure, aid to dependent children of unemployed fathers was not adopted by the Michigan Legislature despite Governor Swainson's pleas reinforced by tax-burdened Detroit and Wayne County.

BILL KILLED

Party lines were drawn and the enabling bill died in a House committee, costing Michigan an estimated $20 million in Federal money. In addition to the objection of Republican legislators the bill was also questioned because of its temporary nature.

The State Association of Social Welfare Boards questioned a program that would require turning large caseloads on local welfare over to the State, disrupting personnel.

This year Congress extended aid to dependent children of unemployed fathers until 1967.

One welfare official commented: "Let's not kid the public, that means it's a permanent program."

Republican leaders in Lansing refused to reconvene the legislature before the November election to consider the measure. When the lawmakers meet, observers expect opposition on the grounds that the Federal Government will be assuming too many local prerogatives.

BURDEN LIFTED

Welfare officials welcome the lifting of an estimated $10 million burden from local taxpayers.

Daniel J. Ryan, head of Detroit's welfare department, estimates aid to dependent children of unemployed fathers would remove 5,000 cases from direct city payment County Welfare Director Walter Dunne figures 1,700 cases would be dropped from county rolls.

"We think a sensible program of public assistance would do away with categories, placing all relief programs in a federally and State supported agency under local control, with local financial participation," Ryan said. "This kind of program will relieve the local community of a financial burden it can no longer face."

LIST DIFFERENCES

Here agreement between Ryan and Maxey ends.

Ryan would like to see a plan for general assistance similar to welfare's operation. Basically the differences between aid to dependent children and city welfare are these:

Under aid to dependent children the father must be absent (97.5 percent in Wayne County cases, 88.3 outstate) or incapacitated (2.5 and 11.7).

An aid to dependent children applicant must have resided in the State 1 year; welfare applicants also must have been self-supporting for 1 year. (The county maintains a fund for nonresidents who do not qualify under city welfare residence requirements.)

Aid to dependent children allows its clients to keep $750 worth of property, excluding their homestead. Welfare demands that all resources be utilized before aid is granted. An automobile may be retained when the head of the family is employable and loss of the car might hinder employment.

Aid to dependent children grants are in cash under Federal law. Welfare used relief-in-kind, giving food stamps, clothing orders, paying rent.

Under welfare more than one-quarter of the cases are engaged in work relief projects, earning portions of their grants at city jobs. Aid to dependent children has no work relief program.

Although new Federal law provides for such programs, local officials wish to spend the money for job retraining.

Unannounced investigations of the home are required twice yearly under aid to dependent children where caseloads are 120 per worker. Welfare investigators with caseloads of 75 each investigate every 2 months.

Welfare emphasis is on employment. Aid to dependent children's emphasis is on adequate child care.

CHANGE IN LAW

Ryan would particularly like to see relief-in-kind maintained. This would require a change in present Federal law which demands cash payment.

R. Bernard Houston, head of the Wayne County Bureau of Social Aid, the parent organization for aid to dependent children, said that administrative expenses of in-kind payments would be prohibitive.

His boss in Lansing balked for a different reason. "There is more dependency in-kind payments. People develop responsibility by dealing with reality and nothing is more real than money," Maxey said.

GIVES DIGNITY

"When families move from welfare to aid to dependent children it helps their morale," Father Clement Kern of Holy Trinity parish said. "Aid to dependent children gives them cash to spend. They aren't marked as a public charge. They can become part of the community. They have a feeling of dignity."

Countering the argument that payments in kind reduce dignity, Ryan said: "We are just as concerned in preserving dignity as any highly professional social worker, but I personally can't accept the theory that you must have cash in hand to preserve that dignity."

City officials attempting to get aid to dependent children of unemployed fathers adopted by the State legislature realize that once adopted it will be more difficult to prescribe the kind of general assistance program they might wish.

CONTROL FEARED

One said: "If it is passed, it will be the beginning of the Federal Government taking in the whole relief spectrum—on its own terms."

Viewing aid to dependent children of unemployed fathers as skeptically as he does the current program is Willis Hall, member of the Wayne County Board of Supervisors and director of the Detroit Board of Commerce.

"Aid to dependent children is operated by such remote control," Hall complains. "There is inadequate casework or counseling to make sure money is actually expended for child care, the purpose for which it was intended."

He believes the recent slash in supplementation funds will give the city and county greater supervision over some cases since they will be reinvestigated before being accepted by either of the two welfare agencies.

GRANTS CUT OFF

As an economy move both the city and county ended the addition of from $1 to $45 to aid to dependent children grants to help make up the difference between State ceilings and budgeted needs.

"Under supplementation, we had no control over the aid to dependent children caseload. We were giving them a blank check to spend county and city money," Hall said.

Hall and other critics of aid to dependent children hail the end of supplementation as a step toward fixing financial responsibility for the program on the Federal and State Government.

CALLED MISTAKE

"Supplementation should never have been initiated. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to finance whatever budget is necessary," he said.

"Our mistake in Wayne County was yielding to pressure rather than forcing the State and Federal Government to pay proper support."

Supplementation was established by the board of supervisors in 1940 a few months after it switched from a county mothers' pension fund to the Federal-State aid to dependent children program. Mothers picketed the county building, complaining that aid to dependent children checks were too low. The added funds were granted.

TELL OF HARDSHIP

The first year it cost $700,000. When it ended, September 1, it was costing the city nearly $3 million and the county $300,000.

While some have praised Mayor Cavanagh for ending supplementation, aid to dependent children mothers protested it will create enormous hardship.

A group of 250 persons Tuesday told Mayor Cavanagh that the trimmed grants would lead to school dropouts, poorer nutrition, and increases in juvenile crime. Aid to dependent children groups asking for restoration of supplemental aid have been joined by social work associations and the Trade Union Leadership Council.

URBAN LEAGUE WAITS

The Urban League is taking a wait-and-see attitude.

"We don't want to say a program is wrong until it has been given a chance to operate," Director Francis A. Kornegay said. "We will be observing applications at the welfare offices during October to see if real hardship is being suffered."

Houston said the slash would free one-third of his staff from bookkeeping chores for "more imaginative and creative work." He said there was no statistical evidence that living in Wayne County was more expensive than living anywhere else in the State.

Hall questioned the need for surplus grants. "When Wayne County cut grants in 1959, there was very little complain," he said.

The next few months will probably be a turning point in the hectic history of aid to dependent children.

They may mark the beginning of a national general relief program and an end to the familiar assistance categories. Unless city and county officials yield to mounting pressure, they will also mark the end of a 22-year tradition of supplementation.

John F. Kennedy Tells Youth of America How To Prepare for the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, for the first time an incumbent President of the United States has given frank counsel and advice to young Americans on how they may best train to be of service to our country should they rise to be President.

In a brief article in the September 23 edition of Parade magazine, President Kennedy writes about the Presidency and advises youth of some of the qualifications needed to be President, some of the demands that are made upon the President, and offers advice upon how our American youth may prepare for this responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, believing this writing unique and worthy of preserving I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

JOHN F. KENNEDY TELLS YOUTH HOW TO PREPARE FOR THE PRESIDENCY

(NOTE.—Parade's Fred Blumenthal asked President Kennedy this question: "Somewhere in our land today there is a high school or college student who will one day be sitting in your chair. If you could now speak to this future President, what advice and guidance would you give him or her?" Following is the President's answer. This is the first time that an incumbent Chief Executive has given such frank counsel to a young American destined to succeed him.)

(By John F. Kennedy)

The first lesson of the Presidency is that it is impossible to foretell the precise nature of the problems that will confront you or the specific skills and capacities which those problems will demand. It is an office which called upon a man of peace, Lincoln, to become a great leader in a bloody war; which required a profound believer in limiting the scope of Federal Government, Jefferson, to expand dramatically the powers and range of that Government; which challenged a man dedicated to domestic social reform, Franklin Roosevelt, to lead this nation into a deep and irrevocable involvement in world affairs. And when you assume the Presidency you too will face problems, difficulties, crises and challenges which no one can now foresee.

In 1645, John Winthrop, Deputy Governor of Massachusetts Bay Colony, after a long and stormy trial acquitting him of impeachment for exceeding his authority, reminded his fellow citizens that "when you call one to be a magistrate, he doth not profess nor undertake to have sufficient skill for that office, nor can you furnish him with gifts * * * therefore you must run the hazard of his skill and ability."

This insight into the nature of governing affirms the lesson of our history that there is no program of vocational training for the Presidency; no specific area of knowledge that is peculiarly relevant. Nor are qualities of great leadership drawn from any particular section of the country or section of society. Nine of our Presidents, among them some of the most brilliant in office, did not attend college; whereas Thomas Jefferson was one of the great scholars of the age and Woodrow Wilson the president of Princeton University. We have had Presidents who were lawyers and soldiers and teachers. One was an engineer and another a journalist. They have been drawn from the wealthiest and most distinguished families of the Nation, and have come from poor and anonymous beginnings. Some, seemingly well endowed with great abilities and fine qualities were unable to cope with the demands of the Office, while other rose to a greatness far beyond any expectation.

Thus I cannot counsel you about what subjects to study or what vocation to follow. But whatever you do you would be well advised to practice stern discipline and vigorous, unremitting effort. For high qualities and great achievements are not merely matters of chance or birth. They are the product of long and disciplined toil.

Yet, in a more general way, ther are experiences which you can pursue, experiences which will support you in the conduct of your great office.

It will help you to know the country you seek to lead. It was one of the great strengths of a President such as Theodore Roosevelt that he knew and loved the diverse magnificence of our fields and mountain ranges, deserts and great rivers; our abundant farmlands and the thousand voices of our cities. No revolution in communication or transportation can destroy the fact that this continent is, as Whitman said, "a Nation of nations," which you must see and know before you can govern.

Nor is it accidental that many of our outstanding Presidents, men such as Jefferson or Wilson or Truman, have had a deep sense of history. For all of the disciplines, the study of the folly and achievements of man is best calculated to help develop the critical sense of what is permanent and meaningful amid the mass of superficial and transient events and decisions which engulf the Presidency. And it is on this sense, more than any other, that great leadership depends.

Most important of all, and most difficult to consciously pursue, is an understanding of the people you will lead. You, and at times you alone, will be the spokesman for the great and often silent majority. And the final measure of your administration will, in large measure, rest on how well you respond to their inward hopes while leading them toward new horizons of ambition and achievement. Perhaps you will derive this quality from your origins, as did Lincoln; or

from the application of understanding and compassion to the problems of government, as did Franklin Roosevelt. Yet, although the possible sources of this understanding are many, if you find the opportunity to know and work with Americans of diverse backgrounds, occupations, and beliefs, then I would urge you to take eagerly that opportunity to enrich yourself.

As a great world leader you will have problems and responsibilities which were not faced by Presidents throughout much of our history. As President of the United States you are a focus of the attention, ambitions and desires of people and nations throughout the world. It will help you to travel and to learn about these other lands. For the welfare and security of the United States, the future of your own country, is bound to your capacity to exercise leadership and judgment on a global scale.

The most important human qualities of leadership are best embodied in that most towering of American Presidents, Lincoln: a combination of humility and self-confidence, inner resolution and energy, which gives a President the capacity to listen to others, to be aware of his own limitations, but also to follow the command of John Adams that "in all great and essential measures the President is bound by honor and his conscience * * * to act his own mature and unbiased judgment." I can advise you to be aware of the importance of these qualities, but no one can tell you how to develop them. I only hope, for the welfare of our country, that you will possess them when you come to office.

No one can guarantee that if you follow this or any other advice you will become a great President. For the Presidency is is peculiarly an office which is shaped by the individual who holds it. And greatness depends on the times as well as the man. But if you work toward your goal, practice discipline and unremitting effort, wish Godspeed to those who will hold and protect the great office of the Republic so that it may pass unimpaired to you and those who will follow you, then, if some chance keeps you from the Presidency, you will still know that you are prepared to serve well your nation as a citizen.

American Legion of Maryland Pledges Funds for Antietam National Battlefield Site

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, not long ago I advised the House of the unusual action of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, in pledging a substantial sum of money to the Federal Government for use in acquiring historic lands to be included as a part of the Antietam National Battlefield Site. This action is representative of the high standard of citizen participation which characterizes the American Legion in Maryland. It represents not only an expression of interest in, but an active desire to promote, knowledge of the traditions of this country. The letter from Mr. Francis R. Saunders transmitting the donation to the National Park Service sets out both the intention of the American Legion and the means by which the donation was made possible. It is a pleasure to append such a testimony of the patriotism and initiative of the Legion:

LANDS PRESERVATION COMMISSION,
THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND,
Sharpsburg, Md., September 21, 1962.

Mr. RONALD F. LEE,
Regional Director, Northeast Region, National Park Service, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. LEE: The Lands Preservation Commission for the Antietam National Battlefield Site at Sharpsburg, Md., an agent of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, takes great pleasure in presenting to the U.S. Government, National Park Service, an initial payment in the amount of $4,000 by check enclosed, to be used to acquire historic lands on the Antietam National Battlefield Site. We hope to supplement this initial payment in the very near future that this added help will be ready for your use when needed. We are very much concerned with the delays in acquiring land here and are of the opinion the scenic easement plan, as imposed in the Antietam bill, is of no value at Antietam and is an unnecessary burden to the taxpayers.

The centennial program at Antietam is now past and widespread interest has been reflected to this area. Regular visitation to the area has been constantly expanding and arrangements must be made now to accommodate increased visitation in the years to come.

This first payment of obligation to the Antietam acquisition reflects the interest of many people of all walks of life. This money has been collected in very small amounts (pennies, nickels, and dimes) with the majority of the revenue coming from the sale of an American Legion Sterling Silver Commemorative Medal.

Our association with the representatives of the National Park Service has been very satisfying and our joint participation in this most worthwhile venture to preserve the Antietam battlefield for posterity is representative of the wishes of the general public in this effort.

It is our intention to support this endeavor until it is accomplished and we believe this should be done with all haste possible inasmuch as we have already had several examples of encroachment which will deteriorate the outward appearances of this area, not to mention rising land costs and the loss of economy.

Again, we are proud to present your agency this check and look forward to an early expenditure by you.

Very truly yours,
LANDS PRESERVATION COMMISSION,
F. R. SAUNDERS, *Chairman.*

Now Let Us Start Captive Nations Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, when the 1962 Captive Nations Week observance was proclaimed in Chicago, Mayor Richard J. Daley said, in effect:

We must never permit the captive peoples to believe we have forgotten them.

These words resounded in other cities and States. In Buffalo, N.Y., the letter and spirit of these words not only motivated our groups and citizens to stage their finest observance yet but also inspired them to intensify their fight for the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in this Chamber of Congress.

As speaker after speaker pointed out in Buffalo's week-long observance, the constructive existence of a Special Committee on Captive Nations would not allow the American people to forget the captive nations. Those who enjoy freedom have the heavy obligation of seeking freedom for those deprived of it. Such a special committee would inform and enlighten our own people as to the existence of numerous captive nations which they are unaware of. With positive legislative intent it would go beyond this to find the ways and means of securing the eventual freedom of the captive nations.

We still have time in this session of Congress to establish a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. The long delay and inaction on the part of the Rules Committee to at least take a decisive vote on this vital proposal are inexcusable. I share with numerous other Members the confident feeling that once this proposal reaches the floor of the House, it will be passed overwhelmingly. I, for one, should like to return to my district this fall to inform my constituents that every fair opporunity for the passage of this important measure has been given. I know scores of my colleagues are of like mind.

A fair opporunity for the two dozen and more resolutions on the special committee has yet to be given. I call upon the members of the Rules Committee to bring this proposal to a vote so that the people of this Nation may see who is for it and who is against it. In our democracy there cannot be anything fairer than this. The arguments and reasons for a special committee are quite persuasive and well understood by our people in many different sections of the country. Not a single solid argument or reason has been offered in opposition to the proposal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, on August 11, 1962:

NOW LET US START CAPTIVE NATIONS YEAR

Captive Nations Week is past; but it would be well for Americans to begin to observe Captive Nations Year—or Years. For it is incumbent on devotees of freedom everywhere to keep a light of hope aglow for the millions entrapped and enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

A modest beginning for a more intensive American effort in behalf of those millions can be found in House Resolution 211, introduced by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, calling for establishment of a special Committee on the Captive Nations, composed of 10 members, not more than 6 to be members of the same political party and of whom 5 would be members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The function of this committee would be to "conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these

nations and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms."

While the resolution would empower the committee "to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States * * * as it deems advisable," it is obvious that there would be insurmountable obstacles to holding sessions within the captive countries concerned—to say nothing of requiring "by subpena or otherwise" attendance of witnesses and production of documents therein. The fact remains, however, that the committee could obtain much useful testimony from refugees from the captive lands and from Americans and others who have had opportunity to gain information as to conditions there either by personal visits or by correspondence with friends and relatives behind the Iron Curtain.

It is significant that the resolution does not apply merely to neighboring countries overrun or subverted by the Communists but also to the captive peoples within the Soviet Union itself—those who were conquered by czarist Russia and have been held ever since. These would include the Ukrainians, Byelo-Russians, Georgians and others in Europe and practically all of the Soviet "republics" (actually colonial possessions of the Russian Empire (in Asia).)

So establishment of the proposed committee would accomplish at least three important purposes: (1) Kindle renewed hope in the captive lands; (2) direct American and other free-world attention to the captives' plight, and (3) proclaim to the world the hypocrisy of the "anticolonial" pretensions of the most ruthless imperial and colonial power on earth—"anticolonial" pretensions to which, unfortunately, American policy frequently has lent aid and comfort.

It is to be hoped, therefore, that the Rules Committee of the House will be reasonably prompt in releasing the resolution for action by the Foreign Affairs Committee and the whole House.

"Iliopsoas"—Muscles and Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, last week I was thrilled to be appointed by Mr. Clarence Cannon to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare. These are subjects in which I have been keenly and vitally interested, not only by reasons of early misfortunes, but because of the sensitivity to the needs of my fellow man and the youth of our country.

I owe a great deal to the medical profession. I admire those who follow the vows of the Hippocratic oath. Their profession is one of the noblest of all. Few violate their great responsibilities and few pursue the golden calf to the detriment of their patients.

In my present congressional district is the New York Medical College Flower-Fifth Avenue Hospital, which for the past hundred years has made, and is still making, numberless contributions to advancement in medical science, in which field lies the primary responsibility of determination and maintenance of physical fitness.

Dr. Arthur Michele, professor and chairman of the Department of Orthopedic Surgery, New York Medical College, has written a book, published just recently by Charles C. Thomas, of Springfield, Ill., in which he presents the results of 5 years of intensive research, study, and experiment, culminating in the establishment of unequivocal criteria of physical fitness. The title of the book, "Iliopsoas," does not connote the discussion of a muscle per se, but rather of an intrinsic force harbored by man within his own body and which in a maladapted individual is capable of bringing into activity a host of disorders and bodily deformities. Incredible as it may appear at first glance, this force or power represents a potential of destruction to the human race far beyond that of the H-bomb.

When I venture the opinion that the significance of Dr. Michele's accomplishment is immeasurable, I know whereof I speak, for I have suffered greatly by reason of a childhood disorder, whose infirmity and blemish remain with me. And I can well testify to the efficacy of the doctor's work, for he is my orthopedic surgeon.

The need for the White House Conference for the Study of Physical Fitness, stemming from the status as determined during mobilization of our forces in World War II, is in itself a challenge to all workers in the field of man's physical well-being and to the medical profession in particular. It goes without saying that in a situation where survival of a nation may depend upon the activities of its defensive forces, there must not be even the shadow of a doubt as to the fitness of the members of those forces.

Discovery of the sulfonamides and antibiotics has done much toward eradication of specific infectious diseases; steroids have been effective in arresting the devastation caused by rheumatoid diseases, and vaccines have erased severe poliomyelitis epidemics. There remains with us, however, an ever expanding group of youths who inevitably will fall into the category of the physically unfit. The burden of responsibility inherent in the task of classifying and preparing the military and other services for possible active combat is a heavy one; there must be cognizance of the repressions, progressions, and adjustments of the human biological organism incidental to the demands of ever changing environmental conditions, so that their reflective manifestations may be discerned, and identified and interpreted and their significance weighed in arriving at a true evaluation of fitness. Ponderous as the burden may be, it may be assumed with confidence in the light of total comprehension of the vital, pivotal factor involved, the kinesiology of the human body.

The White House Conference on Child Health and Protection defines body mechanics as "the mechanical correlation of the various systems of the body with special reference to the skeletal, muscular, and visceral systems and their neurological association. Normal body mechanics may be said to obtain when this mechanical correlation is the most favorable to the function of these systems." This again implies a study of kinesiology, both physiological and pathological, and recognition of the significance of "Iliopsoas" influence.

Too often deformities which Dr. Michele has perceived to derive from nothing more than maladaptation by the individual to his environment have been found causes for rejection by the military, as well as deterrents to the full enjoyment of life and chosen vocation. A fundamental knowledge of the principles of kinesiology and their application in given situations would have expedited early detection of maladaptation and its correction, with consequent restoration of the nonvulnerable individual to a status not only acceptable by military standards, but also enabling him to follow his life's normal pattern insofar as physical well-being is concerned.

There is no doubt that much can be done to rectify in some measure the results of abnormal body mechanics. Greater attention should, however, be directed toward eradication of those maladies that follow maladaptation, lag in or failure of readjustment during the rapid growth period in the development of our youths; adjustment made mandatory by man's achievement of his self-appointed goal, the erect posture. According to Dr. Michele errors of posture are but reflections of maladaptation, and one must be competent to recognize circumstances and situations favorable to the incipience of malposture; furthermore, that the first to be considered are hip dislocations in infants and their classification, for the doctor believes that any program for physical fitness of the future citizen should commence with the mother-to-be.

In his book, "Iliopsoas," Dr. Michele offers his concept of the formation of deformaties in man, a plan for the earliest detection of physical unfitness or its potential, and a rational approach to management and correction of infirmities revealed. He is confident that any fitness program formulated in the light of a complete comprehension of the principles expounded in his book may be undertaken with the assurance that it will achieve its goal, a physically fit individual in perfect balance with his environment, capable of a full and productive life and of service to his country should the need arise.

Soblen the Spy: How Did He Leave the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, because of numbers of letters I received after

publishing an article in my weekly papers and a letter sent to the Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, I am inserting the article together with correspondence between the Attorney General and myself. This matter deals with two subjects, namely, how was the convicted spy, Dr. Soblen, allowed to escape the United States and why have not avowed Communists been prosecuted for not having registered a year ago in accordance with the law.

I am sure my article, together with the corespondence, will provide some eye-openers in respect to the freedom Communists enjoy in the United States.

The material follows:

AUGUST 27, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: I am enclosing herewith copy of a story I am releasing to my weekly newspapers on August 29, 1962. I am sure it is self-explanatory in every respect.

You will note in the last paragraph of this article that I have stated that I am sending this to you and asking that you attempt to get or give me an answer as to how Dr. Robert Soblen, after having been permitted bail, escaped from the United States.

Many people in my district have written me letters condemning the lack of care attendant in this case and wanting to know why. A frank and open reply from you would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. BECKER,
Member of Congress.

SOBLEN THE SPY: HOW DID HE LEAVE THE UNITED STATES?

I have been asked this question many times in recent weeks. Soblen was convicted as a Soviet spy, released on $100,000 bail pending disposition of his appeal to the Supreme Court, then he got up and left the United States and fled to Israel. Israel would not give a spy a haven and shipped him out. The big question, How did he get out of the United States? How did he escape from the country? It is strange, but very little is said about this, the most important aspect of the whole case.

This was a matter that the Attorney General had in his hands. He has the instrument of the most effective police and investigative force in the world, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. After Soblen was convicted as a spy and released on bail, it seems only reasonable that the Attorney General would have assigned enough personnel to keep an "eye" on this spy so that he would be "available" to serve the life sentence imposed upon him. But apparently, Attorney General Robert Kennedy was too busy harassing the steel industry people and reporters to crack down the scheduled price rise of steel. There is something strange, to say the least, about this whole case.

An ordinary law-abiding and patriotic citizen who, perhaps, makes a mistake on his income tax form is very suddenly called into the Internal Revenue office and, if he does not come in, it is just too bad for him. An upstate dairy farmer, trying his best to serve his customers with milk and cream, buys it on the market to make up an unusual shortage of his own supply, is hauled in and fined $29,900.

The average citizen who makes these and other honest mistakes is hit hard and cannot get away with it. But a convicted spy, such as Soblen, can be released on bail, walk out of court, and shortly thereafter go to the airport, purchase a ticket, get on a plane, after first having passed customs, and fly away to another country seeking a haven and avoiding the penalty for having betrayed his country, the United States.

You and I, reading some fictional novel, would say, "Well, that was only fiction. In real life, we wouldn't let that happen." But it did happen, just as it has happened that up to the present time, going on 1 year now since the Court upheld the law prescribing that all Communists in the United States must register with the Attorney General, none have done so and none have been prosecuted as yet. Why?

Do Communists or Communist sympathizers in our country have a certain charmed freedom that does not apply to the average citizen? It would seem that way, and I am sending this to the Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, in an attempt to get the answers and I will publish his reply in a later column. From the number of letters I have received expressing interest, I think you would want to know.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., September 12, 1962.

Hon. FRANK J. BECKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In reply to your letter of August 27, I am sure you know that the release of a prisoner on bail and the amount of bail is a matter set by the court. In the case of Dr. Soblen, his wife had put up $10,000 of her own money by borrowing from her personal savings and from her life insurance. The remainder of the $100,000 was borrowed from or put up by friends. There was no indication that Dr. Soblen intended to flee and because a large amount of bail had been furnished by his family and friends—and would be forfeited—it was not believed that he would do so.

It is standard procedure that unless the Government has reason to believe a person convicted of a crime may attempt to flee the country, such persons are not placed under surveillance while on bail. The reason for this is to employ the manpower of the Federal law-enforcement agencies in the most effective way. A surveillance normally requires the deployment of a large number of men and, therefore, is not undertaken without good reason.

I am sure you also know that the Department of Justice has taken every step possible to enforce the Internal Security Act of 1950. The law requires members of the Communist Party to register if the officers and the party itself do not register. However, the Department of Justice must appear before the Subversive Activities Control Board and get a ruling on each individual member before the members can be required to register. The Department has petitioned the Board to require 10 Communist Party members to register. Hearings will be held in which the respondents will have an opportunity to present evidence in their behalf.

As you know, the Supreme Court did not rule on the constitutionality of this provision of law and so a complete review by the courts of this procedure is in the offing.

If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

ROBERT KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

SEPTEMBER 17, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: I appreciate the courtesy of your reply to my letter of August 27. However, I must insist that the answers you give in the two unrelated cases are quite unsatisfactory.

In the light of history of previously convicted and escaped people and the fact that Dr. Soblen was convicted as a spy, it would seem that only good commonsense would dictate that a hundred thousand dollars would be nothing to escape the penalty imposed by the court.

I am enclosing herewith a little marked article that was written in the New York Post (you will admit quite a liberal paper) that points this up very carefully. I think it was a travesty that such an escape became possible.

In reference to the failure of Communists to register here, too, it would seem that a long period of time elapses, whether the Supreme Court has ruled or not, or whether a complete review of the courts is in the offing, there seems to be more reason for haste and action.

I feel in both of these instances the people of the country are somewhat disenchanted, as I am, with the lack of action by your Department in matters of this great magnitude.

In closing, I would merely like to say that if haste and action and care had been applied in the Soblen case, as well as in the registering of Communist Party members, as was applied by you in the steel price incident earlier this year, you would go down in history as a really great Attorney General. I would like to be in a position to say that to you rather than to write in a spirit of criticism.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. BECKER,
Member of Congress.

The Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, freedom of the press is one of this Nation's most precious possessions. The responsible press has done much to further the cause of freedom through keeping our people informed of important events in this country and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, the September–October issue of Liberty magazine printed a short article on freedom of the press entitled, "Extra! Read All About It." This brief article clearly points out the importance of the free press. Under unanimous consent, I include this article to be preserved by being reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

EXTRA! READ ALL ABOUT IT

Today I sat in town meeting and heard the city fathers debate the future of our community.

I also observed a dispute between a great labor union and the President of the United States.

Then, too, I dropped into the mayor's office to explore a water-supply problem.

I looked in on the stock exchange with some trepidation.

But then I was reassured by an inspection of a booming new factory development in our county.

I sat in on the trial of a man charged with selling on Sunday and heard public comments against the law itself.

Also today I heard teachers talking about wage rates, and I saw a 10-year-old boy who had inherited $35 million.

I heard important disclosures at a congressional hearing and took in an outdoor art exhibit.

It has been a busy day.

Of course I did not do all these things in person. I covered all this ground in less than an hour—the local newspaper was my magic carpet.

Through the press, in all its forms, we see, we hear, and we feel the force of events far beyond our powers of personal participation.

More important, through the press the agencies of government feel our presence. Because the press is there, we are there. Because the press is free, we are free.

Shut out the press, still its voice, and we go back through the centuries to a serfdom our forebears knew. We become pawns of powers at work in secret, controlling in secret, fearing no exposure.

We salute the world's free press—our eyes, our ears, our voice.

Protest Against Rent Hikes for Navy Enlisted Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Assistant Navy Secretary Kenneth E. Belieu today signed an order boosting rents as much as $22.60 monthly in the Long Beach-San Pedro area's Savannah, Cabrillo, Lexington, and Portsmouth naval housing projects. The rent raises will be effective November 1.

Sagging service morale will be the principle result of this dismal action. It will cost the United States far more because of reenlistments which will not occur than the sums collected by way of additional rents.

Naval authorities are bound by regulations and policies of higher authority in making this upward adjustment. On August 28 I wrote President Kennedy pointing out the seriousness of the situation and requesting him to take action to permit dropping the matter of the rent hikes.

The housing involved contains a total of 1,983 units. Of this number the Navy plans over the next 3 years to raze 1,583 of the units because they are so disreputable, inadequate, and substandard.

I feel the Navy would, if it could, have junked this whole incredible matter of increasing the rental rates in such patently undesirable housing. From my own years of naval service I know one of the most pressing, serious, and constant concerns of all naval commanders is the welfare and happiness of the families of men serving in the fleet. It reflects itself not only as to the reenlistment rate of skilled, trained personnel in whom the Government has made considerable investment, but also in the fighting abilities and morale of the fleet itself.

My appeal to the President pointed out these things and asked him to permit the Navy to take the course I believe it would, if it could, in this matter; namely, the course of wisdom and justice.

It appears that failure by the President or his close advisers in this matter to act left Secretary Korth no alternative except to place the increases into effect.

Hundreds of the Navy wives involved signed a resolution to be forwarded to the President begging his action in the matter. Their spokeswoman is Mrs. Phyllis A. Duffy, a resident of one of the projects, living at 2103 West 20th Street, Long Beach.

The wives' resolution points out that "service people ask for little, they must depend on the action of those responsible in Washington to be ever mindful of the needs of Navy men and their dependents."

The text of the resolution is as follows:

Be it resolved, That we wives of Navy men shall place our faith in the administration, and the Congress, to bear the burden of listening to our appeal in regards to the housing situation in Long Beach, Calif.

Navy wives stand by the men, who, in turn, must always be ready to serve in behalf of our Nation, knowing a strong defense depends on the dedication of these men who serve.

In this, the most critical period of our Nation's history, it is of utmost importance that the morale of service personnel be at the highest degree possible.

President Kennedy said, "Ask not what can your country do for you, but rather, what can you do for your country?"

Service people ask for little. They must depend on the action of those responsible in Washington to be ever mindful of the needs of Navy men and their dependents.

As citizens of the greatest democracy ever founded, we are initiating our prerogative of enlisting the aid of our representatives in the U.S. Congress in our behalf.

Service life has problems peculiar to itself. Never before in our history have so many personnel in the U.S. Navy been family men.

The following seems to be the problems taxing the patience, morale, and financial affairs of the service personnel in this area:

1. The basic allowance quarters raise, effective in January 1963, will not, in most cases (i.e., Cabrillo Lanham Act housing) cover the proposed increase in rent.

2. In the past, the difference of lower rent and the basic allowance quarters, was used to supplement the financial needs of the family, such as medical bills, due to limited facilities here. The new increase will deplete further usage of the basic allowance quarters for family needs.

3. We will be paying more than values received with the new rates. Already it is obvious through the cutback of maintenance standards.

4. The units in which we reside do not have cupboard doors, closet doors, or light fixtures. Any improvements in this manner is done at the expense of the tenants. The same is true in shrubs and flowers for beautifying and maintaining the surrounding grounds. In some cases, tenants have painted the old wooden clothesline posts, and patched sidewalks to prevent the appearance of a slum area. Higher rents will deteriorate further incentive along these lines.

5. Not knowing the area with which we were compared in private rentals, we could not argue either pro or con if the comparison was fair in determining a fair market value; however, it is worthy to mention that our rents have never fluctuated so much in the past as they have on this recent survey. Our question is, "Why is there such a difference of opinion?"

STIPULATED HOUSING PROBLEMS

1. Long Beach is roughly two families for each unit.

2. Long Beach needs 10,200 units and is short 5,400.

3. Five hundred and eighty men would move their families to Long Beach if they could find adequate housing.

(Nos. 1, 2, 3 results of survey of housing; reference Navy Times dated September 19, 1962.)

4. Our new housing bill was cut from 500 units to 250 units.

5. All units of Lanham Act housing in the Cabrillo, Savannah, Portsmouth, and Lexington projects of the Long Beach-San Pedro area are to be razed by 1965.

STIPULATED WAGE PROBLEMS

Even if the Navy man should be successful and be given a 10-percent increase in pay in the future, he will still be 15 percent behind the home guard within the past 4 years of expanding cost of living and salaries (reference Naval Affairs, February 1962).

STIPULATED MEDICAL PROBLEMS

1. The Navy hospital was slashed from 750 beds to 350 beds. This smaller number will not be sufficient now or in the future.

2. Dependents must continue to pay for medical expenses not covered by medicare.

It is our sincere belief that due to the aforementioned facts, morale is and will continue to be seriously affected.

Navy people do not want charity. They want only to be represented in good faith, to be able to pay their own way, a sufficient income, and adequate housing facilities, so they may have as high a standard of living as is due our country.

Your jobs, as servants of the people, are probably understood by few and criticized by many. We, therefore, respectfully ask, in due course, to have our problems considered.

The text of my August 28 letter to the President is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1962.

Re naval housing, Long Beach, Calif.; proposed rent increases.

President JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am greatly concerned about the above captioned action proposed by the Bureau of Yards and Docks office in San Diego and request that you give careful consideration to the facts involved that prompted Capt. F. W. Silk, commanding officer of the naval station, Long Beach, to appeal for a review at the Navy Department level of the findings, of the appraiser and the validity of the application of the new rent schedule. It is my understanding that the recommendations of the Bureau which support the proposal of its San Diego office will be presented to the Secretary of the Navy shortly.

About three-fourths of the 2,000 Navy families—almost all in the low income levels—live in Savannah, Cabrillo, and Lexington projects in Long Beach and Portsmouth in San Pedro. These projects, with 1,938 units, were built from 1940 to 1945, and most of them were considered temporary at that time. In 1960 an act of Congress ordered all substandard Government housing discontinued by 1965. Of the units in those four projects about 75 percent fall in the substandard category.

Typical problems in this substandard Navy housing are: platerboard walls; inadequate wiring (some wired for 15 amperes, compared to a modern home's 100-ampere wiring); no showers; small rooms; slab decks; exposed heaters; inadequate drainage (one tenant cannot use the toilet, for example, while her washer is draining); inadequate quarters for children; and clotheslines in front yards of the Savannah project.

For instance, consider the rent increase proposed on two apartments: A three-bedroom duplex is to be boosted from $58.20 to $64.80; a two-story three-bedroom from

$64.80 to $84.90. The latter boost absorbs a $9 electric bill monthly. But these figures do not tell the story. Neither of these apartments have standard heating facilities nor standard wiring, and the rooms are small.

I understand that the Navy Department takes the position that service families, who can afford private housing in an area, should not live in Government housing. But the average Navy family using Government housing has 3.2 children. If you refer to information obtained in a housing survey, conducted early this spring, in the Long Beach area by officials of the Bureau and of the Federal Housing Administration, I believe you will find that there are few units available for a large family requiring three or four bedrooms and that these are completely out of the financial reach of the low-income Navy families living in the Long Beach area. On those that are available, the rent starts at about $125 per month, and in most cases the tenant must provide his own stove and refrigerator. If he does not, he is charged something like an additional $10 per month for each of these pieces of equipment.

The Navy plans to raze 1,583 of the 1,983 units by July 1, 1965—333 units during this year, 250 in 1963, 500 in fiscal 1964, and the remainder by July 1, 1965. I realize that 500 units of new housing were requested and that the House approved the authorization of this number, only to have the Senate slash the number of units to 250.

But what is to happen to the Navy families in the Long Beach area? Some cannot afford to pay the proposed increase in rent which in some instances will be as much as $22.60 per month for the substandard unit in which they are living. Where will the displaced Navy families go? How can the Navy expect the men in its service and their families to have any kind of morale when faced with these situations? The top basic allowance quarters allotment to men in these four projects is presently $96.90 for a man, his wife, and two children. The proposed higher rents will eat up the small household fund upon which these men depend to help feed and clothe their families.

The rent adjustments, made through the years since these temporary units were constructed from 1940 to 1945, have usually been $2 or $3 per month, and the decision to increase them at this time, as much as $22.60 per month in some cases, is unreasonable. It is claimed that the proposed increase will establish realistic rents which are comparable to rents for like housing in the Long Beach area. However, I do not believe this to be the fact. Can it be said that these proposed rents are in fact realistic when one considers the substandard condition of the units, the fact that they were constructed some 22 years ago and have had little, if any, repair or improvements?

I respectfully request that careful thought be given to these problems and that the Secretary of the Navy analyze and accept the reasons given by the commanding officer of the Long Beach naval station for rejecting the increase. He is more familiar than anyone with conditions in these housing projects and knows the hardship that the Navy families will experience when faced with the additional cost of rent for the very units in which they are living—the units that are considered substandard.

I understand that similar hardship situations are about to be imposed at other naval housing locations, including the Bellevue project here in the District of Columbia.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the one saving grace in the matter is that the Secretary's order permits the commanding officer of the Long Beach naval station to put the rent hikes into effect on a step-phase basis. It is my understanding this permits him to put the increases into effect over a period of a year in equal monthly installments. I am confident he will take this ameliorating action.

Effect of Rail Tieup on South Dakota Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the South Dakota Industrial Development Expansion Agency has made a hurried survey of the cost to South Dakota industries of the Chicago & North Western Railway strike. According to the Associated Press release the cost to industry alone has been more than a million dollars.

This does not include the millions of dollars in damage and costs to farmers and ranchers of the State.

Attached is the article which certainly points up the seriousness of this strike:

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News, Sept. 21, 1962]

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT EXPANSION AGENCY SURVEYS 49 INDUSTRIES IN STATE—RAIL TIEUP COSTS $1,160,000

PIERRE.—The 3-week-old strike on the Chicago and North Western Railway has cost 49 South Dakota industries a total of $1,160,000, a survey conducted by the Industrial Development Expansion Agency (IDEA) indicates.

That is about $58,500 per day.

Eugene H. Stearns, director of IDEA, said the Agency conducted a survey in an attempt to place a dollars and cents evaluation upon the rail tieup.

"Our study was made with only one thought in mind—that of assessing the impact of the strike upon South Dakota's economy to the best of our ability," Stearns said.

A total of 230 firms located on or near the North Western line were issued questionnaires. As of today, 88 had been returned and tabulated.

Forty-nine of those replying said the strike was affecting their business while 39 reported no effect. Firms contacted in the survey are among those listed in the South Dakota industrial directory. Contractors who are members of the highway and heavy chapter, Associated General Contractors of South Dakota, also were surveyed.

The $1,160,000 loss reported by the firms from the strike thus far has resulted from increased costs or from loss of sales, the survey indicated.

Aberdeen Block Co., Aberdeen, reported "up to now we have lost 2½ days of production. Our sand supply has been cut off, as a result we had to find other means to get sand from another railroad. Also our raw haydite will cost us about 15 percent more because of extra handling at the haydite plant. If this strike continues, it will certainly hamper our winter operations because we will not be able to get our stock built up in raw materials for winter use."

Firms participating in the survey also were asked to report how many jobs have been or would be affected by the strike. Tri-State Milling Co., of Rapid City, reported payroll losses of about $6,000 per week because 100 men were working only half time.

Utah & Idaho Sugar Co. at Belle Fourche said that if the strike continues, about 300 employees will not work during the processing season.

Another 4 firms said a total of 37 men have been laid off because of the strike.

Comments from other firms replying to the IDEA survey.

Dakota Steel & Supply Co., Rapid City: "If the strike continues beyond 30 days, we expect to lose a minimum of $250,000 of business by not being able to get materials for jobs. This can affect one-fourth of our payroll or 12 men being out of work. An average of $200 per day in extra trucking and handling cost."

Farmers Cooperative Co., Brookings: "There is a real problem in getting coal into Brookings and Brookings is the only source of coal in this area."

Paramount Pipe Co., Salem: "We have laid off 7 of a 14-man crew and may have to shut down for lack of steel mesh and cement."

Pierre Development Co., Pierre: "Shortage of concrete and floor joists for residences. Winter approaching and we can't close in without these materials."

Huron Sash & Door Co., Huron: "The indirect cost is terrible. We are entirely dependent on the economy of this area for our business. The local economy is largely dependent on the farmer. Already there have been countless jobs canceled because of the possibility that the beet crop will be a total loss. Then, too, several jobs have been canceled because of the impossibility of getting sand and rock along the line."

McCook County Feed Co., Salem: "Normal marketing procedures must be abandoned. So far no personnel have been released but a long strike will necessitate laying off several men."

Utah & Idaho Sugar Co., Belle Fourche: "Harvest (of sugarbeets) would be delayed if the strike ends tomorrow. The effect of a delayed harvest could be disastrous. If harvest weather remains good for longer than normal, a slight delay would not be too serious. Fifty permanent employees and 300 part-time employees could be affected during the 100-day processing period."

Tri-State Milling Co., Rapid City: "We are operating 3 days per week in flour mill and 2 days in feed mill but must haul all flour and feed in trucks to cars on the Milwaukee line, thus adding a lot of expense. Farmers and ranchers who depend on us for feed are also suffering."

Wilson Ready Mix, Miller: "Have not laid men off yet, but will have to if strike continues a week longer."

Black Hills Clay Products Co., Belle Fourche: "The present time is a critical time in construction since the contractors must close the buildings in before cold weather hits. We have approximately 50 cars of brick which should be moving right now."

Good Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, because of the propensity of Congress to engage in ever increasing spending on programs of questionable need, I would like to recommend to the readers of the RECORD an editorial containing what I consider to be excellent advice. Its brevity is

striking and its contents convincing. I feel it should be carefully considered and heeded by all of us in these days of deficit spending. The editorial, penned by the very capable editor of the Laurel, Miss., Leader-Call, Mr. J. W. West, appeared in the September 17, 1962, edition of his fine daily newspaper. It follows:

GOVERNMENT CAN LEARN HOW TO REDUCE EXPENSES

Just 22 little words. Less than a good size sentence.

But they said more than all the thousands of words that have gone into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this year. More than even the public utterances of Senators, Congressmen, yes, even the President, Vice President Lyndon Johnson and the whole shooting match, Republican or Democrat.

"If we can reduce expenses at United States Steel, then I'm sure there is room for reduction in the U.S. Government."

They were spoken by Roger W. Blough, board chairman of United State Steel.

Private business knows it cannot survive on red ink. Some day Government will learn it, too.

Minority Staffing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, A cut and edited version of Roscoe Drummond's thoughtful and constructive column about staffing was included in my remarks of September based upon having read this column in the Washington Post on Saturday, September 8. Within a few days, mail arrived in my office that this column had appeared in very different form, more complete and with its concluding paragraphs intact, in various newspapers throughout the country from the New York Herald Tribune to the Los Angeles Times. One of the key portions of the Drummond column which was edited out by the Washington Post was a request for persons who were interested in this matter of the need for minority staff on committees in the Congress to write to Senator HUGH SCOTT, 355 Old Senate Office Building. As chairman of the House-Senate ad hoc Republican staffing committee, Senator SCOTT has received scores of letters every day since the Drummond column appeared, from people all over this country who are worried about the situation and want something done about it. It seems, therefore, only right and proper that the full, unedited, uncensored column, as written by Mr. Drummond for the New York Herald Tribune syndicate be part of the RECORD of this body. It is a source of great encouragement to those of us interested in this important matter, both in this body and in the other body, to know that men and women taken from so many parts of our country have taken the trouble to write personal, handwritten, individual letters and postcards to Senator SCOTT urging Republican action on this matter and improvement in House and Senate minority staffing on committees.

The column follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Sept. 7, 1962]

CRUSADE COULD HURT DEMOCRATS—REPUBLICANS CARRY FIGHT FOR STAFF JOBS TO PEOPLE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The Republican crusade to correct the intolerable and crippling imbalance in the professional staffing of the congressional committees is taking on new force and drive. It is at last being taken into the hands of high-level and influential party leaders and is now being pressed in a manner which, in the end, cannot be denied.

Senator HUGH SCOTT, himself a former chairman of the Republican National Committee and the most powerful Republican leader in Pennsylvania, and Representative THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, who has been stirring up opinion on this issue almost singlehandedly for a long time, are creating an ad hoc committee of three Senators and three Congressmen to make this crucial reform a national crusade and to enlist the active support of party leaders and independents in every State.

They merit this support. When the facts are widely known, I think they will get it.

The facts are not in dispute. There are eight joint Senate-House committees. They are served by a total professional staff of 72 persons, 70 of whom are controlled by and responsible to the Democratic Members and 2 of whom are responsible to the Republicans. The imbalance is 35 to 1.

The comparable professional staff of the 22 House committees is 461 responsible to the Democrats, 42 to the Republicans. The imbalance is 11 to 1. The Senate Democrats have a professional staff of 462 on 16 committees, the Republicans, 39. The imbalance is 12 to 1.

These are the facts which justify Senator SCOTT in saying to his Democratic colleagues in Congress—and to the voters across the country—that "the majority party is not playing by the rules of the game, and if the American people knew the full facts of the story, their sense of justice and fair play would cry out against the shame of a loaded legislative procedure."

That's strong language, accusing the Democratic leadership of "loading" the legislative dice against the minority party. It is a valid complaint. It is a truthful complaint. It will stand as a fair and factual charge until the Democratic Party puts an end to the egregious imbalance in the professional staffing of the congressional committees.

I am convinced that unless the Democratic leadership corrects this injustice before Congress adjourns next month—or gives assurance that it will do so next January—the Republican Party has in its grasp an effective congressional campaign issue. If the Republicans find it necessary to make this an issue at the polls this fall—and I find it hard to believe that the Democratic congressional leaders will make the mistake of leaving their party exposed to this issue—here are the questions which they can properly put to the voters:

Do you wish to endorse a ratio of 12 to 1 between the majority and minority staffs in Congress?

Do you approve of a system that places virtually complete control of the congressional committee staffs under the majority chairman—with the majority chairman free to hire and fire at will, set salaries, and determine tenure?

Do you wish to condone the limitations placed upon the minority in terms of inadequate office space, very limited travel, telephone calls, secretarial services, and other essentials of the mechanics of adequate staff work?

The real issue here is not the welfare per se of any particular minority party, whether Republican or Democratic, but the preservation of the two-party system of government and the effective functioning of Congress itself.

At a time when a Democratic President is frequently petitioning Congress to increase his powers, does the Democratic Party in Congress want to go before the country this fall supporting such a one-sided monopoly of congressional staffing that it has every appearance of being in Senator SCOTT's words, "an attempt to exterminate the party in opposition"?

Readers often ask what they can do to make their influence felt. If there are citizens who want to further a reform of this injustice in congressional staffing in the interest of both parties, they can write to Senator HUGH SCOTT, 355 Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., and he will tell you how to help.

UNESCO Treaty Convention Against Discrimination in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent request to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a letter addressed to Mr. J. Boyer Jarvis on the subject of UNESCO. The letter is from a constituent of mine, Mrs. Richard M. Kuhn, of Laguna Beach, Calif.:

LAGUNA BEACH, CALIF.,
August 28, 1962.

Mr. J. BOYER JARVIS,
Special Assistant to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JARVIS: Our concern over the UNESCO Treaty, Convention Against Discrimination in Education," stems from the study of UNESCO documents. Information, printed by this Organization, which the State Department and U.S. Office of Education are not giving to the Congress and people of the United States.

The mass of material published by this agency of the United Nations is overwhelming! It is dishonest and traitorous to keep the Nation in ignorance regarding what is being planned by the United Nations and its specialized agencies. If we are going to be inched into a different kind of government, we have the right to know about it.

Both the State Department and the U.S. Office of Education were involved in the drafting of this treaty from 1954 on. Our delegates were James Simsarian, of the Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State, and Fredrika Tandler, Assistant Director of International Educational Relations, U.S. Office of Education.

You misstated these facts when you said officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were "consulted" and guidance received from officials in the Department of State—they were working on this treaty from its beginning.

It is of interest also that Sterling McMurrin, the U.S. Commissioner for Education (a hearty supporter of UNESCO) was the U.S. delegate to the 25th International Conference of Public Education held in Geneva July 2–13 under the auspices of UNESCO. Mr. McMurrin's ideas as published in "Edu-

cation for Freedom and World Understanding" are also worth pondering. He says: "Our past local and national isolations are gone and the provincial attitudes that arose from these isolations are doomed to die. The instruments of education must be employed to more adequately prepare us for the new world-mindedness that must replace those attitudes." And the soft-on-communism line, "the answer to our present challenge is neither fearful retreat nor a demand for total victory."

The people should know in connection with the statement of Mr. McMurrin, that in 1952 Congress attached a rider to Public Law 495 (the 1953 appropriations bill for the State Department) which provided as follows: "None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used to pay the U.S. contribution to any international organization which engages in the direct or indirect promotion of the principle or doctrine of one-world government or one-world citizenship." This provision of law enacted by the Congress and signed by the President is a specific directive against the teaching of one-world citizenship or one-world government in the schools of this country. It has been renewed every year since 1953 and is still in effect.

Your statement of the purposes of UNESCO sound wonderful. But you should tell your readers who some of the "world scholars" are. For example, the "scholars" behind "A History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind" (which is due to be released to the American people soon and has been in preparation since 1948) are men such as Julian Huxley (the London zookeeper who became the first Director-General of UNESCO), Bertrand Russell (of "ban the bomb" fame), John K. Fairbank (identified under oath during the Institute of Pacific Relations hearings as being a Communist Party member), Ralph Turner (discussed in all his atheism by William Buckley in "God and Man at Yale"), and ADA's Prof. Arthur Schlesinger (who will be the top consultant on the "Social and Cultural History of America"). UNESCO document 9C–PRG–9 (revised) gives the list of Communist nationals such as A. A. Zvorikine, U.S.S.R., V. S. Nemtchinov, U.S.S.R., V. V. Strouve, U.S.S.R., and countless others. There is nothing like having the Communist and atheistic viewpoint thrust upon innocent children in their textbooks—this may be acceptable to the Russians, but not the Americans.

And remember the U.S. taxpayer pays just under one-third of the UNESCO regular budget, which has reached staggering proportions.

You stated that UNESCO is prevented from interfering in the educational policies or in any other domestic concerns of its member states—that the UNESCO constitution restricts this. Mr. Marvis, this is just so much hot air. In the State Department document, "The Defenses of Peace," part II, page 18, State Department publication No. 2475, confidential series 81, we read, "The states which belong to UNESCO will already be bound by the charter of the United Nations, which in a similar clause protects legitimate domestic concerns from outside interference, but at the same time makes it clear that the maintenance of peace and security is not a matter of domestic jurisdiction. If a member of UNESCO utilizes its educational and cultural facilities in such a way as to endanger peace, it runs the risk of having to submit to an investigation, and if the matter proves serious it may have to answer to the Security Council of the United Nations for its conduct."

There are three authorities on law whom I shall quote, whose statements are diametrically opposed to yours. Benjamin Cohn, legal adviser of the United Nations, says: "When states deal with a matter in a treaty, it no longer can be considered a matter of domestic jurisdiction—but one of international concern." Also Mr. Moses Moskowitz, in the American Bar Association Journal, April 1949, page 352, says: "Once a matter has become in one way or another the subject of regulation by the United Nations, be it by resolution of the General Assembly or by convention between member states—that subject ceases to be a matter of being essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the member state."

John Foster Dulles, in the American Bar Association Journal, June 1952, said: "Under our Constitution, treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are, indeed, more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty law can override the Constitution * * * they can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights."

From the report of the Federation of Malaya in UNESCO document 10C–4, 1958, we learn that Malayan citizens are not exactly panting for cultural development and that if they were, it would be for their own nation's culture. Malaya reports: "This country would appreciate it very much if UNESCO could offer scholarships for Malayan painters and musicians to study in Europe without requiring the assurance they would be given a job on their return. The most serious obstacle to our taking advantage of this scheme is that UNESCO has stipulated the condition that we should undertake to employ these scholars on their return to this country. Another difficulty is that the amount given to the scholar seems to be insufficient to support a student while abroad."

From this statement it would seem that UNESCO has no real interest in education, science, or culture per se—only in creating "UNESCO Typhoid Marys" who will carry political poisons back to their native lands.

This brings to mind all the tax money spent by the State Department and U.S. National Commission for UNESCO in putting out whitewashes of UNESCO. Telling us that UNESCO never instructs anybody about anything. UNESCO only suggests and recommends. The Malayan report says just the contrary—"We are being instructed to give lectures and encourage students to learn about the United Nations" (the iron fist within the velvet glove).

From your letter one might get the idea that Brooks Hays is an authority on this treaty—the last word. While a Representative, Mr. Hays became well known for his support of world government legislation—this was before he was thrown out by his constituents. Nowhere does anyone say that our Government will not seek ratification of this treaty. Mr. Henry J. Kellermann, U.S. Permanent Representative to UNESCO, made the statement that "We preferred the recommendation" (p. 38, ed. 167, add. 2, "Questionnaires that the U.S. Government answered on the treaty").

Also, you neglect to point out that the U.S. Government is obligated by its national honor and by its adherence to UNESCO's constitution to make a full report to UNESCO of action taken to obtain U.S. ratification or adoption, and what legislative measures have been taken to implement the convention or recommendation by September 1962. The Conference manual, "UNESCO Rules of Procedure," section V, article 16, paragraph 2, says: "Initial reports relating to any convention or recommendation adopted shall be transmitted not less than 2 months prior to the opening of the first ordinary session of the General Conference following that at which such recommendation or convention was adopted." Article 19 contains the threat that "The General Conference reports on the action taken by member states in pursuance of a convention or recommendation shall be transmitted to member states, to the United Nations, to the National Commission, and to any other authorities specified by the General Conference" (again the iron fist within the velvet glove).

Most important for the American people to realize is that one administration has nothing to say about what the succeeding administrations do. This treaty will forever be a threat to our Nation as long as a treaty supersedes our Constitution in becoming the supreme law of the land. Frank Holman, past president of the American Bar Association, in the 1960 hearings on Senate Resolution 94, "For Repeal of the Connally Amendment," page 469 states: "It should be pointed out that even though a treaty like the Genocide Convention has failed of ratification, it does not cease to be pending at the expiration of a particular Congress, as do other forms of proposals or resolutions. The State Department can bring it up on the calendar of the Senate at any succeeding session of the Senate no matter how much time has elapsed meanwhile."

Thomas Jefferson warned us thusly: "Don't trust your basic rights to the whim of a man. Tie them down in the Constitution and then they can't step out of bounds."

It is a known fact recorded in UNESCO document 11C/PRG/SR.19 (prov.), Paris, November 28, 1960, that our delegate James Simsarian states that "His government, which had participated in the work of the special committee, would vote for the approval of both the draft convention and draft recommendation." Since it has participated in the writing of this treaty from the beginning and voted for both the convention and recommendation, it will have to make an effort to get it ratified or stand before the court of world opinion and answer questions as to why no moves have been made to obtain ratification since it is evident that they are in full agreement with both convention and recommendation.

Abraham Feller says in his book "United Nations and World Community," "We have seen how the charter has grown as a foundation for world law. Less dramatically, the body of law outside the charter has been growing through the United Nations organs. The Assembly has sponsored a number of lawmaking conventions, which, as they came into force, expanded the boundaries of law," (p. 135). Thus, whether or not we ever ratified this treaty doesn't stop the expansion of international law in every provision. Since we helped to draft it and we voted for both versions we are involved in this new world law and can be held accountable by the U.N. court, at least to that degree of our participation.

Lastly, the differences between the convention and recommendation: UNESCO doc. 11C/15, p. 19, states: "Subject to the difference in terminology inherent in the character of the instruments, the text of the (draft) recommendation is the same as that of the (draft) convention. The recommendation is divided into sections, the numbers of which parallel the numbering of the convention." The words of UNESCO's top legal adviser, Hanna Saba: "As indicated above, the draft recommendation adopted by the committee contains similar provisions. The only difference between the two texts are those that arise necessarily from the different juridical natures of the two instruments" (UNESCO Chronicle, October 1960).

Mr. Jarvis, "Americans have the right to know if we are to live under a different economic and social system than that provided in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights." It is treason, as well as dishonest, to withhold facts involving the security and sovereignty of our Nation. Let the promoters of socialism, communism, and one-worldism come from behind the idealistic phraseology which they use and lay their cards before the American people honestly. If they are com-

pletely sold on the idea that the American way of life and the Constitution are failures, let them say so.

Sincerely,

Mrs. RICHARD M. KUHN.

Hon. Kenneth A. Roberts, Guest of WBC's "Washington Viewpoint" Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include a transcript of the interview of my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, the Honorable KENNETH A. ROBERTS.

Congressman ROBERTS on September 24 was a guest on the television program "Washington Viewpoint," and was interviewed by Miss Ann M. Corrick and Sid Davis:

WASHINGTON VIEWPOINT

(Produced by the WBC Washington News Bureau)

Miss CORRICK. Good evening. This is Ann Corrick with Sid Davis in the House Radio-Television Gallery on Capitol Hill. Our guest on "Washington Viewpoint" this evening is Democratic Congressman KENNETH ROBERTS, of Alabama. Now serving his 12th year in Congress, Mr. ROBERTS is chairman of the House Commerce Subcommittee on Health and Safety. Mr. ROBERTS, your committee has long been concerned with the continuing problem of smog and air pollution generally. This is not merely a hazard to the health of our citizens, but it involves our outdoor recreational facilities, our wildlife, and the problem isn't getting any better. It's getting worse. In the absence of adequate action by local communities and industries to tackle this problem, don't you think it's time for the Federal Government to launch an allout comprehensive attack against air pollution?

Representative ROBERTS. I would agree with that statement, Ann, except to this extent—that is, that I doubt if there's enough money in the Federal Government to completely do away with this problem. I think we have to depend upon the local jurisdictions to do a good job, and, therefore, I conceive it to be the purpose of the Federal Government to provide leadership, technical advice, and try to appeal to the civic minded people in the various local jurisdictions to do their parts.

Miss CORRICK. How do you draw the local jurisdictions into this program. Apparently they are not moving fast enough?

Representative ROBERTS. Well, a good many of the county health departments and State health departments are fully aware of the seriousness of this problem. And we have had some instances—I think Pittsburgh may be one example, where they have done a very good job, not without some Federal help. But the major portion of the effort was supplied by the city authorities.

Miss CORRICK. Earlier this year, the House Appropriations Committee said that the Public Health Service had shown commendable vigor in studying the problem of air pollution, but it doesn't have a comprehensive enough program. Can't Congress put the heat on the Public Health Service, so to speak, to get going on this problem?

Representative ROBERTS. Well, I doubt if any heat is necessary. It may be that they have not had enough money to do the job that we feel is necessary. However, this problem of air pollution breaks down into a different problem from that, for instance, of water pollution. We have in that instance an interstate problem. Yet with air pollution we have some local situations where the problem is almost completely local. Take Los Angeles, for instance, and many people when they think of the smog problem, the city of Los Angeles automatically come into the fore. Now in some other cities the problem may be one that's mixed—that is, it may be some of the pollution is coming from outside the State. And one of the reasons why the House did not go all out this time on the air pollution—that is, we didn't adopt as strong a bill as some of us would have liked to have seen passed—was that we want to study the problem and find out how much of it is local and just how far can the Federal Government go.

Miss CORRICK. How are you going about making this study? Are you planning to go into the various communities?

Representative ROBERTS. We hope to go into the other communities that are affected. We have held, between the two sessions of this Congress, we held a very fine hearing in the city of Birmingham, Ala., which is in my native State. Birmingham has quite a problem. The lung cancer instance there is about three times that of the national average. Birmingham is an industrial city. We found out, however, that other cities, such as Washington, D.C., and Nashville, Tenn., and many other cities throughout the country, which are not primarily heavy industry cities, have maybe a problem that's even worse than that of Birmingham, Ala. This leads us to believe that the auto exhaust has a great deal to do with this problem. And, as you know, my subcommittee has sponsored the Schenck Act which is now on the books to provide the Public Health Service with the necessary authority and funds to try to develop a device that will be effective when used on automobiles, trucks and other vehicles, which we think contributes largely to this problem.

Miss CORRICK. Sid Davis.

Mr. DAVIS. Congressman, tests so far indicate that the so-called blowby device has been effective in many instances in eliminating some of this exhaust pollution. Why don't we get the automobile manufacturers by Federal law to make it standard equipment on all cars?

Representative ROBERTS. Well, that's a very good question. Of course, in the automobile itself you have two problems there. You have the crankcase gases which the blowby device takes care of. But you also have a problem with the engine exhaust. And as I understand it, this device that we hope that the Public Health Service will develop will take care of this entire problem. I think some tests have shown that in the Los Angeles area, almost half as much sediment or unburned hydrocarbons is deposited in that area by engine exhaust as comes from the crankcase exhaust or the unburned gases which go into the crankcase. Now what we hope to do is that when we come up with a device that will do the entire job, that we will make an attempt to see that these devices are placed on every vehicle that's manufactured and sold to the public.

Mr. DAVIS. If we can reduce at least a part of this now with eliminating the fumes from the crankcase with the blowby device, and they only cost an estimated $5 per car—I think I've seen figures to that extent—why not take the first step now and say let's made this mandatory now and when we get to the point where we develop something better that will eleminate both the exhaust and the crankcase fumes, we'll put that on?

Representative ROBERTS. I would certainly go along with that approach to the problem. But I believe that by the time Congress meets next year that the Public Health Service will be far enough along on this device that we can do the entire job at one time. This is what, of course, I would hope to see.

Mr. DAVIS. How much opposition do you think making that a Federal law—making it mandatory nationwide—would face? Would there be a great deal of reluctance on the part of the manufacturers to go ahead and install this device?

Representative ROBERTS. We find that our field hearings are very helpful in educating the people to the danger of polluted air. I believe that if our subcommittee could hold hearings in a few of the major cities, and we could let the public know what the Government is trying to do, that we would have fine support for the movement that we hope to see come about.

Miss CORRICK. Congressman ROBERTS, is the petroleum industry as cooperative in these studies and in handling this problem as you think it ought to be?

Representative ROBERTS. Yes, I think that they realize it affects their public relations quite a bit. And I think, too, that the main opposition that would come, and has come in the past, has been from some of the heavy industries involved. I think some of them feel that they have been singled out in this matter. We, of course, believe that before very long people will attach as much importance to the clearing of the air as they do to pure water and other things that we know are necessary.

Mr. DAVIS. Congressman, do we really attach enough importance to clear water, cleaner water, and cleaner air? We seem to be a lethargic nation when it comes to situations like this. There are many streams and rivers in this country that are terribly polluted—for instance, the Potomac here in Washington is a terribly polluted river. And I've read statistics where some of the water we're drinking here at this very moment has gone through somebody's bathroom several times. Are we really interested in cleaning up our rivers and cleaning up the air? Or would we rather go fishing on Saturday and Sunday and forget about some of these important things?

Representative ROBERTS. Well I think you're entirely correct. I think we've been too slow to recognize the importance of pure water, pure air. You know they say that a person can live for almost 5 days without food. You can live, I think someone has said, several hours without water. But you can't live, I would say, more than a few minutes without air. And certainly it's my feeling, and I think the feeling of the members of the Health and Safety Subcommittee on which I serve, that this has not had the attention of the public as it should have.

Mr. DAVIS. The elimination of streetcar tracks in some of our major cities puts more of the gasoline-type engine on our city thoroughfares. And even now when you drive across a turnpike, it used to be that you could enjoy the beautiful scenery, but there are so many trucks and buses now that even there the air is polluted. So it isn't only in the metropolitan areas that we find this, we find it all over. Isn't there something that we can do to educate people a little better, perhaps in the rural areas and get some support there? I think that most people who live outside the cities think this is a city problem. It really isn't. It's a problem for the whole country.

Representative ROBERTS. I think if they could see some of the agricultural damage, if you want to put it in the realm of mil-

lions of dollars of damage, and also to flowers and shrubbery and other things, I think that we coud bring this fact home to people better than we've done in the past.

Mr. DAVIS. In your thinking on legislation then, you're not only thinking of putting these devices on automobiles or passenger cars, you're thinking in terms of commercial vehicles, too?

Representative ROBERTS. That's correct.

Mr. DAVIS. And this could also be a stumbling block in getting it to be a nationwide legislation, because this would be another faction of the economy that would have to go to some expense to do this?

Representative ROBERTS. There is one thing that I might mention, I think would eliminate some possible opposition. We believe that with the device now being worked on at the Public Health Service, it may contribute a great deal to better mileage and more miles per gallon of gasoline. I think if that does happen, if we can say to the consumer that this device is going to give you about 10 to 20 percent more mileage, that this will be a factor that would have to be considered not only by the consuming public, but also by the commercial part of it also.

Miss CORRICK. How far along is the Public Health Service on perfecting this device? You mentioned a moment ago that you hoped by the time Congress reconvenes that it will have been completed. Can we expect it next year for sure?

Representative ROBERTS. I would hesitate to say for sure, but they have been at work on this particular device now for over 2 years, and a great deal of work has gone into it, and there's no opposition so far as I know to the effort that they're making, and I feel that they will be successful.

Miss CORRICK. Has the auto industry been consulting with the Public Health Service on this device?

Representative ROBERTS. I'm sure that there have been meetings between the manufacturers and the Public Health Service, and I know that some of the manufacturers are trying to come up with their own devices.

Mr. DAVIS. Congressmen, are you convinced in your own mind that air pollution could be a cause of cancer? I notice you mentioned Birmingham, Ala., where you have a high percentage of lung cancer. Does air pollution figure into that? I know that you have a lot of soft coal smoke down there too. What is the breakdown in this? Do they think it's the automobile exhaust, or is it any type of air pollution?

Representative ROBERTS. They have tested small animals—the effect on small animals and have actually produced tumors in these animals when they're exposed to polluted air. So far they have not been able to find that that causes cancer in human beings. But there is a very definite suspicion of that happening, and we do know that in the elderly and in people who suffer from some type of lung ailment, such as emphysema or some type of tuberculosis, that the polluted air can certainly be an irritant, and we feel that in many cases it can be very dangerous. Now some of the scientific evidence before my committee points out deaths in Denore, Pa., a few years ago. We know that during the blackout in London during the war, that several hundred people, we believe, were killed because of the heavy concentration of smog. We've also detailed some other instances which make us believe that this can be very dangerous, particularly to the people I mentioned.

Mr. DAVIS. We were talking mostly about automobile exhaust. Let's get to the industry problem in air pollution. You said this is a local matter. How reluctant is industry to go along with smoke abatement programs, for instance, in steel centers—areas like that—where they could curb smoke but it costs fantastic amounts of money? How reluctant is industry to cooperate in some program like this?

Representative ROBERTS. Well, I would say that where there has been no education of the problem that they are reluctant to spend huge sums of money unless they know that there is an answer to the problem which is practical. That's one of the reasons why it's my feeling that these field studies must be made, and we must do a better job of educating the public to the need for this type of legislation.

Miss CORRICK. Congressman ROBERTS, in a little different area that also concerns your committee, advance word from Detroit indicates that the 1963 model cars will be still bigger, still more powerful, and go still faster. Yet from the advance information, the auto manufacturers don't seem to be building in any new safety devices that would accommodate this greater power, and provide the safety factor. Do you think that the auto industry is fulfilling its responsibility to build safe cars?

Representative ROBERTS. I definitely do not think they are. Recently the House passed my bill, H.R. 1341, which would require reasonable safety devices on all Government-purchased vehicles. That bill is now in the Senate for the second time. We passed it in the House in the 86th Congress by a vote of over 2½ to 1. We passed it in the House this year on the Consent Calendar. Now we believe that this would furnish Federal leadership in the field of safety devices, and that the industry would then have to tool up for everyone, and we believe that the public, once they see these devices on federally owned cars, would naturally desire them on their cars. And it's my feeling that if this horsepower race continues in Detroit, it will be necessary for us to pass a bill in the House which will go across the board and require these devices which we believe will save many, many lives and will reduce injuries which are serious to injuries that are not so serious. And we think that eventually if they continue to pursue this philosophy of more speed and more power, that we will be in a position to enact legislation that will affect all of the consuming public.

Miss CORRICK. One of the safety devices, Congressman ROBERTS, that I believe now is going into federally operated automobiles are safety belts—seat belts—and I know many cities and communities now are debating whether to make seat belts mandatory, and in many communities also there have been insurance companies and gasoline stations that have launched advertising campaigns to get the driver to go in and have seat belts installed for as little as $5.95. Well, that brings up this question. There are seat belts and there are seat belts. How does the average citizen know which is a safe seat belt?

Representative ROBERTS. I appreciate very much your mentioning that fact because my subcommittee made the first report to the Congress recommending the use of seat belts back in 1957. And believing that these belts should be adequately made and should be properly anchored to the frame of the automobile, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 134, which requires that these belts meet certain adequate Federal standards. This is to do away with the flimsy type of belt which will not hold the passenger and which will not do the job. This bill has been well received. We held hearings recently and there was no opposition to the bill, and I am hoping this week that the full committee will take action and we can get this bill to the floor of the House. Naturally, we are racing against a deadline—the adjournment of Congress—and it may not be possible for this bill to clear the Congress this time. But I would hate to see this fine movement which is taking effect all over the country defeated by the use of a belt that is inadequate and is not properly made and is not properly attached to the vehicle. We have had adequate testimony of the safety of these belts and that they do in many instances save lives, and I think that even one or two instances where they have failed to do the job at the crucial time might mean that the people would become discouraged again and would refuse to put these belts in their automobiles.

Mr. DAVIS. This is a hypothetical question, but it is possible that 1 day the Federal Government could pass legislation requiring the devices you talk about to be used, not only put on the car, but to be used on something like the Federal interstate system—the highway system. Could we have that much control over these roads to insist that people actually use the safety devices that are in a car?

Representative ROBERTS. I think it would be very hard to do that. Now we have about six States which have enacted legislation to require these belts on all automobiles. Now I think it's much better for the States to pass these laws and to enforce them at the State level. It would be very hard, in my opinion, for you to enforce—rather, to force people to wear belts. They have to be educated to the fact that they will prevent loss of life, and they have to desire to use belts, because even though they have them in the car, they're not worth anything if they're not used.

Mr. DAVIS. I notice a lot of people who have them will use them, say, on a long trip, but never use them to go three or four blocks, which defeats the whole purpose.

Representative ROBERTS. The trouble is that most of the accidents occur within a few blocks of home, in many cases—I wouldn't say most of them—but a great many of the accidents occur right at your front doorstep, so to speak.

Miss CORRICK. Congressman, this brings up kind of a general question, and that is—which is related to Sid's last question about the extent of the Federal Government's responsibility in the matter of safe driving. How far does it go? Does the Federal Government provide good highways and safety standards and then stop?

Representative ROBERTS. The Federal Government, in my opinion, could go a great deal farther into this problem than we've done in the past. It's to be hoped that the States will do a better job than they have been doing. But failing that, I think that the Federal Government will have to recognize that we provide about 90 percent of the funds for our Interstate System. And it's one thing for a person to drive in a small community. It's another thing for a person to be on some of the fast freeways of this country. And it seems to me that we could at least attach some conditions to the granting of Federal highway funds, or we could require that a person driving in interstate commerce should be subjected to some type of physical examination or hold a license from a State which has adopted the uniform motor vehicle code.

Miss CORRICK. Thank you Congressman ROBERTS. I'm sorry to have to bring this discussion to a close but our time is up. Our guest on "Washington Viewpoint" this evening has been Democratic Congressman KENNETH ROBERTS, of Alabama, chairman of the House Commerce Subcommittee on Health and Safety. This is Ann Corrick with Sid Davis in the House Radio-Television Gallery on Capitol Hill.

Health Care Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, along with many others, I was very pleased when the House, on September 11, unanimously approved H.R. 10117, introduced by my able friend, Representative THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri.

The House Committee on Ways and Means, I might point out, previously had been unanimous in their support of this bill. In brief, H.R. 10117 will encourage companies to protect their employees against the expenses of sickness, accident, hospitalization, and medical expenses by allowing certain tax deductions which are not now available.

This proposal to help millions of Americans meet their health needs will receive, I am sure, strong support in the Senate. Enactment of H.R. 10117 will be a landmark in the field.

As an example of the widespread favorable comment on Mr. CURTIS' bill, I ask unanimous consent to include the following remarks by Mr. Fulton Lewis III, over the Mutual Broadcasting System on August 17, 1962:

THE TOP OF THE NEWS WITH FULTON LEWIS, JR.

(By Fulton Lewis III)

Health care bill: The House Ways and Means Committee, in a surprise unanimous vote, gave approval today of a bill which would give business a major incentive for setting up medical funds to cover the health expenses of their retired employees.

The legislation would, for the first time, allow a tax deduction on company payments to such funds as a current business expense.

As it stands now, companies may claim a deduction on pension fund contributions but current law provides that if medical expenses are included, the entire deduction is lost.

Representative THOMAS CURTIS, a Republican from Missouri, and sponsor of the new legislation, told committee members that because of the present severe tax penalty involved, industry has consciously avoided adding medical expenses for retired employees to their pension plans.

He said, and I quote, "Passage of this bill would provide another meaningful step in finding effective ways to provide for the health needs of Americans. It involves some of the most advanced techniques of health insurance, including that of prepayment, allowing the individual to provide for financing his own future health needs by payment, through fringe benefits, on health insurance during his working years."

Congressman CURTIS' bill was originally conceived last February in an effort to find a constructive alternative to President Kennedy's medical care program for the aged which would have created a federally controlled and federally administered compulsion system for medical care.

Congressman CURTIS' approach to the problem is part of an overall Republican campaign to begin solving social problems not by inviting the Federal Government to walk in and take over but by creating incentives for private industry, and the private citizen to solve their individual problems by themselves.

Republican leadership has become worried over an image their party had begun to receive: that of simply being opposed to liberal welfare-state schemes. For years, they had simply registered their votes against the liberal programs without offering any positive solutions of their own.

The Republican Party, in the past 2 years, has held numerous conferences and has adopted a positive policy position on all legislation, offering a constructive free enterprise solution to each problem the radical liberals would create.

The health care issue is one of the best. In this case, President Kennedy has asked for an elitist-controlled compulsion system * * * which in the long run would give medical benefits only to those on social security at the expense of the taxpayer and in competition with free enterprise insurance corporations. Republican Congressman CURTIS, in opposing this step to socialized medicine, suggests that a more effective, and less dangerous approach, to the problem would be to use a tax-credit system and give the individual and the industry the incentive to set-up their own health-care plan, free from governmental control and supervision.

The Republican proposals have become increasingly appealing to the Members of Congress, as was evidenced by the unanimous recommendation Congressman CURTIS' bill received today from the House committee.

The adoption of a positive approach to pressing social problems will strengthen the Republican Party's position immensely in the upcoming November elections.

Rollcall Record of Congressman Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, individual responsibility of elected legislators is one of the requisites of successful representative government. The record of rollcall votes, which becomes a public document, plays an essential part in our governmental system under which Members of the House of Representatives render regular accounts to their constituents at the close of each Congress.

I have today received from the Clerk of the House a record of rollcall votes that I have cast in the 2d session of the 87th Congress up to and including rollcall No. 216. I am appending, herewith, a short résumé of my rollcall record including the 1st session of the 87th Congress and the 2d session through rollcall No. 216. The only rollcalls omitted from this brief summary are, of course, the quorum calls:

Rollcall record of Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., House of Representatives

1ST SESS., 87TH CONG.

Rollcall No.	Legislation	Explanation of action or title of the bill	Mathias' vote
2		Election of Speaker	Halleck.
3		Terminate debate on investigation, Indiana election	Nay.
5	H.R. 127	Enlargement of Rules Committee	Yea.
7	H.R. 4806	Temporary extension Unemployment Compensation Act	Yea.
8	H.R. 167	Un-American Activities Committee's budget	Yea.
9	H.R. 5188	Impacted area aid to education	Yea.
13	H.R. 4510	Motion to recommit feed grain program	Yea.
14	H.R. 4510	Feed grain program	Nay.
17	H.R. 4510	Conference report on feed grain program	Nay.
19	H.R. 5463	To extend the Sugar Act	Yea.
20	H.R. 4806	Conference report on extension Unemployment Compensation Act	Absent.
22	H.R. 5000	Cancel Army research project in Natick, Mass	Nay.
23	H.R. 5000	Military construction appropriation	Yea.
27	H.R. 3935	Kitchin-Ayers amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Amendment of 1961	Yea.
28	H.R. 3935	Motion to recommit the Fair Labor Standards Amendment of 1961	Nay.
29	H.R. 3935	Fair Labor Standards Amendment of 1961	Yea.
32	S. 1	Motion to recommit bill on depressed areas	Nay.
33	S. 1	Depressed areas bill	Yea.
38	S. 912	New Federal judges	Yea.
40	H.R. 6027	To increase benefits under social security	Yea.
42	H.R. 6518	Latin-American aid program	Yea.
44	S. 1	Conference report on distressed areas	Yea.
46	H.R. 3935	Conference report on Fair Labor Standards Amendment of 1961	Nay.
47	H.R. 6441	Motion to recommit with instructions the Federal Water Pollution Control Act	Yea.
48	H.R. 6441	Federal Water Pollution Control Act	Yea.
53	H.R. 2010	To extend the law to admit Mexicans for farmwork	Nay.
54	H.R. 6094	Motion to recommit bill for increase on salaries of Council of Economic Advisers	Yea.
55	H.R. 6094	To increase ceiling on salaries of Council of Economic Advisers from $345,000 to $2,000,000	Nay.
58	H.R. 284	To consider establishment of U.S. Office of Travel and Tourism	Yea.
61	H. Con. Res. 226	To urge Organization of American States to impose sanctions on Cuba	Yea.
62	H.R. 4614	To establish U.S. Office of Travel and Tourism	Yea.
64	S. 1852	Appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval ships	Yea.

Rollcall record of Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., House of Representatives—Continued

1ST SESS., 87TH CONG.

Roll-call No.	Legislation	Explanation of action or title of the bill	Mathias' vote
65	H.R. 1986	Motion to recommit bill to repeal express company information requirement	Nay.
67	H.R. 7371	State and Justice Departmental appropriation	Yea.
70	H.R. 7444	To reduce agricultural conservation program	Nay.
71	H.R. 7444	Agriculture Department Appropriation	Yea.
75	H.R. 7446	To repeal tax on transportation fares	Yea.
76	H.R. 7446	To extend excise tax rates	Yea.
78	H.R. 7053	Motion to recommit bill to admit certain evidence in courts of District of Columbia	Nay.
82	H.R. 303	Disapproving reorganization of Federal Communications Commission	Yea.
83	H.R. 302	Disapproving reorganization of Securities and Exchange Commission	Yea.
85	H.R. 6765	To amend charter of International Finance Corporation	Yea.
86	H.R. 7712	Supplemental appropriation for State, Justice, Treasury, and Defense Departments	Yea.
88	H.R. 304	Disapproving reorganization of Civil Aeronautics Board	Yea.
89	H.R. 305	Disapproving reorganization of Federal Trade Commission	Yea.
95	H.R. 6028	Motion to recommit Housing Act	Yea.
96	H.R. 6028	Housing Act	Nay.
99	H.R. 7677	To increase debt limit to $298,000,000,000	Yea.
104	H.R. 7851	To retain price differentials in defense contracts in favor of depressed areas	Yea.
105	H.R. 7851	Defense Department appropriation	Yea.
106	S. 1922	Conference report on Housing Act	Nay.
107	H.R. 354	Congressional flag	Yea.
108	H.J. Res 108	Delaware River Basin compact	Yea.
109	H.R. 187	Federal court review of alien deportation orders	Yea.
110	S. 857	Cape Cod National Seashore Park	Yea.
112	H.J. Res. 435	Centennial observance of Department of Agriculture	Yea.
113	H.R. 2555	Emergency evacuations of civilian employees in oversea areas	Yea.
116	H.R. 6874	National Aeronautics and Space Administration appropriation	Yea.
117	H.R. 328	Disapproving reorganization of National Labor Relations Board	Yea.
118	H.R. 336	Disapproving reorganization of Federal Maritime Board	Yea.
119	H.R. 8302	Cancel Army research project in Natick, Mass	Nay.
120	H.R. 8302	Military construction appropriation	Yea.
124	S.J. Res. 120	Reserve mobilization	Yea.
127	S. 2311	Additional appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval ships	Yea.
128	H.R. 30	Northeastern water and related land resources compact	Yea.
130	S. 1643	Farm bill	Nay.
132	H.R. 7856	Reorganization of Federal Communications Commission	Yea.
133	H.R. 7856	To permit emergency sales of military supplies for aircraft	Nay.
135	H.R. 404	To table motion to delete public power provisions from Hanford atomic plant authorization	Nay.
136	H.R. 404	To instruct conferees on H.R. 7576 not to agree to Hanford electric generating facilities	Yea.
138	H.R. 8033	Reorganization of Interstate Commerce Commission	Yea.
140	H.R. 404	To consider H.R. 6882 to provide an additional Assistant Secretary of Labor	Yea.
142	H.R. 6302	Transfer Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University	Yea.
144	H.R. 7851	Conference report on Defense Department appropriation	Yea.
157	H.R. 8400	Foreign aid	Yea.
160	H.R. 5384	Airplane hijacking bill	Yea.
164	H.R. 7703	New York World's Fair	Yea.
167	H.R. 84	Lead and zinc subsidy	Nay.
169	H.R. 8181	National Fisheries Center	Yea.
170	H.R. 8181	National Fisheries Center	Yea.
171	H.R. 7176	Hog cholera eradication program	Yea.
173	H.R. 8773	Readjustment payments for reservists	Yea.
175	H.R. 6242	To increase Justice Department attorneys' salaries	Nay.
177	H.R. 8890	To consider for 1 day on Calendar Wednesday a substitute for the President's eduction bill	Nay.
179	H.R. 8028	Limitation on juvenile delinquency program to pilot plan in District of Columbia	Nay.
180	S. Con. Res. 34	Opposing admission of Red China to United Nations	Yea.
181	S. 1988	Conference report on foreign aid	Yea.
184	H.R. 9033	To increase military aid appropriation	Yea.
185	H.R. 9033	Foreign aid appropriation	Yea.
188	H.R. 9000	2-year extension of Federal aid to schools in impacted areas	Yea.
190	H.R. 8723	Amendment of Pension Plans Disclosure Act	Yea.
191	H.R. 8666	Cultural exchange bill	Yea.
197	H.R. 8302	To cancel Army research project in Natick, Mass	Nay.
198	H.R. 7317	Extension of Civil Rights Commission	Yea.
199	H.R. 9076	To prohibit construction of public power hydroelectric grid lines	Yea.
200	H.R. 9076	Public works appropriation	Yea.
202	H.R. 7576	Conference report on public power facilities at Hanford plutonium production reactor	Nay.
203	H.R. 8102	To limit extension of Federal Airport Act to 3 years	Yea.
205	H.R. 7500	Peace Corps	Yea.
207	H.R. 455	To send Mexican farm labor bill to conference	Nay.
208	H.R. 464	To consider raising postal rates under closed rule preventing amendment	Nay.
210	S. 2393	Extension of National Defense Education Act and impacted areas aid	Yea.
211	S. 1450	To increase longevity pay for postal workers	Yea.
212	H.R. 8751	To publicize dissemination of Communist propaganda through the mails	Yea.
213	H.R. 8914	To permit wheatgrowers in summer fallow areas to plant barley	Nay.
214	H.R. 7377	To increase the number of supergrade positions under civil service	Yea.
216	H.R. 9118	U.S. Arms Control Agency	Yea.
219	H.R. 7500	Conference report on Peace Corps	Yea.
220	H.R. 5628	National Tropical Botanical Garden	Nay.
221	H.R. 4172	Federal Advisory Council on the Arts	Yea.
223	H.R. 258	Conference report on District of Columbia sales tax	Yea.
225	H.R. 7377	To increase civil service salaries	Yea.
226	H.R. 9118	Conference report on U.S. arms control	Yea.
229	H.R. 258	Reconsideration of District of Columbia sales tax	Yea.
230	H.R. 9033	Conference report on foreign aid appropriation	Yea.
234	H.R. 9033	To concur in Senate amendment No. 27 to "Foreign aid" appropriation relating to certification of certain data	Nay.

2D SESS., 87TH CONG.

2		Election of Speaker	Halleck.
8	H.R. 8900	Aid to higher education	Yea.
11	S. 383	To acquire a mining claim on south rim of Grand Canyon	Absent.
12	H.R. 6300	To authorize an additional Secretary of Commerce	Nay.
17	H.R. 549	To consider a further temporary increase in the public debt limit	Yea.
18	H.R. 10050	To increase the public debt limit	Yea.
20	H.R. 530	To disapprove plan No. 1 of 1962 (Department of Urban Affairs)	Nay.
22	H.R. 6747	To amend the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia	Yea.
26	H.R. 8899	Manpower Training Act	Yea.
30	H.R. 132	Educational television program	Yea.
34	S. 167	Civil investigation in antitrust cases	Yea.
37	H.R. 8723	Motion to recommit conference report on bill to amend Pension Plan Disclosure Act	Nay.
28	H.R. 8723	Conference report on amendment of Pension Plan Disclosure Act	Yea.
39	H.R. 10606	Motion to recommit bill to extend social security benefits	Yea.
40	H.R. 10606	To extend social security benefits	Yea.
43	H.R. 9751	Appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels	Yea.

Rollcall record of Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., House of Representatives—Continued

2D SESS., 87TH CONG.

Roll-call No.	Legislation	Explanation of action or title of the bill	Mathias' vote
45	H.R. 10904	Appropriation for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments	Nay.
47	H.R. 576	To consider tax bill	Nay.
48	H.R. 576	A rule to debate the tax bill	Nay.
51	H.R. 10650	Motion to recommit tax bill	Yea.
52	H.R. 10650	Tax bill	Nay.
54	H.R. 10162	To authorize the United States to participate in loans to International Monetary Fund	Absent.
55	H.R. 10743	To suspend rules and consider bill to increase rates of disability compensation	Absent.
57	H.R. 10700	To amend Peace Corps Act	Yea.
59	H.R. 11038	Motion to recommit supplemental appropriation bill	Nay.
61	H.R. 4441	Motion to recommit bill for ex gratia payment to New York City	Yea.
62	H.R. 4441	Ex gratia payment to New York City	Nay.
65	H.R. 589	To consider amendment sec. 204 of Agricultural Act	Yea.
68	H.R. 10788	To amend sec. 204 of Agricultural Act	Yea.
69	H.R. 11151	Legislative branch appropriation	Yea.
78	H.R. 11289	Defense Department appropriation	Yea.
80	H.R. 8031	Television reception regulatory authority	Yea.
82	H.R. 11040	Communications satellite	Yea.
84	H.R. 8617	Philippine war claims	Yea.
85	H.R. 625	To send higher education bill to conference	Yea.
95	H.R. 11747	NASA appropriation	Yea.
99	H.R. 11665	Motion to recommit a bill to amend School Lunch Act	Yea.
100	H.R. 11665	School Lunch Act amendment	Yea.
103	H.R. 5532	To amend Armed Services Procurement Act	Yea.
110	H.R. 11990	Motion to recommit bill to provide for increase in public debt limit	Yea.
111	H.R. 11990	To increase public debt limit	Nay.
114	H.R. 691	To consider a bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948	Absent.
117	H.R. 12154	Motion to recommit bill to amend Sugar Act of 1948	Yea.
118	H.R. 12154	To amend Sugar Act of 1948	Yea.
123	H.R. 11222	To amend farm bill with respect to deficit feed areas	Yea.
124	H.R. 11222	Motion to recommit farm bill	Yea.
127	H.R. 11800	To extend Defense Production Act	Absent.
128	H.R. 11309	To continue regulation of exports	Absent.
134	H.R. 11970	Motion to recommit Trade Expansion Act	Nay.
135	H.R. 11970	Trade Expansion Act	Yea.
137	S. 1658	To prohibit interstate transportation of gambling devices	Yea.
138	S. 1900	To amend Federal Aviation Act	Yea.
141	H.R. 12154	To amend Sugar Act of 1948	Yea.
144	H.R. 11586	To amend Merchant Marine Act	Yea.
145	S. 2775	To continue civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	Yea.
146	H.R. 714	Class I–A clear channel operations	Yea.
153	H.R. 11921	To amend Foreign Assistance Act of 1961	Yea.
157	H.R. 726	To agree to Senate amendments to H.R. 8050	Yea.
160	H.R. 11974	To delete Hanford new production reactor from Atomic Energy Commission appropriation	Yea.
162	S. 167	Motion to recommit bill to authorize Attorney General to compel production of evidence	Yea.
163	H.R. 12135	Highway construction appropriation	Yea.
165	H.R. 10606	Conference report on extension of social security benefits	Absent.
166	H.R. 12391	Farm bill	Nay.
169	H.R. 12580	Appropriation for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, etc	Yea.
173	S. 2996	To amend Foreign Assistance Act of 1961	Yea.
175	H.R. 12648	Department of Agriculture appropriation	Yea.
178	H.R. 529	Mann Creek Federal reclamation project	Yea.
184	H.R. 12711	Sundry executive appropriations	Yea.
185	H.R. 575	Baker Federal reclamation project	Yea.
186	H.R. 10904	Motion to recommit bill providing appropriations for Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare	Nay.
187	H.R. 10904	Appropriations for Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare	Yea.
192	H.R. 4055	Monetary reward for recipients of National Medal of Science	Yea.
193	H.R. 7283	To provide compensation for certain World War II losses	Yea.
196	S. 1005	To amend Federal Reserve Act	Yea.
198		To dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House	Yea.
201		To dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House	Yea.
202	S.J. Res. 29	Poll tax amendment to Constitution	Yea.
203	H.R. 709	To agree with H.R. 11040 as amended by Senate	Yea.
204	H.R. 12028	Housing for aged	Yea.
208	H.R. 10113	Motion to recommit public works acceleration bill	Nay.
209	H.R. 11974	To amend bill authorizing appropriation for Atomic Energy Commission to prohibit Hanford new production reactor	Yea.
212	S. 4	Padre Island National Seashore	Yea.
215	S. 2768	Motion to recommit bill authorizing purchase of United Nations bonds	Nay.
216	S. 2768	Purchase of United Nations bonds	Yea.

Human Aid or Wild Words?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Post, Monday, September 24, 1962:

HUMAN AID OR WILD WORDS?

Hope for a more rational approach to foreign aid now rests with the Senate. The House has finished its butchery. We do not doubt that Representative PASSMAN'S success this year in getting his colleagues to go along with a $1,124,400,000 slash in the administration's request, reflects some domestic disenchantment with a burdensome program. This is a rich field for demagogs.

Yet President Kennedy is profoundly right when he says that mutilation of the aid program imperils our national security. It makes little sense to spend $50 billion on an arms race, $5 billion on a space race and to quit on the human race.

Our foreign aid program is a unique weapon. It goes to the root of contemporary instability by seeking to reduce the gap between the haves and the have-nots. The wealthiest, most affluent society in human history dare not forget that, even if there were no Soviet Union, backwardness, poverty, disease, and illiteracy would still constitute a danger to world stability. In the face of the Soviet challenge, to disregard our obligations toward the underdeveloped world is to court disaster.

It has become a truism to say that the great contest between East and West, given the nuclear stalemate, will be decided in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. But it bears repeating, if only to emphasize the corollary proposition that the development race is a contest we are better equipped to carry on than the Russians, providing we have the will, the staying power and the ability to see beyond our noses.

With an economy half the size of ours, the Soviet Government no doubt is hard pressed to meet the competing claims of armed forces, rising consumer pressures and foreign clients. It has, nevertheless, embarked upon a massive economic aid program to Cuba.

Can the United States afford to deal less generously with the Alliance for Progress?

A domestic fiasco in Cuba, at a moment when the rest of Latin America moves ahead economically with U.S. help, could well be the end of Castro. Conversely, a Cuban advance while the U.S. defaults on its pledges to Latin America could cause Castroism to spread like wildfire.

The same is true in Asia. If the nations on the periphery of Red China move ahead economically with the help of the West while China, denied Soviet aid, approaches economic disintegration, the consequences could be enormous. Either there would be revo-

lution in Red China or the regime would be obliged to moderate its policies drastically.

None of this will happen overnight. The stagnation, decay, and backwardness of a millenium will not be overcome in 5 years or 10. What is important is that the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America should have a sense of hope and a confidence that we want and intend to help.

Do we offer them only wild words, or do we pledge them enduring help?

Aid to Dependent Children—Part VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, one of the main problems involved in public assistance is providing job opportunities and training. In this last of a six-part series Detroit News Reporter Jo Ann Hardee described the vital need for new job skills.

The article follows:

(By Jo Ann Hardee)

A 500-piece jigsaw puzzle.

This is what Juvenile Judge James A. Lincoln called the aid to dependent children (ADC) program.

Everyone, from taxpayers to community leaders, has his own idea of which piece is most crucial to the puzzle.

LACK DIRECTION

Starting as depression legislation, aid to dependent children was designed to save families by providing support to widows and orphans. In 22 years it has grown into a $40 million annual program in Michigan. It is a frequent target of public criticism.

"The keystone is jobs," Lincoln said. "The permanency of public assistance does terrible things to people, especially to children.

"They absorb a lack of purpose when they live with an adult who has no direction."

Many citizens agree with the judge.

Willis Hall, a member of the Wayne County Board of Supervisors and executive vice president of the Detroit Board of Commerce, said:

"It is a long, slow, evolutionary program, but at the very root of public assistance is the problem of providing job opportunity and training."

PLEAD FOR JOBS

Spokesmen for aid to dependent children mothers said at a recent city council meeting:

"Give these women jobs. They are willing, qualified and eager to work. You hear about aid to dependent children mothers who have beer parties and boy friends. But you don't hear that these women want to work."

John Bartholomew, director of the Sophie Wright Settlement, had this to say:

"As long as there is hard-core unemployment and racial discrimination, it is easy to give up—to rationalize lack of energy as lack of opportunity.

"Economic security would solve 99 out of 100 welfare problems."

One community house worker lamented that no aid to dependent children money has been available, above State grant ceilings, to pay for education of recipients.

She pointed to a mother of five who wanted to take computer school training and become self-sufficient.

But purchasing school supplies for her children was a serious financial drain on her $245 monthly grant (now $200 since city supplementation has been cut off.)

LAW IS CHANGED

The woman could not afford the training and so remained on ADC, the caseworker said; commenting:

"Think of the money they could have saved in the long run if they had included tuition, babysitter's fees, and carfare in the woman's grant 4 years ago.

"It is incredible that we are spending money on special programs like this $200,000 juvenile delinquency study while we could be stemming such problems with so little expense by providing an adequate living standard."

Under new Federal law, local ADC officials will concentrate on upgrading employment skills of their clients.

Currently 80 percent of Wayne County's 16,394 recipients are classed as domestics, service workers, and unskilled labor.

Upgrading may not be an easy task. A welfare test designed to predict job retraining success found one-third of the clients too illiterate to take the test, and one-third not trainable.

FOCUS ON TEENAGERS

ADC also want to steer as many as possible of its teenage children toward upgraded job skills.

"The key to the welfare problem is prejudice," said Urban League Director Francis A. Kornegay.

"How much in welfare costs are we willing to pay for the privilege of discrimination? If Negroes could get jobs, it would reduce the welfare load."

The "Negro ghetto" is cited as another factor complicating rehabilitation of ADC recipients.

POLICING JOB

Often pervaded by a deep-rooted sense of frustration, it is an area of poor housing, crowded conditions, high unemployment, high welfare loads.

"Outside Wayne County, the job of policing ADC recipients to see that money is adequately spent is often done by the community," a caseworker said.

"In Detroit that job is made nearly impossible by the existence of these ghettos."

"A civic leader said:

"One answer to the problem of low standards among aid to dependent children clients is to break up these welfare ghettos through urban renewal.

"Then distribute these people into other neighborhoods where there are incentives for higher cultural and moral outlooks."

Another often-advanced answer to "the aid to dependent children problem" is birth control.

Appalled by the fact that 42.6 percent of Wayne County's aid to dependent children are illegitimate, one of the agency's severest critics said angrily:

"There isn't nearly enough birth control information available to these women, nor are they encouraged to use the eight birth control clinics that are available.

"Here we are spending U.S. money to set up birth control programs in India and Japan, but we won't use the knowledge here."

OFFICIALS HESITANT

Officials balk at forcing clients to attend birth control clinics. They are reluctant even to institute a vigorous program of encouraging such attendance, leaving this to the discretion of the caseworker.

"A public agency has to be careful" the State welfare head, W. J. Maxey, said. "There are religious issues involved."

Father Paul Hickey, head of Catholic Social Services in Detroit, indicated that Maxey's apprehensions were well founded.

"The State has no business interfering in personal life," he said.

TERRIBLE DAY

"It would be a terrible day when a person felt he had to order his personal life according to State dictates to be assured of the basic necessities of food and shelter."

The church has no published doctrine on giving birth control information to non-Catholic public assistance recipients, Father Hickey said. He added however, that "it considers all artificial birth control methods immoral."

STERILIZATION HIT

Welfare officials in Fauquier County, Va., are being severely criticized by Catholic and Jewish clergymen for a voluntary sterilization program instituted there 33 months ago for public assistance cases.

Another attack on illegitimacy was suggested by an aid to dependent children critic:

"We need more stringent discipline over these mothers. Take the children away if there are more than two illegitimate children.

"If a woman has three or four illegitimate children, it ought to arouse some suspicion of an inadequate home."

Juvenile authorities are reluctant to follow such a plan.

"We never take a child from his home unless it has to be done," Judge Lincoln said. "Our standard is whether the child is a success in his emotional adjustment, his school life, his relationship with other children and adults."

Foster care is also expensive costing at least $60 a month for each child. Under the State ceiling, a mother can care for four children at $36 monthly for each child.

FUNDS INCREASED

Under the new Federal law, more money is available for foster care. But another problem is to find foster or adoptive homes for the large percentage of Negro children on ADC. Such homes are extremely difficult to locate.

Better supervision is often demanded of ADC, usually in reference to rumors of widespread cheating and misspending.

"An indication of effective supervision will go a long way in convincing mothers to police themselves," a Wayne County official said. "There is now an open invitation to be profligate with the money. Only the most flagrant cases are dropped."

HITS AT LOAD

"I imagine 75 percent of ADC mothers are doing a good job, but it is the 25 percent that should be better policed."

Denying that there is widespread ineligibility, Rev. Bernard Houston, head of the Wayne County Bureau of Social Aid, said his staff could do a better job if caseloads were smaller than the current 120 for each caseworker.

Kornegay said:

"ADC is not giving the casework and counseling necessary because of its inadequate budget. We are paying a tremendous social price for this pet economy."

A special section attached to the friend of the court has been advocated since 1958 for pursuing men who are delinquent in support payments.

QUESTIONS BACKLOG

"We must urge the court to do a better job on paternity and support," Hall said.

"A backlog of 700 support warrants indicates that the court is not doing its best job of bringing in delinquent husbands or fathers. Nor is it tough enough in enforcement."

He criticized judges who permit men to settle, for less than the full amount, support payments that are in arrears.

Maxey also says that the courts could help his agency by "enforcing support, restricting divorce, adopting a more uniform system of payment, and developing some method of directly attaching wages for support."

ASK CRACKDOWN

Some citizens want to go a step beyond the current support law.

They want legislation passed to permit courts to assess support payment from fathers of illegitimate children born to married women.

Michigan's "conclusive presumption of legitimacy," designed to protect children from stigma, also protects these fathers from support payments.

Maxey, who has argued the possibility with lawmakers, feels that the law would "cause more trouble than it would solve."

Officials of ADC are counting on $300 million in addition Federal money to upgrade staff work and change ADC's emphasis from relief to rehabilitation. They hope to launch what Houston calls "a direct attack upon chronic dependency."

Still in the planning stages, these services may include:

Special caseworkers assigned to follow up "problem families" or those with high rehabilitative potential.

Day care centers for children of mothers who are working.

Work incentives and job training for ADC mothers.

Transfer of the State's children's division to Houston's office where it can better serve ADC clients.

Programs for unwed mothers to prevent recurring illegitimacy.

SEES HURDLES

While Houston is enthusiastic about these new services, he said that his agency cannot go it alone in combating factors which create dependency, such as broken homes, unemployment, racial discrimination, lack of education and job training, low "aspirational levels."

The Urban League has been working for 3 years in two limited projects designed to reduce dependency and to upgrade standards of those receiving public assistance. Both projects, although small, have been judged successful.

A seminar series to help ADC mothers to solve common problems has been taken over by several settlement houses.

The second program was aimed at high school students, to show them the value of education and to guide them away from admiring socially unacceptable occupations.

UP TO COMMUNITY

Kornegay agrees with Kathryn Van Zoren, local ADC head, that these programs are "drops in the bucket."

Officials of ADC would welcome a coordinated community attack on chronic dependency, perhaps through the United Foundation.

They agree with the civic leader who said:

"The community has shoved off on government its responsibilities toward upgrading its welfare load. Now the community must shoulder this burden."

It Doesn't Grow on Trees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, apparently the hucksters are at it, with the help of President Kennedy, to try to get from Congress every cent the President requested for foreign aid.

I think the Appropriations Subcommittee did an excellent job on the subject and today's article by Richard Starnes, in the Washington Daily News, buttresses this viewpoint:

BLUNT WARNINGS ON AID

(By Richard Starnes)

Whether they are ultimately restored or not, sharp cuts made in the foreign aid appropriation bill contain a blunt warning to the administration that Congress means to force reforms in the program.

The President, of course, understands this, even if his faintly melodramatic plea for restoration of the cuts disingenuously ignored it. Mr. Kennedy's defense of the program contained no suggestion that shocking abuses in foreign aid were to be corrected. Anticommunism is still a splendid stock in trade for any American politician, but it is wearing thin as an excuse for chronic waste and mismanagement in the foreign aid program.

There is no reason to doubt the will of the American people to continue to support foreign aid. There is, however, considerable ground for believing that they are fed to the ears with endlessly underwriting profligate administration of the program, and with subsidizing legions of foreign potentates whose knaveries would long since have jailed them in any civilized society.

It is this wholly justifiable resentment that motivated the Appropriations Committee of the House in reducing the proposed foreign aid bill, not some dark relapse into know-nothing isolationism.

It is easy enough to deride Representative OTTO PASSMAN as a curiously comic, sinisterly benighted yahoo who is an implacable foe of foreign aid. But it does not explain why the sweat of the American taxpayer should buy a $3 million floating palace for some African despot. Nor does it justify such chronic scandals as the multi-million-dollar highway in Cambodia, which began to crumble before the ribbon could be cut to open it.

And it is not know-nothingism, surely, when Eugene R. Black, retiring president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Redevelopment, expresses grave doubts about foreign aid programs as they are now constituted. It cannot be brushed aside as "irresponsible" (Mr. Kennedy's word for foreign aid cuts) when Mr. Black, a distinguished supporter of the concept of mutual assistance, decries the stupidity of building lavish airport terminal buildings and sports arenas in nations whose crop irrigation systems haven't emerged from the stone age.

Some of the Appropriation Committee's explorations into the never-never land of mutual assistance bureaucracy are illuminating to any discussion of irresponsibility. For example, the committee cited as "typical" of unreliable information submitted in support of appropriation requests one for $1,260,000 for 23 U.S. technicians. Representative PASSMAN pointed out this "means these technicians are costing $54,000 a year, each."

The committee report, anticipating the outcry the proposed reductions would trigger, pointed out that last year's cuts had provoked much the same sort of lament. It quoted a letter signed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara warning that a workable program "cannot be done with the cuts proposed by the subcommittee."

The House and Senate dutifully increased the appropriation from the committee's figure, which was $3.3 billion, to $3.9 billion. But, as Representative PASSMAN's subcommittee cheerfuly pointed out, actual expenditure totaled less than $3.2 billion—a fact which may help put the President's protest in some reasonable perspective.

Bill Robb and the Elks Youth Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation owes a debt of gratitude to men who give unselfishly of themselves in the interest of developing healthy, alert, and patriotic young citizens. A splendid example of this type of American is William P. Robb, of Milwaukee. For more than 6 years, William Robb has devoted countless hours to developing the championship Milwaukee Elks Youth Band. Hundreds of youngsters can thank Bill Robb not only for the opportunity to become musicians, but to benefit by a growing community experience.

I commend to Members on both sides of the aisle the inspiring account of Bill Robb and his work contained in the current National Elks magazine:

NO ONE BEATS ELKS YOUTH BAND

Organized 6 years ago, the Youth Band sponsored by Milwaukee, Wis., Lodge, No. 46, has had a meteoric rise to fame. In 24 contests against the finest bands in the country, these youngsters have won 15 first prizes and 4 national championships.

A great deal of the credit for this enviable record goes to its manager, William P. Robb, who, as exalted ruler in 1955, was responsible for the formation of this group. Since its inception, under his guidance, the Milwaukee Elks Youth Band has been almost entirely self-supporting and self-governing. The group makes its own decisions, through which its members learn leadership, tenacity, thrift and cooperation; all are growing to make a definite contribution to the community as responsible adults.

Founding Director George Zoske started the band on solid ground with strict membership requirements and performance standards. When he was called into the Army he relinquished the baton to an untried 19-year-old assistant James A. Walker; it was under Mr. Walker that the band began its rise to fame; discarding the normal parade band repertoire, the band devoted its talents to contemporary band music. It began to attract to its ranks outstanding musicians from nearby colleges to act as section coaches and soloists. As a result of this instruction many former players are now music students at Julliard, Eastman, and the University of Michigan. Among the band's erstwhile members are Fred L. Hemke, student-instructor at Eastman; Bob Smith, a trombonist with Ralph Marterie; Thomas Mason, recent first-prize winner in a national jazz contest sponsored by Downbeat magazine, and Richard Metzger and Rogers Bloemers, both full-time members of the Milwaukee Symphony Orchestra.

Then Mr. Walker, just 23 years old, was named director of bands at Harvard and the job of finding a replacement was begun. After screening about 20 applicants, Mr. Robb presented 2 to the band itself; each conducted a few rehearsals and talked with the players whose choice was Wayne M. Becker, a member of the exclusive American Bandmasters Association. Mr. Becker's ability was unquestioned, and under his leadership the band swept to a record score to win first place at the Cedarburg Festival of Music in 1960–61.

Last fall, the band started its own cadet band of grade school children trained by

Nick Contorno with the assistance of the youth band members who have underwritten most of the cost of this new venture.

Now Milwaukee lodge has two bands to carry its banner, and as a reward for their hard work each year, and out of their earnings from contests and parades, the youngsters vacation at beautiful Camp Bird in northern Wisconsin in August when all the recreational facilities of the camp are enjoyed, in addition to 4 hours of voluntary rehearsing each day.

Is it any wonder Milwaukee's Elks are proud of this rewarding project?

Congressman Green of Pennsylvania Aids Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the hospitals of the northeast section of Philadelphia have been particularly fortunate in having the dedicated service of the senior Congressman from Philadelphia, the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR. I am pleased to be associated with a legislator who has been so persistent and diligent in his determination to accomplish favorable results in a field which is so beneficial to the community.

The securing of help for hospitals is a difficult task. The competition is very great, and the conditions are hard to meet. My distinguished colleague, Congressman GREEN, left no stone unturned in his efforts to procure favorable results. His work has been reported by the press of the city and particularly by the Mayfair Times and Northeast Times, newspapers in the northeast section of Philadelphia.

I have attached the news report in the Times newspapers and the editorial which was presented to the public in recognition of his extraordinary efforts on behalf of the people:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Mayfair Times, Sept. 20, 1962]

GREEN HELPS NORTHEAST HOSPITALS GET $4,670,000 IN GRANTS

(By Stewart G. Ettinger)

Northeast hospitals have received $4,670,000 in Federal funds during the past 4½ years.

The awarding of these grants was the culmination of 7 years of planning, maneuvering, and perseverance on the part of a small group of private citizens and civic leaders headed by Congressman WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., of the fifth district.

His behind-the-scenes work has resulted in a total of $7,070,000 in Federal grants to Philadelphia hospitals.

Congressman GREEN is the man who "turned on the lights" during Nazareth Hospital's "darkest hour" and pushed through to a record $2½ million grant.

JUST ANNOUNCED

Last week, in Harrisburg, the Hill-Burton Advisory Committee, charged with the distribution of these Federal funds on a State level, awarded $500,000 to Frankford Hospital to complete its building program.

Other hospitals in the Northeast who got Hill-Burton funds last week are Jeanes, $170,000, and the soon-to-be-completed AFL-CIO Hospital, at Cheltenham Avenue and Langdon Street, $1,500,000.

The Jeanes grant will be used to complete construction started 2 years ago. It will include renovation of a 16-bed area of vacated space in the old hospital building and the installment of mechanical equipment for the new wing, including air conditioning.

One floor of the new wing also remains to be completed.

The hospital began applying for Hill-Burton funds in 1958 and reapplied each year until they got the grant. They were in the same predicament as Frankford and Nazareth—they were too low on the priority list due to the fact all of Philadelphia was in one hospital service area.

The AFL-CIO Hospital, at Cheltenham Avenue and Langdon Street, has also been under construction for several years. The completion date for the 220-bed hospital is set for June 1963.

"It was the end of a very successful and hard fought battle," Congressman GREEN told the Times when reached at his Washington office.

He stressed that it was not necessarily the end of hospital appropriations for the Philadelphia area. He said he would continue to work for funds for any hospital that needed them.

SPECIAL CATEGORY

When Nazareth was unable to get Hill-Burton funds, GREEN came up with a provision of the act that allowed allocations to "areas of special need" regardless of their standing on the list of priorities.

It was this clause through which he was able to get the record Nazareth grant in 1960. However, this "area of special need" was then written out of the law.

As a result, when Frankford applied for its grant, another way had to be found to get an appropriation.

"The Northeast could get no Hill-Burton funds the way the districts were set up," explained Congressman GREEN. "It was necessary to get a resurvey."

RESURVEY NEEDED

GREEN approached Harry Shapiro, secretary of public welfare, in 1957 and asked him to have the Philadelphia Board of Health resurvey the hospital service areas.

Shapiro agreed, but left office when the new administration was elected, without having initiated the resurvey.

GREEN approached the new secretary, Mrs. Ruth Grigg Horting, and asked when the resurvey was going to be started. She knew nothing of the action.

The facts were presented to her and she immediately authorized the resurvey, for she was thoroughly convinced that something should be done about the situation of Philadelphia's hospitals as soon as possible.

As the situation stood before the resurvey, all of Philadelphia was in a single hospital service area. This meant that the hospitals in the Northeast which desperately needed more beds because of the rapidly expanding population were in the same area with the large downtown hospitals which had more than enough beds.

This put the Philadelphia area very low on the priority list for appropriations. GREEN helped that by resurveying the area; the Northeast could be put into a separate area and get the funds it needed.

A LITTLE TOO MUCH

The resurvey was finally made in 1959 after many delays and proddings. Unfortunately, the new area that the Northeast found itself in included such hospitals as Einstein Northern and Temple University. Furthermore, part of the Northeast above Pennypack Creek was included in an area set up in lower Bucks County.

This took just enough population away from the Northeast service area to again put it too far down on the priority list to get funds.

Once again GREEN had to go to bat for the Northeast and get enough of the area back to give the Northeast hospitals a chance at getting the necessary grants.

That he was successful is shown in the amount of funds subsequently awarded to Northeast hospitals.

As Richard Sawyer, administrator of Frankford Hospital, put it, "Before the resurvey, there was no chance at all for us to get any funds. After the hospital was placed in the new district, it was an outside chance that we might get a grant—but at least it was a chance."

FRANKFORD ANXIOUS

Frankford Hospital is anxiously awaiting the arrival of the State commissioner of general and special hospitals and representatives of the U.S. Public Health Service.

It is up to this group to look at the situation at each of the hospitals allocated money and fix the exact amount the Government will contribute.

The provisions of the Hill-Burton Act state that the Federal funds will cover one-third of the cost of construction. However, this is based only on unfinished work. Frankford has already started and is well along on its construction program. Each day it moves nearer to completion and each day means less money they will get from Hill-Burton.

Nazareth was awarded its record $2½ million grant before any construction was started and as a result got one-third of all money they must spend.

Congressman GREEN informed the Times that one of the hospitals in Philadelphia still in need of funds is Episcopal. They need to replace one of their old buildings.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Times newspapers, Sept. 20, 1962]

EDITORIAL VIEWS OF THE TIMES: FEDERAL AID RESULTS FROM LONG, HARD EFFORT

The Times was proud last week to have printed well in advance of any other newspaper, daily or weekly, the report that more hospital aid will be coming to the Northeast from the Federal Government.

Obtaining this Federal aid was another step forward for the Northeast.

Residents from Frankford Creek on the south to Poquessing Creek on the north, and from the Delaware River to Montgomery County were happy to hear the news. They know that the fine hospitals of the Northeast will now be able to expand their facilities to handle the rapid population growth.

One thing they may not know, however, is that the Federal grants to Northeast hospitals were the outcome of hundreds of meetings, phone calls, and letters by a group of Northeast citizens.

It took 7 years, altogether.

It was a long, weary, often discouraging effort.

NOT LIST THEM

We will not attempt to name all the people who took part, for it would be a near certainty that we would leave out someone who played a quiet but vital part.

But two things must be mentioned: (1) It is likely that none of the hospitals—Nazareth, Frankford, Jeanes, nor the AFL-CIO Hospital—would have received Federal aid if the hospital service areas had remained as they were at the start of the effort. (2) It is also likely that the boundary lines for those hospital service areas would not have been changed had it not been for the persistent efforts of Congressman WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr.

When the effort began, the hospital service area that included the Northeast also included the other parts of Philadelphia. This meant that the large downtown hospitals,

with their many extra beds, were averaged in with the Northeast hospitals, which were desperately in need of additional beds. Thus the single Philadelphia area figure for hospital beds per thousand population showed no great need yet in th Northeast the need was great.

The Times has rarely reported a continuing series of negotiations with Government officials as complex and frustrating as that in which the Northeast sought to change the boundaries of the hospital service areas.

On a number of occasions it appeared that the effort had failed and that the Northeast would continue to be figured in with the other hospitals of Philadelphia.

GREEN GOT BUSY

But each time this happened, Congressman GREEN would begin making phone calls, writing letters, and making personal contacts.

His opponents will, of course, remark that he did it because it was good politics. But this is like saying that a reporter worked persistently at a news story because it was good newspapering, or that a salesman worked hard to sell because it was good salesmanship.

The point is that GREEN did a good job. To argue that it helped him win votes is silly. After all, that's the business he is in.

The others who took part in the effort through the years also deserve great praise. Some were hospital officials, some were politicians, one was a highly effective public relations man, and others were just citizens interested in improving vital parts of their community.

Thousands of patients who benefit from the improved and expanded hospital facilities in the years to come will owe much to this persistent group.

Synonyms for Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the dramatic domestic struggle within the country is raging between the fanatic forces of socialism and those Americans who have faith in and respect for our free enterprise economic system. This issue is becoming of major importance to citizens throughout the country, and I was recently proud to note that the Blue Island Sun-Standard, a local community newspaper in my district, very succinctly and dramatically pointed out to its readers in editorial of Thursday, September 13, the subterfuges which are being used by advocates of socialism in the United States. Under previous leave I insert into the RECORD at this point the editorial entitled "Synonyms for Socialism":

SYNONYMS FOR SOCIALISM

"Social progress" or "social reform" or some other pretty sounding phrases, is used by the misnamed liberals as a substitute for the word socialism, which they are working toward in the United States.

By clever devices they seek to create distrust of private enterprise, the capitalistic system, and the profit motive, the foundation on which our U.S. economy rests. Our Government itself is the greatest beneficiary from profits through its tax take.

Mr. Khrushchev has boasted that we will destroy our private enterprise system from within by accepting the socialistic doctrine piece by piece—then we will be ripe for the takeover.

That fate will be up to our people themselves. If they sanction, through their elected representatives, the continued extension of Government ownership of business and industry, they will set the trap that will ultimately crush their liberties and individual opportunity.

Looking at the world today the handwriting is as plain as the nose on your face—we will uphold our representative form of government, our profit system, and our individual property rights—or we will go down the socialistic drain along with the other subjugated nations.

Doctrine Again Is Challenged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people, in ever-growing numbers, demand action against Russian intervention in this hemisphere.

The Florida press has been particularly alert to this threat at our southern door—only 90 miles from our own beaches. Our editors and feature writers report from the vantage point of close proximity to the danger, and with the advantage of contacts with Cuban exiles now living in Florida.

Over the past months I have had reprinted, here in the RECORD, stories and editorials from Florida so that these events would be called to the attention of all Members of Congress and other Government leaders. As a further indication of the feelings of our citizens on these matters, I insert, under unanimous consent, the following in the RECORD:

[From the Boynton Beach (Fla.) Star, Sept. 13, 1962]

DOCTRINE AGAIN IS CHALLENGED

Way back during the administration of President Monroe, Russia under the rule of the tzars landed fishermen in the islands off Alaska, almost in Russian waters but our President didn't like it. Congress, alive, patriotic, and brave, and under the guidance of Monroe, acted—and the Monroe Doctrine was born. Russia got out.

The Monroe Doctrine (so much in the papers about it these days) prohibits any foreign power to land materials of war, or men in any number on sovereign soil of any nation in South, Central, or North America, without permission from the President of the United States.

Last week Premier Khrushchev of Russia advised the President that his country was shipping and had shipped war materials and men into Cuba and that he would continue to do so—and he didn't even ask permission. If ever the Monroe Doctrine was directly challenged, it is challenged today.

It may be that Nikita doesn't understand the wording of the Monroe Doctrine. But we understand what Nikita wants. It is not likely he thinks so much of Fidel that he risks the chance of war to send him aid: more likely he is acting merely to annoy the United States, testing us to see how far he can go before he is stopped or possibly it is a form of blackmail—he will get out of Cuba if the United States leaves West Germany.

You can depend upon it, Khrushchev is after bigger game than little Cuba.

Aid to Dependent Children—Everyone's Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Detroit News Reporter Jo Ann Hardee has performed a valuable service in describing the problems involved in running an effective aid to dependent children program. In closing this series of articles I would like to insert an editorial from the Detroit News which emphasizes the fact that aid to dependent children is a problem—everyone's problem:

What to do about aid to dependent children? Reporter Jo Ann Hardee's stories in the News have described the problem. They have not (and could not have) provided the answer.

Almost everyone has an idea on the subject. No one seems to have an answer—at least not an answer with validity so obvious and practicality so clear that nothing remains but to put it into practice.

All that can be said with certainty is that the program is sick. There is little agreement on why, even less on the cure.

Aid to dependent children is not as sick as some of its detractors shout it is. Many aid to dependent children homes are paragons of all a genteelly poor middle-class home should be. Aid to dependent children mothers do not live in luxury at taxpayers' expense; the grant is far from luxurious. They do not have more babies to get another $20 a month; only males and childless women, we suspect, would give that notion much credence. They do not uniformly neglect their children to live it up on their aid to dependent children checks; many aid to dependent children get more love, interest, and genuine care than their luckier fellows in more than a few better-furnished but far colder middle-class homes.

Yet aid to dependent children is floundering and drifting, in too many cases, far from its original humane purpose, which was to provide support for children deprived of their father's support, so that mother could maintain a decent home for them. If it does not foster the social ills its critics lay at its doorstep, aid to dependent children is at least reigning benignly over their spread.

An unhealthy percentage of aid to dependent children mothers do not have the talents of self-discipline to use their grants wisely. There are unkempt homes. There are such things as "A, D, and C. parties" when the checks arrive There are husbands and boy friends who leave by the rear when the aid to dependent children worker knocks at the front. There are illegitimate children, and children growing up in a pattern of chronic dependency upon public funds.

There are enough abuses, arising both from intent and from ignorance, to give

know-nothing critics ammunition, to stigmatize the good and successful aid to dependent children mother, to bring into question the validity of the whole concept.

Some reply that only 25 percent of the caseload make the problems. "Only" is a poorly chosen word.

Its not enough to say "Throw out the program" or even "Throw out the offenders." The children are there; they must be housed, fed, cared for.

It is not enough to say "Take the children away," if a mother doesn't shape up by middle-class standards. The supply of good boarding homes is far less than the need, and a natural mother would have to be bad indeed to make institutional care preferable—even if there were enough institutions.

It is not enough to say "Let 'em work." For many there is no work. Their skills are too limited, or their work potential undeveloped, and there is little being done or available to upgrade their skills. More important, the primary purpose of aid to dependent children is to maintain a home for the children. Some mothers can make child-care arrangements which leave them free for work; no doubt more could do so. But for many there will remain a genuine need to stay at home and care for the children.

Yet with all the good reasons why the simple answers won't work, there remains the need to do something. The program as it stands is becoming a bottomless pit, into which more taxpayers' money and more human beings disappear every year.

An immediate need is obvious: Better case supervision But cases are assigned to caseworkers by geography, to cut unproductive travel time. With half the caseload moving each year, plus a 40 percent annual turnover in caseworker staff, many caseworkers and clients can hardly get to know each other. And with workers' caseloads far in excess of any practical limit, interviews must be sketchy or scarce—if not both. Under such conditions, "better casework" is more a slogan than a practical cure.

Better enforcement by aid to dependent children and by courts of child support orders against fathers is worth a try, if for no better reason than to cut the drain on tax funds. But it's a complex and difficult job; a father in jail is surely no help. And it bears little on aid to dependent children's basic ills.

The long-range answer lies, of course, in education and training—to prevent the dependency habit and rehabilitate those who have fallen into it; to upgrade moral standards to curb illegitimacy; to upgrade personal skills and habits; to develop work skills for those in position to work—and some are, despite the bleats of some social workers; and most crucial, to pull the children in these families out of the rut into which their parents may have fallen, either through personal failings or through no fault of their own.

But all this would take a far more massive effort than is now being made. And those who run aid to dependent children can hardly do the whole job by themselves. The roots of the problem run beyond aid to dependent children; the cures are far beyond its single-handed capacity.

One plain requirement is salary levels which permit aid to dependent children to recruit and to hold well-trained caseworkers—enough of them to do a proper job. Under present conditions they can hardly do a good job as bare policemen, much less as the guide and counselors they are supposed to be.

With that must come both the authority and the determination to keep a close rein on recipients who demonstrate that they cannot keep rein on themselves. There are those who take offense at the notion of a caseworker telling someone how to behave. But there are obviously some people who badly need someone to do just that.

This is no call for midnight raps on every aid-to-dependent-children door, payment in kind, not cash for every case. Many have no need for such supervision. Others obviously do need it, and if the public is to pay the piper, it must claim some right to keep the tune from becoming too discordant.

Needed are ways, now lacking, to help aid to dependent children mothers acquire job skills. If some have little potential, others have more, and it should be treasured and cultivated. Certainly a mother's first responsibility is home and her children, but there's much to be said for work for its own sake, especially for these mothers. Part-time work at least, for those who can get their children cared for (day care centers are needed), would do much to mitigate the dulling effect of chronic dependency.

And when these mothers are training for work and their children properly tended to, there's the matter of jobs. Many aid to dependent children mothers are Negroes. Fair employment laws notwithstanding, we've probably not yet reached that millenial point where this fact is of no significance.

Then there's the problem of the children—the problem which more than all the other items takes more than aid to dependent children can provide. The schools, the settlement houses, the other social agencies, all must take major roles in lifting their standards and their aspirations above those their surroundings impose. The ways are being charted, what it takes now is the community's will—and its bankroll.

There's the rub. It's hard enough to discern the things which need doing, harder yet to work up the resolve to do them. It's hardest of all to allocate funds for them, in these days of ever-rising competitive demands on both public and private treasuries. Yet not to do them is the grossest of false economies, for we then are doomed to keep feeding the bottomless barrel forever.

The Record on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, while talking to a very influential Democratic member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs yesterday, I was astounded by his statement that Eisenhower was responsible for today's Khrushchev-Soviet buildup in Cuba. Of course, we all know the Hitler technique was to tell an untruth long enough so that finally everyone believed it and I suspect President Kennedy will push this untrue statement.

To set the record straight again, today's article by David Lawrence, which appears in the New York Herald Tribune, places the responsibility exactly where President Kennedy, himself, said it belongs—on President Kennedy. Apparently the President has not learned, because he does nothing while the Soviets send to Cuba such "defensive" weapons as landing craft and missile pad equipment.

The article follows:

AT LAST, THE STORY BEHIND CUBA INVASION THAT FAILED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy in his speeches likes to refer to his troubles—particularly Cuba—as having been "inherited" from the Eisenhower administration. Former President Truman says in his political outbursts that Mr. Eisenhower was a "lazy" President. The real question is not how much time a President gives to golf or yachting or campaigning or social events, but how he uses the time he does give to official business—the kind of decisions he makes.

Members of Congress in the last few days put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a lengthy article that was published 2 weeks ago in U.S. News & World Report giving a comprehensive account of the fateful decision President Kennedy made when he first withdrew and then—when it was too late—actually approved of air support for the Cuban exiles in their invasion of their homeland in April 1961.

Ever since that time there have been attempts to blame the whole fiasco on the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff or on the Central Intelligence Agency. But President Kennedy told the truth when he himself assumed full responsibility. What hasn't been generally known, however, is how he came to make the mistake he did. The magazine article was the result of many weeks of investigation and research among official sources, particularly among persons who were in the know at the time. Certain administration officials have since conceded the accuracy of the article. It reads in part as follows:

"A fateful decision, made by President Kennedy on Sunday, April 16, 1961, is rising now to plague the United States. On that Sunday evening, an armed force of Cuban refugees, trained by the United States, was at sea, sailing secretly to invade Fidel Castro's Cuba. The American President, a few hours earlier, had given final approval to that invasion.

"Only the day before, on April 15, a surprise attack by B-26 bombing planes belonging to the invaders had knocked out all but seven planes of Castro's tiny air force."

INVADERS FELT SECURE

"A second air strike was scheduled for Monday morning, April 17. It was to coincide with the landing of the invaders. It was supposed to finish the job of wiping out Castro's planes and to provide air support for the invasion.

"Secure in the assurance of air support, the invaders went ashore in the early morning darkness of Monday, April 17. Their landing was successful: 1,400 armed men reached the beaches of a place called the Bay of Pigs.

"In the battle that followed, Castro's troops suffered heavy casualties. Castro's tanks, coming up to the battle, were sitting ducks for an attack by air. Confidently, the little invading force waited for its air support to arrive. Its leaders had assurance of that support. It was provided in the pre-invasion planning.

"Hours before, on Sunday evening, a small but potent force of B-26's was sitting in readiness on an airfield 500 miles away (in a Latin American country), waiting to take off for the Bay of Pigs. Those were planes of the invasion force, with Cuban pilots. But those planes didn't take off. The reason: President Kennedy forbade their use.

"When the invasion began, in the predawn hours of Monday, the need of air support became apparent. Worried, the nonmilitary officials in Washington who were running the invasion went to President Kennedy for a new decision. They suggested that U.S. Navy planes from a U.S. aircraft carrier be used to fly air support for the invaders.

"In the planning of the invasion—planning begun under the Eisenhower administration—the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff had recommended the use of U.S. air support. President Kennedy vetoed the idea. He insisted that there was to be no direct American participation. Now, with the outcome possibly hanging in the balance, military and nonmilitary men joined in renewing the plea.

"Once again, in the early morning hours of Monday, April 17, President Kennedy made a fateful decision. He said 'no' to the use of U.S. planes."

AT LAST THE SHIFT

"With no air support, the invasion soon began to run into trouble * * *. In the face of this situation, President Kennedy took the wraps off the Cuban fliers. On Monday noon he said they could go into action. But bad weather interfered at first. Finally, an airstrike was set up for early Wednesday.

"On Tuesday, however, the situation continued to deteriorate * * * by Tuesday night, April 17, a crisis was clearly at hand. Once again there was an appeal to President Kennedy. On this night the President, in white tie and tails, was playing host at a congressional reception in the White House. He left the party to confer with his advisers—both civilian and military. Again it was proposed to use U.S. planes to save the invasion.

"This time the President relented slightly. He consented to using one carrier's planes for just 1 hour on Wednesday morning—just long enough to provide cover for the invaders to land some supplies and for their planes to make a quick strike. U.S. planes, still, were not to attack land targets.

"Even this limited plan for U.S. aid went awry. There were communications mixups. The Cuban fliers mistimed their strike. The U.S. planes never got into action. And anyway, it developed, it was too late. By sundown of Wednesday, April 19, the invasion was a failure. The invaders inflicted close to 2,000 casualties on Castro's forces, suffered only a hundred or so casualties of their own. But without air support, the invaders could not hold out. Most of them wound up as Castro captives."

Criticism and analysis in retrospect by those who know the full story is concentrated today on one point—full authority should be given in advance and a military operation should be handled by military men near the battle scene and not many hundreds of miles away in the White House or even in the Pentagon.

Textilemen Calm Over Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

TEXTILEMEN CALM OVER TRADE ACT
(By Richard Neff)

PORTSMOUTH, N.H.—The textile industry—second largest employer in the United States and largest in New England—is not expected to feel any great and direct impact from passage of the trade expansion bill.

Textile leaders care, of course, but their industry is not as directly affected as other New England manufacturers, particularly the possibly endangered jewelry and shoe industries.

The reason textile leaders stand apart is that special problems, and arrangements already made with the Federal Government, place international textile trade in a special category.

All this was obvious here Wednesday as leaders of many major textile firms in New England and some other Northeast States gathered in Portsmouth for the 2-day, 108th annual meeting of the Northern Textile Association.

THREE RESOLUTIONS

First-day discussion was not about the trade bill. Rather the textile officials focused on three resolutions, unanimously passed, calling on the Federal Government to:

Adjust the present "two-price" arrangement under which U.S. textile firms must pay the world market price for American cotton while foreign manufacturers pay 8½ cents less per pound for the same cotton. The U.S. Tariff Commission recently rejected an industry plea to equalize these prices.

Provide for strict administration of the 19-nation, long-term cotton-textile agreement due to go into effect October 1, greatly restricting expansion of cotton textile imports into the United States.

Restrain imports of wool and synthetic fiber products to the 1961 level, on the grounds that expanded imports of these products would have adverse effects on the domestic industry and in turn on the Nation's security.

AGREEMENT SOUGHT

A fourth goal mentioned here, though not passed in a formal resolution, is early Federal Government negotiation of a long-term agreement with wool- and synthetic fiber importing nations, similar to the long-term agreement on cotton.

If these actions are taken, textile officials feel they will have the basic protection needed regardless of tariff negotiations now authorized by the Trade Expansion Act.

Textiles form a special category in world trade because (1) so many people are involved—4 million people directly and indirectly employed by U.S. industry and some 200,000 of these in New England—and (2) because so many nations produce quality textiles.

Thus the world market is extraordinarily competitive and unregulated in the absence of international laws, making special international agreements and national safeguards necessary, in the view of textile producers.

President Kennedy, despite his drive for freer trade, conceded the special needs of textiles on May 2, 1961, when he issued a seven-point program to bolster the industry. Some parts of the program have been carried out; others still are being worked on.

Despite agreements presently in effect, cotton-textile imports will have risen by the end of this year by some 25 percent over 1961. In the absence of such agreements on wool and synthetic textiles, imports into the United States are expected this year to increase by 60 percent over the 1961 figure.

At the business meeting here Wednesday, Seabury Stanton, outgoing chairman of the Northern Textile Association and chairman of Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., of New Bedford, Mass., stated: "It is my opinion that the entire industry is suffering from a lack of confidence engendered by fear of the future and that this fear is unjustified and will be overcome."

Mr. Stanton and others expressed confidence that President Kennedy would take the actions necessary to protect American textiles.

Cheap Imports: A Great Threat to Labor and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the United States is a great trading nation. We desire and seek trade with all nations of good will and peaceful intentions. We have done much in our own Congress and Government and in international councils to foster and promote mutually beneficial foreign trade that would be of benefit to this country and all well-motivated trading nations.

The United States today is one of the least protected industrial nations in the world. This cannot be said for the Common Market which has already shut out goods from Japan. But it should be kept in mind that tariffs here have been reduced by more than 75 percent since 1934, notwithstanding the fact that tariff barriers to American imports to countries to whom we made important tariff concessions have been increased. In effect, our concessions amounted to additional foreign aid.

At stake in this picture are not only the prosperity of many basic American industries and investments, but of great moment to us, the jobs and skills in these industries—electronics, textiles, plastics, woodworking, steel and its fabrication, chemicals, sewing machines, boots and shoes, rubber goods, watchmaking, typewriters, machine tools and many other industries—skills that are desperately needed in our arsenal of democracy.

Absolute free trade, or anything approaching it, such as proposed by some, would undoubtedly greatly impair or even destroy our mobilization potential as well as our domestic economy and job-producing potential, and could be the difference between victory and defeat if we were ever attacked.

As has been so well stated, it is a myth that greater productivity in the United States offsets the low-wage rates in Europe and the Orient. American jobs are now being exported to plants overseas set up by American management and capital and, in many instances through the use of American foreign aid funds. Trends are undoubtedly increasing to supply the American market from overseas. These trends are extremely ominous and should be noted and acted upon, if we are to preserve the strength, vitality, and prosperity of this Nation and the jobs, well-being, and personal and family security of millions and millions of American workers and their families.

It would be interesting in that connection for us to note and keep in our minds the warnings in this regard of some of our great national leaders, past and present.

For example, President Roosevelt said in 1934:

I have advocated a lowering of tariffs by negotiations with foreign countries. But I

have not advocated, and I will never advocate, a tariff policy which will withdraw protection from American workers against those countries which employ cheap labor and operate under a standard of living that is lower than our own great laboring groups.

President Truman said in 1945:

I have had drawn to my attention statements to the effect that this increased authority might be used in such a way as to endanger or trade out segments of the American industry, American agriculture, or American labor. No such action was taken under President Roosevelt and Cordell Hull and no such action will take place under my Presidency.

President Eisenhower said in 1955:

Obviously, it would ill serve our Nation's interest to undermine American industry or take steps which would lower the high wages received by our working men and women. Repeatedly, I have emphasized that our own country's economic strength is a pillar of freedom everywhere in the world. This program, therefore, must be and will be administered to the benefit of the Nation's economic strength and not to its detriment. No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure. Were we to do so, we would undermine the ideal for which we have made so many sacrifices and are doing so much throughout the world to preserve.

I am sure that our great President Kennedy also shares the basic views expressed in these three impressive statements.

In any event, if we are to retain and strengthen our great free American economy, we would do well to pause and ponder before we plunge into international arrangements and agreements that would permit this Nation to be flooded by huge quantities of cheaply produced foreign goods and products from all over the world. This policy, if pursued to its ultimate logical end, would bring ruin and destruction to our great free system and leave most of it in shambles; it would leave our faithful workers and their families on the relief rolls; and our country a wasteland of human misery.

To Congress, Our Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting editorial which appeared in the September 21, 1962, issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

TO CONGRESS, OUR HAND

Passage of the trade bill is a victory for the President of course. But in a much larger sense it is victory for the American political system.

Who would have said, even a few years ago, that the Congress of the United States would wade upstream against the pressure of protectionist lobbies with such irresistible force? The Senate vote for the bill was 78 to 8. This was phenomenal. The vote in the House earlier was a thumping 2½ to 1.

It is not enough to say that international trade has become more important to the United States. This has been the case for decades and the Hull free-trade policy of the thirties has nevertheless been recently in steady retreat. It is not enough to say that key industries like textiles and oil were bought off by the administration by agreeing to protect them. This was in fact done and it will not be easy to live with the consequences however compassionate in the case of textiles.

Nor is the explanation to be found with Lawrence O'Brien and his adroit corps of Kennedy liaison officers with Congress, or with the No. 1 priority which the President handsomely attached to this bill.

The plain fact is that Congress rose to the occasion. This much embroiled, much harassed, heavily bludgeoned group of men who face biennial reelection and know how damaging a protectionist pocketbook issue can be, crashed through.

We are obliged, deeply so. Our confidence in this group of men who serve for so little and in the face of such skeptic obloquy from the American people, is strengthened. This was an adult, far-sighted assertion of the interest of the whole country over an unavoidable hurt to some of its parts.

Fortunately this is a temporary hurt, and we are convinced, a transient one. The express object of the bill is to help industries and workers who cannot compete with the new vigor abroad to convert into new lines where they can compete. The hurt should turn soon into advantage.

But this is beside the point, which is Congress. We wish to thank every Member who this week stood for a national conviction against a self-serving pressure. This is a day to cut a benchmark of progress under the Constitution of the United States.

Henry Poellnitz Johnston Tells of Trip Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, recently my good friend and constituent, Mr. Henry Poellnitz Johnston, had occasion to visit a number of countries behind the Iron Curtain. He was one of the American delegates to the eighth cancer conference held in Moscow, Russia, this summer, and on his trip he visited in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany. He delivered the following address to the Birmingham Rotary Club on September 19, 1962, giving some of the details of his trip and his reaction to what he saw. I think that all Members of the House will be interested in these observations by a keen observer and competent reporter:

WE MUST BE READY

(By Henry Poellnitz Johnston)

I have been an Alabamian all of the 50-odd years of my life. I have visited all of her 67 counties. I have read many of her history books. I still do not feel I know all about my State or her people.

Certainly, you would not expect me to imply that I know all about Marxism, Leninism, or communism, or about these people, their customs or their habits.

Given two eyes with which to see, two ears with which to hear, and a single tongue with which to ask questions, I carefully observed and I came home with definite and positive conclusions—yes, some very definite and some very positive conclusions.

Please remember everything I say will be my personal reactions, observations, or my personal conclusions.

It is quite possible I saw things differently from others who have visited the same spots I visited. There can be no controversy over what I saw through my own eyes, though some may disagree with my conclusions.

If you disagree with my conclusions, I hope you will concur with Voltaire who said "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

Remember, any time you cease to defend the right of any man to express his beliefs or conclusions, you are taking the first major step towards communism.

Back in 1947 I served as Jefferson County campaign chairman of the American Cancer Crusade; and each year since then, I have dedicated some of myself to cancer work. I am serving my third year as a member of the national board of directors of the American Cancer Society, and this past summer the eighth cancer conference was held in Moscow.

Five thousand delegates from all over the world gathered in Moscow to exchange information on cancer. Five hundred delegates from the United States traveled some 5,000 miles at their own expense to learn about cancer. Not 1 cent came from the American Cancer Society.

Cancer has not confined itself to Americans, British, French, or other Western Allies. Cancer is worldwide in scope * * * those living behind the Iron Curtain, the Communist * * * those atheist, living without belief in God, living in a state of constant fear, are also dying of cancer.

Now, where did I go? I was scheduled to fly from New York to Paris, thence on a Russian plane to Moscow. We had a forced landing at Leningrad * * * due to bad weather, so we were told.

It was in Leningrad that I learned for the first time the magic of the words "cancer conference." Picturetaking from, or in an airplane, in or about an airport is forbidden.

My itinerary took me from Moscow to Warsaw on a Polish plane; Warsaw to Prague on Air France; and then to East Berlin on a Rumanian plane; to Checkpoint Charley in a taxi; and afoot across the harrowing wall into West Berlin; and a taxi to my hotel. From hustling, happy West Berlin, I went to pleasure-loving Paris, to sleepy London over a long rain-soaked weekend, to Edinburgh on Great Britain's fastest train, the Flying Scotsman * * * 392 miles in 360 minutes with one stop; and by car through the Annandale section of the border country of Scotland of which Sir Walter Scott wrote:

"Within the bounds of Annandale
The Gentle Johnstons ride;
They have been there a thousand years
And a thousand more they'll bide."

And from Dumfries to Glasgow, to Belfast, and along the northern coast of Ireland, back to Glasgow, and then to my America—the land of the free.

And how long was I gone * * * a total of 35 days from Birmingham to Birmingham with 16 days behind the Iron Curtain.

Before I tell you what I saw, perhaps you will be interested in knowing that I read several booklets on Russia, Poland and Czechoslovakia and a comprehensive Russian history. I contacted officials of these three Embassies before leaving. When I visited these countries I discussed habits, customs and the beliefs of these people with our State officials.

I had made contacts with the chief of bureau of the the Associated Press in Moscow and Warsaw, and visited with them while there. I even covered a news beat in Warsaw. There is no AP correspondent in Czechoslovakia—the climate there is none too healthy.

I carried two color slide cameras, one with Kodachrome II, the other loaded with fast speed Ektachrome. I brought back pictures taken in subways, department stores, art galleries, and of jamming stations.

And, along with my camera went my 7-pound Swiss typewriter on which nightly letters were written.

What did I see: In Moscow—the subways fascinated me. Some nine different lines—one circling the city buried under ground more than a 100 feet deeper than the Comer building; and eight lines running from the center of the city to the end of populated sections. These lines are almost 20 feet deeper than our Comer Building. The trains are completely air-conditioned. So are the stations and the tunnels. There are two escalators going up and two down from the ground to the first level, and a like number on to the lower level.

Why are the subways so deep? Why do the escalators go so fast? Why are they completely air-conditioned? * * * Very simple. * * * Moscow has a population of 8 million; it will be the center of any future war. It is a subway system to be used for evacuation and bomb shelters.

I saw the Exhibition of Progress. I went in most of the 15 buildings representing the 15 Republics which comprise the U.S.S.R. (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics); their circlorama; their automobile show; their textile and grain exhibits; their exhibit on electric power development and I came out feeling quite happy and safe about our United States * * * then I went into their space exhibit. I quickly realized they had withheld their proudest exhibit to the last; and it is a good thing, for had I seen it first, I might not have felt like walking through the others * * * a bench on which to catch my breath was welcomed.

As I sat reloading my camera, I thought of my first visit to the Embassay when I had remarked about the scarcity of food in the stores, that I had seen practically no vegetables, a limited selection of canned goods * * * that all the women's clothes looked so lacking in style and fit; that the men's clothing looked worse than our pawn broker suits; and that few men worse shoes * * * sandals were prevalent and neckties were oddities * * * that streets were wider than our widest, and there were no traffic problems, and on and on I had gone. My friend had listened quietly * * * all of this was running through my mind again, and then he had said, "You have observed things closely * * * Russia is behind us in most everything, and only if they did not know how to make so many destructive things so fast, and so efficiently, we would all take it easier."

I then remembered having been shown, from a window in the Embassy, one of the three jamming stations in Moscow and I had listened to a Voice of America program being jammed. I then realized and understood the personal sacrifices the Russians were making in order to place themselves ahead in this space parade. It was mid-afternoon and I was ready to return to the hotel, the quickest way to the Ukraine was not quick enough.

I saw the Lenin Library and I was most impressed—a library with 22 million volumes printed in 173 different languages, with a total of more than 8 million books in other than the Russian lauguage. I was told that between 5,000 and 6,000 American books were added to the library each year. This was to imply the freedom of selection, but I learned these were scientific or medical books, and not a single book told of our way of life.

By this time, I had learned their technique. They never told the whole truth. It is always a percentage increase, and a hundred percent of one is one. Another practice is to compare todays figures with those before the Revolution of 1917, or comparing today with 45 years ago.

Russia has made wonderful strides in the past 45 years, so have we. When you compare our electrical consumption and our automobiles, you'll realize our economic strieds far outstep the Russians.

Practically all of our roads today are paved against almost none in 1917. Most of Russia's rural roads are still unpaved; and even their highways compare with ours of several years ago. But, let's not be too relaxed. Russia is building freeways too, and fast. They must be able to move troops faster than ever before.

Missile and space progress, and their building of better roads are not Russia's only progress. She has made tremendous progress in education. In 1917, the literacy percentage was under 17 percent whereas today, it is well above 90 percent—education is compulsory.

Training of their youth literally begins at the crib. Over 45 percent of the working force is composed of women. A woman and her husband work in a factory, frequently, the same factory. They live in an apartment and their apartment is close to the plant. When the baby is born, mother returns to her job as soon as possible and the baby is left in a nursery manned by people who have proved their party loyalty. When the baby outgrows the nursery, it moves to a kindergarten manned by party loyal people; and from there to the elementary school where they become pioneers and are further indoctrinated (brainwashed, if you please) in communistic doctrine. Advancement depends on their mental capacity, plus their loyalty to the party, and when they reach 14 through 28 * * * high school through college and the first years of adulthood, they are members of Komsomol. Then, if they have proven themselves capable of advancement, mentally, and through loyalty to the Communist Party, they can then become party members.

From the time a child is born until death, he is schooled, indoctrinated, and brainwashed * * * not to believe in God, and to believe his only freedom from imperialistic capitalistic slave labor rests solely in the socialistic-communistic state.

We must ever bear in mind that Russia was a slave or serf state until 1861, and their living conditions were worse and more restricted than our very worst during southern slavery. Our Negroes were emancipated in 1865, but the 1861 freedom of the Russian serfs was far from complete and, though technically freed, they remained under the tight-fisted rule and dominance of the few until their Revolution of 1917.

Russians do not know the luxuries we enjoy in America and you might wonder why they are not restless and demanding of better living conditions. The answer is simply they never knew it better before. Little by little, living conditions are improving, but you never miss a necessity (yesterday's luxury) if you have never had it.

Living quarters have improved. New apartments are going up all over Moscow and, month by month, crowded living quarters are being eased. Their hope is to someday eliminate all dual apartments. That is, a joint apartment where one bathroom and one kitchen is shared by two families who have one bedroom each in which mother and father and their two to four children live. These dual apartments are quite common.

My guide, a proud member of Komsomol, told me not a private home had been built in Moscow since the 1917 Revolution. Everyone lives in apartment houses.

They have been taught to believe we are a pretty immoral nation. Their papers (I take the Russian's word) constantly tell about our lewd and sordid magazines, sexy moving pictures, wild beach parties, juvenile delinquency, and I was asked to tell about our system of 3 months of free love before a couple marries.

I found, and was assured from the Embassy and the Associated Press, that there were no lewd magazines, or sexy movies, and that juvenile delinquency was unheard of * * * the pioneer and the Komsomol and the party, itself, keep constant vigilance to prevent such.

The communistic countries have organized recreational facilities and compulsory participation. Every park I saw in Moscow, Warsaw, Prague, and East Berlin was open and being used. I was asked about Birmingham's closed parks and was reminded that juvenile delinquency always fomented where there was no organized guidance, or supervision, for youngsters.

Alcoholic beverages: Yes, there is such a thing, but I did not find it in abundance.

The Russians are friendly and the few who speak English speak it with apparent freedom. They remind you they want peace * * * and are interested in our customs and our economic levels * * * they enjoy our cigarettes, our chewing gum, and love our ball point pens, and were fascinated with our scotch tape. They are anxious for us to be more desirous of peace so they can devote more of their efforts to some of the necessities which would improve their standards of living.

They say they have labor unions and strong ones, but they do not, and cannot, understand "your unions striking your space and missile plants—a Communist would never strike himself, or his government," they say—"such a thing could only happen in an imperialistic state where slave labor and a lack of loyalty exists." I could not argue the point. I'll admit I cannot understand how people who live in a country which enjoys our economic position, and our four freedoms, would be willing to strike against the Government, thereby giving our enemies the opportunity, and maybe just the needed time, to completely annihilate us. A day or two lost could mean the end of our way of life.

There is a scarcity of hotel accommodations everywhere. Before you enter these Iron Curtain countries you have been booked through Intourist, Orbis, or Codek. You have paid for room and meals in advance, and they know when you are scheduled to leave. Another is waiting for your room when you vacate.

There is no doubt that the Communists live in, and under, a constant state of fear. We believe in God, and through our trust in Him, we trust our neighbors. The Communist are disbelievers and they disbelieve their neighbors, too. They have never been taught "love thy neighbor as thyself." Each person is looking out for himself; and if to speak out against a neighbor might aid in his own progress, he speaks out.

My final conclusion is that we came home too early in 1913. Had we finished the job then, we would not be so concerned about missile and space weapons today. We were given a second chance to finish things in 1945. We again came home some too soon.

If, a third chance comes, will we make the same mistake again?

Americans, thank God, are peace-loving people, and may we never be the aggressor. America is a land where we enjoy the four freedoms—"freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from fear, and freedom from want."

These freedoms cannot exist in a Communist country.

I don't believe we can long survive this world half free and half slave—Cuba is now on our doorsteps.

I stand solidly for a two-party system, but it's time we put aside name calling.

It's time to unite. It is time to quit striking against ourselves. And, if the occasion arises, we must be ready—ready to strike—to strike hard and fast. We must keep this a free country, and make this a free world.

Views on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my constituent, Mr. Carl Hedstrom, I submit the following two articles by James Reston and Walter Lippmann.

In my opinion both writers follow the policy of the pacifist. They cling to the new slogan of the New Frontier—"Watchful waiting." You will never again hear two words with less meaning or which offer a more dangerous opiate. I ask them to observe Mr. Khrushchev. Has his show of strength brought war to Russia? What has our policy of indecision brought us? Has it not made our ability to defend ourselves a thousand times more difficult and reduced to its lowest level our prestige in the eyes of the world? Have they learned nothing from our experience with Hitler, or must they learn it all over again?

A third article which I submit appeared in the New York Daily News on September 21. In its usual plain talk, the Daily News called on the President to be frank with the American people on the subject of Cuba.

The above-mentioned articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 16, 1962]

HOW ABOUT A BLOCKADE ON NONSENSE?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, September 15.—The urge to do something about Cuba is growing in the country. As Soviet arms and men pile up in that island, even those who reject invasion find it intolerable to do nothing. Accordingly, there is now considerable talk about blockading Cuba as a third course.

Senators GOLDWATER, TOWER, and THURMOND, among others, have been advocating some form of blockade—with the support of other American Republics, if possible; without them, if necessary. This is usually discussed at political rallies as if a blockade were a kind of military America's cup race in which we could strangle Castro without too much risk, and it usually wows the citizenry because it seems a cheap way to relieve their frustrations.

Maybe we will have to come to this in the end, but the thing is not that simple. A blockade is defined in international law as "an act of war carried out by the warships of a belligerent, detailed to prevent access to or departure from a defined part of the enemy's coast."

To be valid, a blockade must be effective and must be continuously maintained and impartially enforced against all vessels—allied and neutral, as well as Communist.

SOME QUESTIONS

This raises some interesting questions Senators GOLDWATER, TOWER, and THURMOND have so far failed to answer. Are they prepared to declare a formal state of war with Cuba, which is the only way to establish a legal blockade? If so, are they ready to halt the ships of our allies in the Atlantic and the hemisphere when those allies oppose both war and blockade?

Beyond this, what do we do if Soviet, British, or Norwegian ships carrying Soviet arms and technicians to Cuba refuse to recognize the blockade and continue their course to Havana? Do we blow them out of the water?

Or take the problem the other way round. The United States has many more missile bases in Turkey on the southern frontier of the Soviet Union than the Russians have in Cuba. If we blockade Cuba, what is to prevent the Russians from blockading the Black Sea and halting our arms en route to Turkey? And in such an event, would we recognize their blockade or shoot our way through?

In the present mood of frustration in the country, it does little good to talk about a unilateral blockad violating our treaty commitments—though our whole foreign policy rests on the sanctity of treaty commitments—but even Senators cannot be allowed to ignore the practical consequences of their proposals.

In this situation, if you say "A," you have to be prepared to say "B" and "C." This is what the "do something" Senators refuse to do. Senator THURMOND is at least consistent. He says "the longer the United States waits to expel communism from Cuba, the more difficult will be the job." He is, presumably, ready for war, and that at least is a clear policy.

But merely to make speeches about blockades, as if it were a kind of bargain-basement solution to the problem, is not fair. A blockade is intended to make the enemy surrender, even if it is merely a commercial or pacific blockade. If it does not do this, it fails to fulfill its purpose; if it does, it is an act of war.

CUBA AND THE CAMPAIGN

President Kennedy, it should be noted, has not ruled out blockade as a possible future course of action. He agrees that the new Soviet arms have made it more difficult, if not impossible, for the Cuban refugees to mount an effective invasion of Cuba, but that has been the situation for some time. The blaance of power has been tipped against the refugees, but all the new arms have not tipped it against the United States. If missiles were mounted there capable of hitting our cities, a wholly new situation would arise. But, despite rumors to the contrary, the administration has no evidence that this is true at the present time.

Meanwhile, the administration would like to keep Cuba out of the election campaign, which is about as sensible as trying to keep boys from kissing girls. The thing can't and shouldn't be done.

Cuba is a mess; it may be a dangerous mess, and the President has made his contribution to it. Therefore, it is a legitimate topic of election discussion. But it should be discussed seriously, and not emotionally. It was the "do something" Senators and the "do something" press that got us into the Spanish-American War, and one like that is enough.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 19, 1962]

CUBA: WATCHFUL WAITING

(By Walter Lippmann)

Although there are some who say that we are doing nothing about Cuba, the fact is that we are doing just about everything that can be done short of going to war. Besides the economic embargo we are keeping the island under "surveillance." We are watching every ship that comes to and goes from the island, and we are keeping a close watch on the loading and unloading of these ships. We have accurate and current records of building operations and the deployment of aircraft and tanks and artillery. There may be some doubt whether we have located every missile site in the vastness of the Soviet Union. But in Cuba, unless our cameras are failing us, we are completely informed.

As a result we are quite able to know about the development of anything like a Soviet missile base directed against the United States, and what may be more realistic, we are able to spot anything like an expeditionary force against Cuba's neighbors in the islands and in the Caribbean.

Our policy at the present is to kkeep ourselves completely informed, and to wait and see whether Castro and his Soviet helpers do any overt act against the United States or its neighbors. Beyond this, there is no serious action the United States can take to remove him which would not be an act of war. The United States is, of course, able easily to blockade Cuba. But stopping ships under threat of seizure or sinking would be an act of war not only against Cuba but against the Soviet Union. For we would be seizing or sinking Soviet ships.

The invasion of Cuba would, of course, be an act of war against Cuba. To be sure, the United States could easily win a war against Cuba. We could close the Cuban ports within a few hours and we could occupy very quickly Havana and a few big cities. The countryside might be another story.

But what we could not be sure of doing is to prevent the retaliatory moves to which we would have laid ourselves wide open, moves against Berlin or against Turkey, or against Iran.

For we would have acted on the rule that a possible threat against our security or our interests justifies us in going to war. We would be saying that because Cuba, which is only 90 miles way, is in the grip of an unfriendly European power, we have a right to blockade or occupy the island; we would be saying too that the Soviet Union has no such right to act against the American military positions in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, right on her own frontier.

Let us not fool ourselves. Such an argument does not wash. It would be rejected, probably even laughed at, not only by all neutrals, but by powerful elements among our closest allies. There are some who think foreign opinion does not matter. But when it comes to war, it means a great deal to the belligerent who is for him and who against him. We could go to war if Castro injures us. But we cannot go to war, even against Castro, because of what he may conceivably do in the future. We cannot wage a preventive war against Castro without establishing the rule that a preventive war is legitimate against our military position in Berlin, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Thailand, South Vietnam, Formosa, Okinawa, South Korea, and Japan.

It is true, of course, that the Soviet lodgment in Cuba is a gross violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Yet we cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine. Why not? The Monroe Doctrine declares that "any interposition" by a European power in this hemisphere would be "the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States." But, and this is the crucial point, the American claim for the isolation of the Western Hemisphere was coupled with a renunication of American interest in the Eastern Hemisphere: "In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do." This fundamental passage in Monroe's message is, of course, a restatement of the principle laid down by Washington in his Farewell Address: "Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or a very remote relation."

This basis of the Monroe Doctrine disappeared in the 20th century in the two World Wars, the Korean war and the cold war.

We cannot invoke the Monroe Doctrine without meeting the question of what we are doing all over Europe and Asia.

Our right to put Cuba under surveillance, and if necessary to blockade an invader, rests not on the Monroe Doctrine but on the elementary right of a people to insure its own security. For two centuries the British felt that way about the occupation of Belgium by an unfriendly power. The Russians felt that way about Turkey. This right can, however, be exercised only when there is a clear and present danger.

Castro is an insulting nuisance but he is not, and is not now remotely capable of becoming, a clear and present danger to the United States. So we must practice watchful waiting, and hold ourselves in readiness, never for a moment forgetting the vastly greater dangers elsewhere.

In a time of watchful waiting, Congress and the newspapers are compelled to remember that the President is conducting a delicate and dangerous operation, and that he is seriously interfered with if he is forced to dot every i and to cross every t in advance of a decision. The President should not be asked to say whether he will go to war. He should not be driven to say that he won't go to war.

A certain mystery and uncertainty are desirable, and will be deterrent to our adversaries.

[From the New York Daily News, Sept. 21, 1962]

WHY KID THE PEOPLE?

President James Monroe in 1823 posted a "Keep out" sign in the Western Hemisphere. The sign applied to all foreign powers planning to carve out future colonies or spheres of influence in this part of the world.

Soviet Russia has now taken over the island of Cuba, and is running it for the time being through a puppet named Fidel Castro.

Khrushchev obviously intends to use Cuba as a base from which to promote Castro-type revolutions in Caribbean and Latin American countries.

So President John F. Kennedy says Khrushchev can stay on in Cuba, but we'll get tough if he turns Cuba into a military threat to the United States, or tries to carry communism by force to other Western Hemisphere areas.

The Senate echoes this, in a resolution adopted yesterday—and adds that we'll work with the Organization of American States (many of whose members show little sign of wanting to work with us) and with freedom-loving Cubans to support their desire for self-determination.

Nothing is said about telling Khrushchev to get the hell off Cuba or else—which is what President Monroe would have told the Red Hitler long before now.

In short, Kennedy has watered down the Monroe Doctrine and Congress apparently will go along with him.

Why try to kid the people that this hasn't happened—or that communism isn't now consolidating a Western Hemisphere bridgehead without any real opposition in Washington?

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Zuckert: The Air Force Is Ready

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the U.S. Air Force, was principal speaker before the Air Force Association September 21, at Las Vegas, Nev.

His remarks are of such import to those concerned with the defense of America that I think all Members of the Congress should have an opportunity to read them.

Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert his speech for our information:

Members of the Air Force Association, this week we are celebrating the 15th anniversary of the U.S. Air Force. As a citizen, I join the American people in a salute to the men and women of the Air Force.

On behalf of the Air Force, I want to thank the Air Force Association for its many contributions to national defense through continuing support of the concept of aerospace power.

On this day, we commemorate with gratitude the work of the thousands of people who have served the Air Force, and particularly the great men who laid the foundation of the Air Force, such as Arnold, Lovett, Spaatz, Vandenberg, Symington, Twining, and White. Their vision and achievements are a source of both pride and inspiration.

It is what they and hundreds of others have done in the past that makes the Air Force what it is today. What we do today will determine what the Air Force is in the future.

I speak to you today as colleagues—colleagues sharing dedication to the defense of the Nation; sharing interest in the Air Force; and sharing a realistic perspective on the world and the times in which we live.

I am proud of the Air Force, proud of its goals, its present capabilities, and its past accomplishments. And I am proud of the fact that I am privileged to have been associated with the Air Force since its start as a separate service.

The story of Air Force achievements goes back at least to the days of World War II when the role of airpower was decisely demonstrated.

Invasion of the Continent, the greatest combined operation ever undertaken was preceded by relentless, centrally controlled attacks against Germany's sinews of war.

By D-day, our domination of the air was so complete that General Eisenhower was able to tell embarking soldiers: "If you see any planes, don't worry—they're ours," and when the landings came, the attack on communications had been so effective that the Germans couldn't bring up reinforcements except by foot or bicycle.

Gen. George Patton said that the support provided to him by 19th TAC was the best example of the combined use of air and ground troops that he had ever witnessed.

In the Pacific the story was the same.

The role of the B–29 in ending the Japanese war prompted Gen. Jimmy Doolittle, first president of Air Force Association, to say to a Senate committee: "The Navy had the transport to make the invasion of Japan possible; the ground forces had the power to make it successful, and the B–29 made it unnecessary."

Since World War II, our strategic airpower has been the greatest single factor in deterring another world conflict and keeping the free world free.

The Air Force's ability to achieve this highest national objective grew from the foresight of pioneers like Hap Arnold and Tooey Spaatz, who even before Pearl Harbor, began the effort to build the 10,000-mile B–36.

The soundness of their vision was confirmed by Winston Churchill, when he said: "It is certain that Europe would have been communized like Czechoslovakia, and London under bombardment some time ago, but for the deterrent of the atomic bomb in the hands of the United States."

In the light of results, the Air Force can say that we have put first things first.

Under the strategic umbrella, it was possible to carry out other vital missions. You are familiar with the Berlin airlift and our role in Korea.

After Korea, in 1954, we received a "green light" to develop ballistic missiles in the shortest possible time. And today, we have a force of more than 100 operational ICBM's and are far along in programs that will give us a total of more than 1,000.

The ballistic missile program is one of the greatest undertakings in America's history—enormous in size, complexity and deterrent value. We are proud of what has been accomplished thus far. We are on schedule—we intend to keep on schedule—but a great deal remains to be done. The completion and efficient operation of our ICBM's remains a matter of the highest priority.

It is impossible to mention all of the innumerable other accomplishments that deserve recognition, but I must cite just one more. In cooperation with NASA and the Navy, we have pioneered with the X–15 on the edges of space at speeds and altitudes undreamed of a few years ago.

But all this is where we have been. I want to be read loud and clear as to where we are today. The Air Force is strong, and it is ready.

The Air Force carries an obviously heavy responsibility under the decision of this Nation to maintain a military establishment for the purpose of preventing war.

Our primary role is the maintenance of the strategic deterrent. It is strength is growing.

The combination of strategic systems, one manned, one unmanned, assures continuing control of the action—strike, reconnaissance and evaluation, and restrike. The strategic deterrent is the bulwark of the Nation's war-preventive policy.

During the past year, we have taken major steps to improve our limited war capability. We are increasing our tactical fighter strength by five wings. We have contracted for fighter and reconnaissance versions of the McDonnell F–4H, to be designated the F–4C for the Air Force. We have set up the Special Air Warfare Center at Eglin to develop tactics and techniques for aerial counterinsurgency operations and to provide, in its 1st Air Commando Group, an Air Force capability in this increasingly important mode of warfare.

The professionalism of tactical units of the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve was demonstrated in last year's mobilization of 27,000 members of those forces. We moved more than 200 jet fighters of the Guard to Europe without accident.

A qualitative and quantitative upgrading of close air support of ground forces is the order of the day in the Air Force. Perhaps I should say also an updating, because the Army has new requirements and is also making imaginative changes in concepts. General LeMay and I are determined that the Air Force will respond totally, with promptness, precision, and plenty.

In recognition of the ground-air nature of the limited war threat, a new command, STRICOM, has been established under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Air Force is concentrating immense power in this combined force, for air superiority and interdiction, for close ground support, and for rapid air movement of the forces. STRICOM will become the testing ground for the customer-producer approach in developing air-ground cooperation.

Mobility of the new, quick-strike, forces is a primary requirement of the broadened deterrent. There has been substantial improvement in airlift capability. Just one example: We delivered troops nonstop from Fort Lewis, Wash., to Frankfurt, Germany, in 9 hours 10 minutes in an impressive demonstration of rapid mobility.

Defense of the North American Continent against attack through or from the air is an integral part of deterrence. That defense, we believe, is better than ever before.

One thing more. The Air Force plays an important role in the peace offensive. We support the United Nations in the Congo, Palestine, and New Guinea, and we carried relief supplies to earthquake victims in Morocco, Chile, and Iran.

It is pleasant to talk about the great deeds of the past and satisfying to talk about our current strength and readiness. But, unlike the GAR which commemorated its glorious past, the Air Force Association is dedicated to the development of aerospace power for the future.

You can be sure of this. Our job ahead will be tougher. It will be different in detail but it will continue to involve primarily the investment of imagination and hard work in providing national defense through aerospace power. The environment in which we work is one in which the problems of national life and national leadership seem to grow at a rate faster even than the expansion of the medium of airpower into the medium of aerospace power.

For one thing, we have to take into account the totality of problems confronting this Nation as the leader of the free world. The magnitude and complexity of all the problems facing our Government—political, diplomatic, social, and economic—necessarily form the environment in which we administer that portion of the national defense for which the Air Force is responsible.

The President, in whom is vested the Executive power of our Government and who

is the Commander in Chief of its military forces, carries the total burden of these problems. In the concert of his responsibilities, the Air Force and the other services have dual parts: One, the highest order of performance in their own roles, and, two, precise responsiveness to the demands of the whole.

The job of the service Secretary is rigorously dual. He is both the agent of the President and the civilian spokesman of the service he heads. In our Government, it should not be and cannot be otherwise.

This is the framework in which we live and work. It makes a sound structure. I serve in it with pride and all the dedication of which I am capable. Its discipline is fully shared and accepted by those who work with me, both in uniform and out.

I speak of these things with confidence in your understanding of them. I am equally sure of your appreciation with me of the integrity, steadfastness, and constructive leadership of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Gen. Curtis LeMay.

I speak with confidence because I know of your devotion to the cause of national security and the role of aerospace power in the defense of the Nation. You are properly the advocates of aerospace power and your competence and capability are the measure of its effectiveness in preserving freedom.

The background against which we provide the aerospace power necessary to support national policies is dominated by what we call the cold war.

We in the Defense Establishment naturally feel the effects of the national effort to balance objectives, to solve the many tough problems, and make the difficult necessary choices.

The defense problems are difficult problems and the solutions are not findable in crystal-clear form. The right answers do not inevitably rise to the top. The interrelationships between the many judgments and decisions, the effects of unknowns dealing with future events or enemy intentions and capabilities, make unbelievably difficult the job of the Commander in Chief and the Secretary of Defense.

In general, the Air Force has received the resources and the backing which assure aerospace forces of great strength consistent with our objectives. That is what has enabled us to build the most powerful Air Force in the world. That is what makes our research and development program the largest and most diversified in our history.

Naturally, not all Air Force programs have received the degree of support sought for them at every level. This has been true within the Air Force as well as between the Air Force and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. I say that this is "naturally" the case because at each level it is essential to make decisions in a broader context and to balance very complex factors and considerations that do not have to be dealt with at the lower level.

In this regard, I would like to emphasize two points. First, we in the Air Force do not claim to have an infallible or total view. Second, General LeMay and I are satisfied that the machinery within the Department of Defense for presenting service views is working well, and continues to promote a full understanding of the issues by those responsible for the decisions. We work within that framework as we expect our subordinates to work within the Air Force organization.

I try to view these things from the standpoint of a practical administrator. It seems to me there is no alternative to a tightly managed, closely coordinated, highly disciplined defense establishment if the American people are to maintain the massive expenditure for national security that now seems inevitable for as far ahead in years as we can see.

Improvement and progress, which means change, will be continuous. This applies not only to combat operational capabilities but also to the management of resources. As I said, the job will be tougher.

Secretary McNamara said the President's instructions to him were, first, to develop the force structure necessary to our military requirements, and second, to do it at the lowest possible cost. The meaning is clear. Defense contracting policies and procedures necessarily will reflect the tighter controls over dollars imposed by the long-term prospect of preparedness.

To men in service, this means greater demands of administrative competence, and correspondingly greater opportunity.

To those of you in industry, this presents a challenge to management all along the line.

In every direction, preparedness becomes more costly. That is why we are striving to avoid waste and make maximum use of resources—to make 1 dollar or 1 plane go farther.

As I mentioned earlier support of Army ground operations is an area of qualitative and quantitative upgrading already underway. We recognize that the Army has a pressing demand for increased mobility and quick concentration of firepower, a need to get its trucks and mechanized cavalry off the ground. We intend to meet that need through continued expansion and improvement of our tactical air and troop carrier forces.

The Air Force has built an unprecedented and, I believe, unreproducible, resource—in terms of experience, doctrine, techniques, and equipment—for the command, control, and efficient exploitation of airpower. This resource must be applied to the Army requirements with the least possible duplication. The entire structure for development, procurement, supply, and employment of aerospace power has been built. Commonsense and the Nation's interest compel its full use.

We need, and welcome, competition of ideas for better support of ground operations.

Imagination is subject to stimuli of many kinds. Advancing military technology, new requirements of limited war, more and smarter people on the job, and yes, a healthy degree of interservice rivalry are among them. There will be and should be, an area of continuing discussion with respect to "who does what" in the direct support mission. I mean the searching type of analysis which Mr. McNamara insists upon. We can stand such review better than we can stand either insufficient support for the Army or dilution of capability.

Progress in Army support capability will encompass development of the new breed of aircraft designed for operation from unprepared fields. Both combat and support craft are involved.

The future seems to hold pressing requirements for the flexibility which is attainable with manned strategic systems. The potentials can be studied with the XB–70 developmental aircraft, scheduled to be test flown this year.

Continuing advance in guidance and propulsion technology, as well as in nuclear weaponry, should permit improvement in missile systems.

A very near future need, one that has been under study for many years, is a long-range manned interceptor for air defense. The range, speed, and other performance characteristics desired in such a plane would put it at the very limits of today's technology. We are watching new developments closely to see if a practical and effective solution can be found.

Paramount, of course, in the future of the Air Force, is space. The interest of the free nations in freedom in space was reflected in President Kennedy's comment on the first orbital flight of an American astronaut. In his characteristically straightforward manner—and we don't mind his using marine terminology—the President said space is "the new ocean, and I believe the United States must sail on it and be in a position second to none."

It seems to me his description covers two very important lessons for those of us concerned with defense. The first is that space is not only the pathway to other planets, but is also the medium of access to all of the earth. An ICBM, for example, traverses space on a ballistic trajectory which intersects the earth's surface at a targeted point.

The second lesson is that space as a new medium of activity for man is also a medium in which we must look to our defenses.

I believe the whole military effort in space reflects these lessons. As the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell Gilpatric, said recently, "We will take whatever steps are necessary to defend ourselves and our allies * * * in accordance with the inalienable right of self defense confirmed in the United Nations Charter."

The United States, in keeping with our motivations in freedom and peace, has embarked upon a space program aimed at peace building, constructive exploitation of space—second to none.

In the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Nation has mobilized an effort unprecedented in history. NASA is making progress, because it has imaginative leadership, a competent staff, extensive facilities, and wholehearted support from all elements of industry and government which can contribute, especially the Air Force.

In addition to our contribution to the success of the NASA program, the Air Force is required by its own mission to put its energies into a different kind of space effort. We are reaching a clearer definition of that mission as it relates to space.

The Air Force, under its assigned mission is concerned with preparations for dealing with threats to the security of the free world that might evolve through the use of space.

This is the reason for our growing research and development budget for space projects in the Department of Defense. The bulk of it is in the Air Force.

We realize that space is an environment, not a project. The development of devices which have to work in space, because of their newness, their cost, and their importance, must be decided upon on the basis of the most thorough scientific and technical analysis, the soundest military judgment, and the broadest possible consideration of national interest.

The United States is dedicated as a matter of national policy to the peaceful exploitation of the space medium. The United States does not intend to extend the arms race into space.

We are, however, taking the step to enable us to protect ourselves in the event the Soviets or any other nation were to undertake missions in space that would endanger our security.

As we look into the future, the things we will have to do to be able to protect ourselves and preserve freedom in space seem not too different from many traditional military missions of scouting, and standing alert. This means launch vehicles—ready to go on short notice.

Protection certainly calls for the capability of observing what goes on in space, and the ability to seek out and investigate vehicles which may appear hostile. We must be able to protect our own vehicles in space.

Such missions, of course, call for adequate command, control, communications, weather, and related support capabilities, including the ability of moving from earth to orbital stage as necessary, and operating freely in the orbital stage.

The dual-vehicle orbital experiment of the Soviets, when coupled with their previous claims, seems to indicate that the need for protection against possible threats to our security will be in the near orbital stage of space, rather than farther out. One possible

instrument of security that might be useful at this level in space may be found in extending the X–15 and X–20 technology, leading to craft which could operate from surface to orbit and back, and perform defense missions at the edge of the atmosphere. Another might be the permanently manned orbital space station designed for military purposes. Progress toward utilization of such a vehicle for security and protection would be speeded by capitalizing upon the NASA program to acquire knowledge and competence in manned orbital flight.

All of the hardware used in carrying out these responsibilities must meet military standards of maintenance, reliability, cost effectiveness and repetitive use. This is why we work toward reusable, or less expensive mechanisms for getting into space, whether by use of recoverable first stage boosters or by employment of airborne launch platforms.

We have learned a great deal from the work we have done on space projects in the past and we are applying those lessons to the future. The necessity for a standardized workhorse launch-vehicle has been recognized by the Secretary of Defense and the Air Force. That is why the Titan III project was recently approved and we are giving it our wholehearted support. It will cost the American taxpayer about a billion dollars to develop this vehicle. The Titan III represents an important step forward in focusing rather than spreading our efforts.

We need to take the same approach in other areas of our space work. We must guard against spreading our brains and dollars too thin.

These are the principles on which Air Force space programs must be based: (a) Ample preparation to utilize the space medium; (b) ample preparation to defend ourselves in case others choose to extend the threat of aggression to outer space; (c) concentration on the really important tasks, including today's job and not just tomorrow's; and finally (d) an organizationally disciplined space program—well planned and specific—which fits into overall national plans and objectives.

We in America have no choice but to extend our defenses as far as they need to be extended to save freedom on earth.

Air Force responsibilities continue heavy as the danger to freedom persists. The celebration of this anniversary should be no more, and could be no greater, than a rededication to the ideal and the service of the people of the United States in their search for peace in freedom with justice.

U.N.: Instrument of Peace or Debating Society?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the United Nations—now in session—faces serious decisions that will determine whether it will be, first, a real instrument of peace, or, second, a debating society.

Recently the Christian Science Monitor published a thoughtful editorial, first, reflecting the realistic appraisal of Secretary General U Thant toward the responsibilities of the United Nations; and, second, a clarifying definition and discussion of the fundamental purposes of the United Nations.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 19, 1962]

U THANT'S DECISION

The most inspiring fact in today's world is the yearning of all peoples for peace. The most dispiriting fact is the strain of violence in the human mind which seeks to thwart it. This is the millennial problem of war and peace. When it comes to cases, the general desire for good will splits on a conflict of specific aims.

U Thant has attacked this gap in a striking fashion.

When asked whether he would accept a full term as Secretary-General of the United Nations, he did not say yes. He asked a question: What kind of U.N.?

There are two kinds, he said. One is what the Russians now request: a forum for debate. The other is "an organic thing" that will take action for peace. He is of the second school.

Before he decides whether the U.N. is the kind he can serve, U Thant wants to know: Will it be an effective force for peace? Will the Congo problem be brought to an early settlement? Will the U.N. peace forces in Africa and the Middle East be financed? Can the Secretary-General be a conciliator of differences between the two giants?

It might be considered rash for an individual to lay down conditions to the assembly of nations. But this wasn't U Thant's motive. Like his predecessor Dag Hammarskjold, the Burmese Secretary-General serves an ideal far larger than himself.

He has watched the U.N. evolving past the concept of a debating society, around the veto, into forms of action which stem from the Secretariat itself. His hope is that of Hammarskjold: that an impersonal, strictly nonnational group of men dedicated to the broadest ideas of the charter can take positive measures to adjust national differences.

He wants, in other words, to work in that terrible gap which divides the unselfed yearning of mankind for peace from the detailed conflicts of interest and ideology which frustrate it.

His manner and words have been conciliatory toward the Communists in spite of their pressures on the non-Communist world. But his actions have been firm in opopsition to them. This is why the Communists will not pay their financial assessments for the U.N. peace forces. This is the assurance that he does not mean surrender by the West when he says conciliation.

We wish U Thant well in his undertaking. We will not always agree with him because we will urge the cause of freedom with the utmost vigor. We believe this to be primary to all else. But this very type of support will make it possible for him to pursue his task of building bridges without sacrificing principles.

Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

SPEECH
OF
HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11378 to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, in order to permit donations of surplus personal property to schools for the mentally retarded, schools for the physically handicapped, educational radio and television stations, and public libraries.

As a member of the Donable Property Subcommittee and of the Government Operations Committee, I also introduced a similar bill, H.R. 11890, indicating my full support for this much needed legislation.

The organizations and institutions, mentioned above, have done a commendable job and certainly deserve to be included in the definition of educational institutions in the broad sense of the word.

I have seen in my own congressional district the fine work being done by the National Association for Retarded Children and its very capable president, Vincent J. Fitzpatrick. Montgomery County has also pioneered in the development of the Montgomery County School for the Physically Handicapped, which now serves as a model throughout our Nation. Our public libraries also deserve recognition under this program.

This bill should have the unanimous endorsement of every Member of Congress who is interested in these humanitarian endeavors.

How to Promote Tourist Travel to America: We Need To Be Realistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, our program of encouraging tourism from abroad is off to a good start, but it needs realistic appraisal and constructive criticism in order to improve it. That is just what is offered by Mr. Selden Menefee, a California editor, in his widely read column "Just for the Record," published in the San Juan Record, of Fair Oaks, Calif.

I was coauthor of the bill, S. 610, which the Congress passed last year—Public Law 87–63—setting up the U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce. It is a good program.

Mr. Menefee, a seasoned traveler and astute observer, comments on the Travel Service's advertising in Europe. I ask unanimous consent that his column from the San Juan Record, Fair Oaks, Calif., September 20, 1962, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUST FOR THE RECORD—AMERICA SHOULD GET READY FOR TOURISTS

(By Selden Menefee)

On Sunday, April 8, when I was on a boat-train from London to Dover, England, I picked up a copy of the London Sunday Times, that someone had left on a seat across from me. I opened it, and there spread across the top of page 5 was a familiar sight—a picture of a horseman on a rocky hill cov-

ered with dry grass, high above a river that stretched out in the distance. I knew I had been there.

I looked for the caption. Sure enough, it read, "This is the 1,270-mile Columbia River in Oregon. You can fish for trout and salmon here. All you need is a license that costs 7/2."

Below the picture, the full-page ad was headed: "What to see in the U.S.A.—if you've only got 3 weeks * * * for 35 pounds a week you can see New York, Washington, San Francisco. You can visit Niagra Falls, see the Rockies from the glass-domed car of a luxurious train, spend a week on a ranch, have more fun than a barrel of monkeys."

That would be quite a trick, I thought, on $98 a week—$14 a day per person, including travel across the West in the Zephyr, no less, and a week on a dude ranch, of all things.

Fascinated, I read on: "Your itinerary will read like a chapter out of Jack London. Spirit Lake, Wizard Island, Sawtooth Mountains, Dagger Flats * * *. In the Pacific Northwest see skyscraping stands of ponderosa pine, sequoia" (oops, somebody slipped here). "In California's Yosemite Park there is a waterfall nine times higher than Niagara * * * you can drive your car right through a giant redwood tree * * *. Expenses for a party of four traveling by car come to less than 4 pounds per day." (That's under $12.)

The writer of this ad really went overboard. You will sleep, he promised, "at Indian trading posts, sumptuous motels with outdoor swimming pools, desert oasis, ghost towns in the Gold Rush Country * * *. The towns you will see, Passamaquoddy, Big Bone Lick, Truth or Consequences, Kalamazoo, Buzzard's Bay, Basking Ridge, Steamboat Springs, Wildhorse.

Wow! I've never heard of Basking Ridge meself.

FUROR CREATED

The U.S. Travel Service, which ran the ad, really kicked up a fuss with its claim that a British visitor could travel and live and see such things for only $98 a week. Two London reporters tried it later, and both failed to make it. The London Daily Mail man said "I don't say it can't be done, but I didn't do it and I hope you won't try it."

I can see what he meant. You'd have to stay in drab hotels like the Milner chain and travel the cheapest possible way to make it—and if you did this you wouldn't see many of the color spots described in the ad.

The biggest thing that has happened to encourage tourism here is the special offer by the Greyhound Bus Co. of a 99-day travel pass for $99. I met one English woman on a bus who had crisscrossed this country and had a wonderful time for 3 months on a $99 ticket. On H.M.S. *Canberra* I met an Australian insurance man who was traveling with a family of seven, around the world, and had his tickets all bought for 3 months of Greyhound travel in America.

I tried to buy one of these ducats myself in Washington, for it would have been little more than the cost of a one-way Greyhound ticket to Sacramento. It was there I learned that the passes can only be purchased abroad, by someone with a valid foreign passport.

RAIL PASSES NEEDED

Our moribund railroads should offer similar passes, as the British railways do, to fill their passenger cars. Hotels and motels should also offer special rates for foreign tourists. We could do a lot more than we have along such lines.

The U.S. Travel Service reports that European tourist travel to America was up 21 percent in the first quarter of this year, compared to last year. French tourists increased 47 percent over last year.

Present emphasis in U.S. Travel Service advertising is on the beauties of America, rather than on low cost. But the shock treatment on costs with which Volt Gilmore launched the campaign for tourists was perhaps a good thing. At least the controversy focused attention on the possibility of traveling over America at a reasonable cost.

Everywhere I have been in the world these past 2 years, people have said to me, "I'd love to visit America, if I only had the money." It does take dough to cross an ocean and see a country this big.

The present administration has removed one great stupid barrier that discouraged travel up to a year or so ago—the cumbersome and insulting visa applications that were inflicted on our friends abroad whenever they wanted to come here.

Now if we can work out more special deals—to trim costs—like the low-cost student ships the Holland-American Line runs across the Atlantic, the Greyhound tourist pass, and special low, low rates, particularly in off-seasons—in hotels and resorts—travel from abroad will really begin to mushroom.

We never tried very hard before to get tourists to come here. So we have a lot to learn.

BEAUTY TOO

And while I'm on this, I say we should speed up our drive to beautify our cities. After rebuilt, supermodern Rotterdam, or colorful Paris, Geneva, or Venice, or the slum-free, spotless cities of Scandinavia—New York, Jersey City, Trenton, Chicago, and downtown Los Angeles, for example, looks pretty ugly.

So did downtown Sacramento a few years ago. The new Capitol Mall has already changed the whole appearance of the city.

These are some of the things we need to press for, if we want foreign tourists to see us at our best and not lose their image of us as a dynamic, young nation.

Comments on Drug Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, thalidomide, side effects, experimental drugs, drug clearance system, Federal Food and Drug Administration, drug control—these are just a few of the currents in recent headline stories which have underscored an aroused public's vital concern over effective regulation of the never-ending spawning of new wonder drugs.

Are there limitations in present drug regulations? Are further controls absolutely required? What are the issues at stake in imposing further Government regulations? Are drugs presently overpriced or oversold? Does drug marketing itself require regulation? These are just a few of the difficult questions which must be recognized and understood before final judgment may be passed upon the broad issues.

In my consideration of this problem I have found the following editorial accounts particularly useful as background reading. Under previous consent of the House, I place these articles in the RECORD, trusting that my colleagues and others will find them as valuable as I have:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Aug. 12, 1962]

PRESSURES RISE FOR DRUG CONTROL—PATH FOR NEW LEGISLATION EASED BY THE THALIDOMIDE EXAMPLE

(By Marjorie Hunter)

A drug blamed for the deformities of thousands of babies abroad has done what men in high public office have tried but failed to do: It has made Americans demand stronger drug laws.

Millions of words of testimony, public pleas by a handful of Senators and Representatives, repeated urgings by President Kennedy—all of this fell on deaf ears in recent years.

And then came thalidomide.

When word reached the United States last spring that many thousands of babies had been born deformed in Germany and elsewhere abroad, apparently because their mothers had taken thalidomide, few Americans paid much attention.

TESTING ROUSES CONCERN

But, when it was disclosed this summer that the drug had been used experimentally on thousands of Americans, the Nation expressed concern about the use of humans in testing unproved drugs.

The testing of drugs on humans is necessary. Even proponents of tighter drug laws agree to that. It is important to test drugs on animals—mice, rats, rabbits, guinea pigs—but they don't supply all the answers. What might be safely used on an animal may be unsafe for a human. And reactions vary from human to human.

No drug is entirely free of unwanted side effects. Even aspirin has undesired effects on a few people.

Before any drug reaches the American market, it must first be tried out on many humans. The law requires a manufacturer to submit proof of its effects on humans to the Food and Drug Administration before a drug is cleared for use.

To obtain such proof, a manufacturer distributes his drugs to doctors or other medical investigators to try out on patients. There is no limitation on the number of doctors or patients involved in such human clinical trials.

HUMAN TESTING GROUNDS

Even after the Government has cleared a new drug for sale, humans still are, in effect, guinea pigs; there have been instances in which a drug, already widely distributed over prescription counters, has been found to produce unwanted side effects in some people.

One such case showed up this spring. Mer-29 was cleared for sale in June 1960, as a drug to retard formation of cholesterol. After reports that some persons taking the drug had suffered eye cataracts or loss of hair, Mer-29 was taken off the market.

Also removed from the market last spring under FDA orders was, Monase, which had been used for a year in the treatment of depressed patients. The manufacturer reported that seven users of the compound had contracted acute blood disease.

Still on the market, but under close scrutiny, is an oral contraceptive pill. Norway withdrew the pill from the market Monday after reports in the British medical journal that four women taking Enovid had suffered blood clots. This week, the Food and Drug Administration ruled that there is insufficient evidence linking Enovid to blood clots.

Until all these disclosures were made recently, prospects for any strong drug legislation or drastic revision of FDA regulations this year appeared dim.

Today, there is action on many fronts—the White House, the Congress, the drug industry and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

President Kennedy has demanded that Congress tighten up the drug laws and Members of Congress are busily patching up the loopholes in the pending legislation. The drug industry has set up a committee on drug safety. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has issued proposed regulations to give the Government more control over testing of drugs on humans.

These proposed regulations—not the legislation under consideration—would have the most direct effect on warding off future thalidomide-type scares.

One proposal would require animal testing before drugs are tried out on any humans. Another would require that the Government be notified when testing on humans begins and also on progress of the test programs. Another would permit the Government to withdraw a test drug if there was doubt of its safety. Another provision would provide that the persons conducting tests on humans must be clearly qualified.

These regulations cannot be made effective immediately. The law requires them to be on file for 60 days for public reactions. After that, they can be made final or, quite possibly, amended.

Legislative changes being considered by Congress would largely affect drugs already cleared for sale. There is every indication that Congress, with the backing of President Kennedy, will authorize the Government to pull drugs off the market when new experience indicates substantial doubt as to their safety. The present law requires the Government to prove that a drug is unsafe before sales are halted.

It is likely, too, that Congress will require that drugs be proved effective before sale; that additional time will be given the Government to study new drug applications; that more extensive factory inspections will be allowed; that drug labels will be required to carry, in prominent type, the official (generic) name of a drug, as well as its trade name.

Stronger controls over advertising contents and distribution of materials to doctors to alert them of possible side effects of a drug also will probably be passed. And it is likely that all antibiotics will be made subject to batch-by-batch testing.

REGISTRATION PROVISION

It also has been proposed that the Government license all drug manufacturers, but it is more likely that Congress will require them merely to register.

Some of these proposals—both regulatory and legislative—are certain to run into opposition. The drug industry agrees that new drug legislation is needed, but it opposes some aspects of legislation now pending.

For instance, drug leaders say they favor "in principle" proposals that drugs be proven to be effective before sale, that the factory inspection system be tightened up and that drugs be taken off the market when found to be unsafe.

But they object to certain details. They think only "substantial proof" of a drug's effectiveness should be required. They object to factory inspections that would pry into a firm's financial status or secret formulas. They feel there should be "substantial evidence" before a drug is taken off the market as unsafe.

They also object to the proposal that a drug be kept off the market until there has been affirmative clearance by the Government. Drugs now are automatically cleared, if the Government is silent.

INDUSTRY WARNING

Some drug industry leaders have given cautious approval to the FDA regulations dealing with testing new drugs. But they have warned against any steps that might impede the advancement of healing by blocking introduction of new drugs.

"In the current emotional atmosphere we must keep in mind that absolute safety can never be achieved—not by legislation or regulation or anything else. * * * The risks and rewards of pharmaceutical research go hand in hand and only an unreasonable person would hold out the expectation of new medical discoveries without pointing out the inherent difficulties of the search for these drugs."

[From the Wall Street Journal]

REGULATING DRUGS: NEW FEDERAL RULES NO CURE-ALL FOR SAFETY COMPLICATIONS

(By Herbert G. Lawson)

The Food and Drug Administration plans to put into effect shortly a series of new rules, the chief result of which will be to bring the agency into testing of new drugs at an earlier stage.

JUSTIFYING NEW CURBS

Ironically, some of the most important new drug control measures now proposed seem to have nothing to do with the issues of the thalidomide case. Yet the President, Congress, and the FDA are pointing to thalidomide in justifying requests for stiffer regulations.

Drug company scientists note that the FDA had ample power, which it used, to keep thalidomide off the U.S. market. Furthermore, they assert, the FDA, without any new grants of legislative or administrative authority, could set new standards for drug tests.

"If the FDA wanted to, it could make us test every new drug on a pregnant camel without any changes in present rules," comments one industry official with slight exaggeration. Thorough testing on pregnant animals has been one frequent suggestion from pharmacologists in the aftermath of thalidomide. Actually, several major drugmakers have already begun using such tests.

In Congress last week, the Senate restored to the watered-down drug control bill a section that would grant significant new authority to the FDA. The restored section would give the agency the right to pass on effectiveness or medical efficacy of new drugs. The FDA now rules only on safety, on the theory that only practicing physicians can determine a drug's usefulness.

THE MARKETING PROBLEM

Another criticism of new drug proposals, perhaps more serious, is being leveled by some scientists. Their criticisms suggest that the commotion in Washington, while reassuring the public and satisfying election year pressures, will do little for the real problem.

That problem, these scientists argue, stems from the nature of present drug marketing rather than drug testing. And its solution, they say, is far from being a simple matter of arming the FDA with new regulatory weapons. It will require thoughtful analysis and unusual voluntary cooperation from the industry, doctors, the Government, and the public.

According to this view, thalidomide was a freak occurrence for which no one is to blame. Its apparent tendency to cause birth defects was totally unexpected by pharmacologists and could not be forecast from tests considered by the Government and industry. Thus, in this sense, thalidomide is relatively unimportant in determining any real deficiences in the U.S. system for new drug introduction.

More important are such drugs as Mer-29, another Merrell drug designed to lower cholesterol levels of heart patients, which was withdrawn from the market recently due to suspected side effects; several drugs used to combat mental depression which were removed from the market because they possibly caused blood diseases; and a host of antibiotics, tranquilizers, and other medicines which show possible dangers, but thus far have remained on sale, either because the evidence of danger is insufficient or because the drugs are very valuable despite side effects.

All these drugs received the benefit of animal and clinical tests that are probably as thorough as any in the world. The FDA cleared them for sale, thus endorsing their safety. Only after massive marketing campaigns which quickly introduced the drugs to many thousands of patients did side effects begin to appear.

REASONS FOR SPEED

Because of the large numbers of patients exposed concurrently to new drugs, serious side effects that occur are likely to be widespread before doctors suspect something is wrong. This was certainly true of thalidomide in Europe. Yet manufacturers feel they must market new drugs with great speed.

It is pointed out that new drug patients give a manufacturer no security in this age of synthetic chemistry. After an important new drug is marketed, chemists in competitors' laboratories, within months or a few years, will synthesize a drug with a slight molecular difference but with similar effects. This second drug can then be patented. The imitator's drug is quickly brought to market, often benefiting from knowledge obtained in tests of the original drug.

In such a situation, the manufacturer of the original drug is compelled to use mass marketing techniques as soon as his drug is cleared. The company blankets the Nation with maximum advertising in medical journals, promotion at medical meetings, and an army of detail men who sell the doctors personally.

What is wrong with a fast marketing campaign? "It means," says Dr. Modell, "that a huge amount of new drugs can be thrown into the hands of doctors inexperienced in their use."

DRUG PRICES MIGHT RISE

More extensive clinical trials before FDA clearance could diagnose more drug dangers. But this is an expensive, and at some point impractical, approach. Sterling Drug, Inc., for example, estimates that already each new drug that reaches the market costs the company an average of $5 million in development expense, including costs of drugs that fail to pass the tests. To increase clinical trial fivefold or tenfold would mean a significant increase in the price the public pays for drugs. And it would still not disclose side effects of very rare incidence.

The other solution is for a drug to be marketed more slowly in cooperation with recognized medical authorities in the field in which the drug is used. Then clinical experience would gradually accumulate and side effects would be noted at the earliest possible moment. But this means a drug company would give competitors a better chance to introduce and establish similar drugs. "Drug firms are in a fix because they have to get their investment back quickly before the competition steps in," says Dr. Modell.

The drug companies are not solely responsible for this dilemma, says Dr. William Spring, secretary of the American Medical Association's Council on Drugs. He argues that doctors are often eager to prescribe new drugs liberally. He adds that physicians must learn to use them cautiously until their margins of safety are established by long practice.

The solution to this marketing dilemma will not be an easy one. Certainly it will require restraint on the part of manufacturers eager to capitalize on significant drug discoveries. Doctors may have to restrain a natural temptation to seize upon new drugs that promise the latest medical miracle.

And the public may have to learn to accept a certain risk as the price of medical progress.

The question remains whether this attitude of restraint needed from so many people—industry, medicine, and the public—can be legislated. The only certain thing is that the Government, rightly or wrongly, is going to try.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times]

THE DRUG BILL'S PRINCIPLE

Sometimes it is easy to confuse "caveat emptor," which is usually translated, "let the buyer beware," with the unrelated battle cry "laissez faire," which means loosely, "let us go it alone"—that is, without Government interference.

The confusion was never greater than in the case of the drug bill, a version of which was finally passed by the Senate a couple of days ago. This bill, or a version of it, still has to be considered by the House. As it was blessed by the Senate unanimously, it establishes, or rather extends, an old principle, one which was accepted long before private enterprise was threatened at every turn by the liberal-socialists.

The principle is that the Government exists to prevent violence and fraud. The Pure Food and Drug Act of the early part of this century accepted the principle that no one could claim the privilege in a free market to sell a food product or a drug which could endanger the lives or health of the citizens of the United States. Not very many citizens in that freewheeling time regarded this law as an infringement of the legitimate rights of private enterprisers.

Since then the notion that the buyer's innocence makes him a legitimate victim of the slick pitchman has been modified even more. The Pure Food and Drug Act protected him from certain kinds of violence (threats to his life and health); then the Federal Trade Commission was given a limited authority to protect him from fraud—from false representations of the efficacy of pills and nostrums. There have been recent cases in which the FTC has ordered manufacturers to stop advertising nonexistent virtues of their alleged remedies.

Generally speaking, the new drug bill would only extend the powers already exercised by the Government. The Food and Drug Administration would be authorized to pass on the effectiveness of a drug before it could be placed on the market. (It ought to be pointed out that the new law would not make it any harder to sell in the American market such a drug as thalidomide; that drug was never approved for sale in this country and sale was legitimately suspended while the Food and Drug Administration was determining whether it was a threat to health and life, which the Administration did in fact find.)

The new law would not necessarily ban the sale of a harmless pain reliever because its manufacturer or peddler represented it as a cure for cancer, but its makers and sellers would have to purvey it as what it was, modifying their claims.

Most of the controversy during the hearing on the bill arose from the radical proposals of such Senators as ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. They welcomed the opportunity to make a virtue of price fixing. Senator KEFAUVER contended that the price of the blessed drugs with a proved power over pain and disease is too high. Most of these drugs in their varieties are developed in the laboratories of private drug companies, and these companies naturally seek to recover the costs of their research in the prices they charge for their products. Senator KEFAUVER would solve this problem of cost by compelling the drug companies to license the patents for their discoveries to anybody who wanted to make them.

The demagogic appeal of this proposal is apparent. But the Senate rose above the temptation and rejected the Kefauver amendment 2 to 1.

As it stands the bill ought to appeal, at least in principle, to the House, which has in this Congress shown wisdom at least equal to that of the more august Senators.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

OVERDUE SAFEGUARDS

(By Josephine Ripley)

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER has brought out in long and searching hearings the fact that many drugs on the market today are overpriced and oversold.

But in trying to force down the price of drugs and promote greater honesty in their sale, he was up against some powerful adversaries.

Comparatively little might have come of his efforts, or even the President's appeal for more stringent drug regulations, had it not been for the thalidomide scare which shocked the public into sudden awareness of the extent and extremes of drug promotion.

Few people realized until then the fact that new drugs are eventually tested on human beings before they are approved for sale.

The effect of a drug on humans is a part of the necessary record submitted to the Food and Drug Administration when the product is up for approval.

A Massachusetts physician, Dr. Chester S. Keefer, Wade professor of medicine at Boston University School of Medicine and senior member of the Evans Memorial Department of Clinical Research and Preventive Medicine at Massachusetts Memorial Hospitals, recently told a congressional committee that "there is no substitute for the trial of drugs in man," no matter how many animal tests may precede it.

He went on to state that "medicine is at best an uncertain science. There is no way of putting a new drug application through a computer and knowing what adverse side effects may occur."

One question which has arisen in this rspect and put to witnesses by legislators is: Should a person be told by his physician that he is being given an experimental drug?

Most have responded in the negative, saying the decision should be left to the physician. It is considered unlikely that the Federal Government will step in and insist upon such disclosure.

But there are many areas in which it does intend to exert greater control, if Congress passes pending legislation.

For instance, the Government wants to make sure that physicians are fully warmed of the side effects of new drugs. In the Kefauver hearings, evidence was produced to show that some drug companies in their eagerness to promote the use of a new drug by physicians played down possible serious side effects in the interest of playing up the drug.

The Government also wants authority to remove a drug from the market immediately if there is reason to feel it is a hazard to public health. Representatives of the drug industry are objecting.

They contend the Government already has such authority. However, it may only do so, under present law, after hearings have been held, or a court injunction ordered. Hearings are timetaking, and to obtain a court injunction there must be specific evidence, such as that in the thalidomide case, to warrant court action.

The Government also wants an extension of time in which to consider a new drug application. FDA now has 60 days in which to register objection before a new drug automatically goes on sale. The industry indicates it will go along with some extension of time, to 90 days, but not up to 180 days or more.

The Government is asking for more authority to examine the manufacturer's investigatory records with respect to drugs, and authority to make certain it is produced under sanitary conditions.

All this is considered needed and long overdue legislation. And except for the "recent unpleasant situation," as one drug industry representative called it, these bills in all probability would not have made much in the way of headlines or progress.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Aug. 5, 1962]

HOW DRUGS REACH THE PUBLIC—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—THALIDOMIDE CASE POINTS UP ROLE GOVERNMENT PLAYS IN TESTING AND CERTIFYING NEW PRODUCTS

(By Marjorie Hunter)

The tragic consequences that have apparently resulted from the taking of thalidomide by pregnant women have focused attention on how drugs reach the public in the United States. What follows in question and answer form is a description of the procedure and its effectiveness.

How does a new drug get on the American market?

A drug manufacturer in the United States can acquire a new drug in two ways: through invention or through purchase of patent rights of a foreign drug already being sold abroad.

In either case, a new drug to be offered for sale in the United States must obtain clearance from the Federal Food and Drug Administration.

Before applying for such clearance, a manufacturer must gather a large amount of evidence that the drug is safe. The drug is analyzed in laboratories and it is tested on animals. The drug then goes to medical examiners—usually private physicians—who test it on humans.

On the basis of all these tests, a manufacturer submits a new drug application to the Food and Drug Administration.

What does the laboratory do in this?

The laboratory conducts numerous laboratory tests, analyzing contents and making sure that each batch of the drug is uniform.

The drug is then tested on animals—mice, rats, guinea pigs, rabbits, cats, dogs. Records are kept as to side effects, amounts of dosage and reactions.

Once a manufacturer decides the animal testing program has shown the drug to be safe, it is tried out on humans. As scientists point out, animals do not supply all the answers.

What is the physician's role in this?

The drug manufacturers themselves determine to whom drugs are sent for experimental use on humans. A firm can distribute a new drug to 10 physicians—or other scientific investigators—or to 50,000. The Federal Government does not set any limitation.

Federal regulations covering such drug testing are few:

1. Investigational drugs must be marked clearly: "Caution, new drug—limited by Federal law to investigational use."

2. Each doctor—or other investigator—must sign a paper stating he is qualified to test a drug and has the facilities for such tests.

3. A manufacturer must keep records showing names of persons to whom a drug was sent for testing and the amounts shipped. These records are available to the Food and Drug Administration on request.

Some doctors are paid for testing drugs on their patients. Others are not. That is up to the manufacturer. Some drug firms have paid doctors up to $10,000 for testing new drugs. Some firms keep a few doctors on their payrolls on an annual retainer.

What is the Food and Drug Administration's role in all this?

Federal law gives the Food and Drug Administration the power to police the purity, safety, quality, and labeling of foods, drugs, and cosmetics. Before a new drug can enter the market, it must be cleared by this agency.

When an application for clearance is received, it is turned over to a medical officer for review. Evaluations are made of the human clinical studies, the animal studies, ingredients, drug reactions, and other data. Actual tests of a new drug designed for human consumption are not made on either animals or humans by Government scientists.

The Government does not approve a new drug or guarantee is efficacy. It merely clears it for safety before it can be sold to the public.

What is the safety record of drugs? Have there been previous mishaps?

By and large, the Nation's drug safety record has been good. With new drugs coming on the market at the rate of more than one a day, few have been withdrawn because they are unsafe, according to the Food and Drug Administration.

But this spring, there have been two notable examples of withdrawals from the market of previously cleared drugs.

One involved Mer-29, manufactured by the William S. Merrell Co., of Cincinnati, which also manufactured thalidomide.

CHOLESTEROL DRUG

Mer-29 was first offered for sale in June 1960, as a drug to retard formation of cholesterol. It was taken off the market by the manufacturer last April after continuing research indicated it might have been responsible for eye cataracts and loss of hair.

A Federal grand jury, probably in Washington, is investigating to determine whether false statements were made in connection with the drug application or whether there was a failure to disclose material facts.

Another withdrawal occurred last March, when the Food and Drug Administration requested removal of monase from the market. The drug had been used for a year in treatment of depressed patients. Its manufacturer, the Upjohn Co., of Kalamazoo, Mich., reported it had learned that seven patients using the drug had contracted an acute blood disease.

What are the criticisms of the present drug clearance system?

Until the thalidomide scare, there had been only limited criticism of the drug clearance system. Those seeking to strengthen the drug laws focused on such areas as factory inspections, the need for drugs to be effective, more adequate labeling, price reductions, and removal of drugs from the market when new evidence shows they are unsafe.

FLAWS IN SYSTEM

However, a few months ago, a Food and Drug Administration official, Dr. K. L. Milstead, did indicate there might be flaws in the present drug clearance system. He said the Government was concerned about doctors who engage in clinical testing of new drugs for a fee but who fail to make the tests, or rig them to fit a predetermined result.

This week, at a hearing into the thalidomide case, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, voiced strong disapproval of the drug clearance system.

"These regulations contain loopholes through which you could drive a South Dakota wagonload of hay," he said.

Federal law is silent on these questions:

1. Who shall be the first humans to receive a test drug?

2. What information should a doctor be given about previous tests on a new drug?

3. Should the patient be told the drug is experimental and should the doctor obtain written consent from a patient before using a test drug?

4. Should the Food and Drug Administration be notified when a firm begins testing a new drug?

5. Should the number of persons on whom a drug is tested be limited?

6. Should the Food and Drug Administration have authority to review animal testing before authorizing human testing to begin?

Food and Drug officials believe drug clearance procedures can be tightened up by regulations, without new laws. The new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze, plans to order tighter regulations in the next few days.

What chance is there that Congress will act on proposed changes in the drug law?

Congress has been reluctant to tighten up the drug laws in recent years. Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, sponsored a far-reaching bill designed to strengthen the drug laws and reduce drug prices. His bill was badly chopped up this spring in Senate committee, with a generous assistance from the pharmaceutical industry.

The much amended Kefauver bill is now before the Senate. The administration bill introduced by OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, is pending in the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Because of the thalidomide scare, the administration bill may fare better than the Kefauver bill did in committee. Some Members of Congress believe it will pass, others do not. The consensus seems to be that some kind of drug bill will go through Congress this year.

The big question is: How far reaching will it be?

Ribicoff on the Commuter Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as many Members know, in the years I have been in the Senate one of my major legislative concerns has been the problems of urban transportation. Seldom in that time have I read as penetrating and forceful analysis of the commuter problem as the speech given earlier this week by former Gov. Abraham Ribicoff to the Stamford Chamber of Commerce.

Speaking from broad experience on the State and National level, Mr. Ribicoff clearly describes the vital importance of modern transit to the cities and suburbs of the metropolitan areas. His proposals for action are most constructive and they offer an effective answer to the criticism that have been made of the administration's $500 million mass transportation bill, which I had the honor of introducing.

As Mr. Ribicoff points out, the Federal Government has been aiding transportation for a long time, but in our urban areas we have been letting rail and other transit service deteriorate and wither away. The administration's program represents a very modest effort to halt the decline and restore a proper balance in urban transportation, using all modes—bus, rail, and automobile—to their greatest natural advantage.

Mr. Ribicoff suggests that we should be doing even more, and I earnestly hope Members of the Senate will take the opportunity to read his important suggestions. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Ribicoff's speech of September 24 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOTAL TRANSPORTATION FOR THE COMMUTER

(Speech delivered by Abe Ribicoff, Democratic candidate for U.S. Senate, before Stamford Chamber of Commerce, Monday, Sept. 24, 1962, Stamford, Conn.)

From the Bible the Book of Ecclesiastes tells us, "There is no new thing under the sun." I doubt if this viewpoint has more meaning for any group in America than the 30,000 Connecticut commuters who 5 days a week face the prospect of spending up to 4 hours a day getting to and from their jobs in New York City.

As the commuter opens his morning paper, more often than not he finds that the New Haven Railroad is still in the news as it has been for a long time because of deep-seated troubles that had their beginnings many years ago.

Yet the need for fast, dependable service at a reasonable cost not only remains but increases daily.

I have studied this problem a long time. It was a major concern of mine when I was Governor. I have talked with railroad executives and railway labor officials, with engineers and with the commuters themselves. In Washington I have pursued this matter with the Secretary of Commerce, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and with officials of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

As I have studied this matter, I have become convinced that the situation is far from hopeless. A lot of suggestions have been made, but no single suggestion can provide a complete answer.

Someone says create a tristate authority—as if that in itself would solve anything. Others say pass the Williams bill, which is an extremely important piece of legislation, providing $500 million for urban mass transportation. But that bill alone will not speed commuters in and out of New York City; and the recent Senate action to send it back to committee is evidence that even this proposal faces an uncertain future. This is also another good example of the fact that one more vote in the Senate may mean the difference between success and failure of urgent legislation.

But much progress has been made. For the first time the States served by the railroad have been working cooperatively, first on an emergency program of fiscal relief to keep the railroad running and to halt its deterioration, and now on a long-range program looking toward its rehabilitation.

I am proud that Connecticut, under the vigorous leadership of Governor Dempsey, has provided able and energetic direction to these cooperative efforts.

The actions that have been taken and many of the ideas that have been put forth are extremely helpful. The big problem that must be faced is fitting all the essential pieces into an overall policy.

The commuter policy I advocate rests on three principles. The first is the frank recognition that the future of the New York metropolitan area depends on the success of its mass transportation system, and in this region rail service must play the key role.

Fairfield County, as well as the ever-extending commuter area of Connecticut, have a vital economic and social stake in the New York metropolitan area. Today, one-tenth of the Nation's population lives in this great urban area, which extends into Connecticut and New Jersey. The cities and towns which make up this region are important to and

dependent upon each other, and together they make an invaluable contribution to the Nation and the Nation's economy. Almost 6½ million jobs are provided in this area. Its unique location is the center of important national and international functions.

Where Detroit's auto production, Chicago's metal manufacture, or southern California's air-age industry lie outside their central business districts, in New York there is a high concentration of key economic decision-makers in a relatively few acres of real estate on the island of Manhattan. Not only is the area small and the size of the total contribution of New York's goods and services great, but many of its activities cannot be duplicated elsewhere. It is the home of the American theater and opera and the cradle and marketplace of all the arts. Nowhere else in the world are so many of the Nation-serving functions so readily available. Nowhere else can the key people communicate face to face: corporation executives, financial advisers, lending institutions, top-flight law firms, advertising men, management consultants.

Clearly, this Connecticut-New York-New Jersey region plays a vital and irreplaceable role as the largest single industrial, business, and cultural center of the Nation. The main key to the successful operation of this region is to get the people into these few acres of real estate in the morning and back to the open spaces at night. This is where the interests of the people of Connecticut come into sharp focus. Because of lack of good and flexible rail commuter service, a vast new population of automobiles, rather than people, is daily poured into downtown Manhattan. The automobile requires about 300 square feet of parking space, three times as much as a person requires for office space or commercial area.

If the present highways are not capable of handling the peak traffic to New York in the morning and evening hours, what are we going to do? Build more highways? Take more property off the tax rolls? Place a greater burden on remaining property owners for essential services to which they are entitled? The cost of acquiring land for rights-of-way and the costs of construction are skyrocketing.

What are we going to do with the cars which are brought into the city? You can pile people 30, 40, or 50 stories high, but you can't pile cars that way. The streets are already choked with traffic so that not only does it impede the flow of commuter traffic, with attendant delays and hazards, but it interferes with the local city traffic, deliveries to business houses and slows down emergency services such as fire apparatus and ambulances.

Obviously, any reduction in highway congestion will benefit everyone—rail commuters, bus commuters, property owners, housewives, local businessmen, the commuter by automobile, and the automobile owner who leaves his car at home. All sorts of transportation are needed, but they are needed in proper balance. The inherent advantages of each type should be used. Each has a role to play, but the role of each type should be determined by peak load capacity. Automobiles on expressways can handle only 2,000 people per lane per hour. Even buses operating on freeways and providing intermediate stops can carry only 6,000 to 9,000 per lane per hour. But rail systems can carry from 40,000 to 48,000, and even up to 60,000 per hour. One rail line has the potential capacity of 20 expressway lanes of automobiles or 7 expressway lanes of buses.

Anyone who thinks more highways can do the whole job in this region just isn't being realistic.

Mass rail transportation must carry more of the load. But, in order to draw commuters to this service, it must be frequent, convenient, comfortable and reasonably priced. This, the railroads of the area cannot afford to do on their own. They are financially weak—our own New Haven Railroad is bankrupt—and they cannot modernize and support what amounts to a true public service out of other revenues.

And, yet, here is a great plant and privately owned investment which lies practically unused. Its capacity can be limited only by the number of cars in a train and scheduling of service. We should put it to work fully and for the benefit of the public. I believe we can do this at less cost and less investment with greater benefits and more convenience and safety than the construction and maintenance of more commuter highways.

I want to stress the safety factor, which is close to my heart. Lives are lost on these highways; property is damaged; their policing is a burden. If we can attract enough present users of the highways to the improved service of the rails, then those who have no choice but to use the highways and streets will be able to do so with better speed, comfort, and safety.

Essentially, what we need most is balance in our commuter transport service. Which is faster, more frequent, dependable, and reasonable in cost? If the peak load could be better distributed, we could meet immediately foreseeable needs. And expanded rail service is the key.

The second principle on which my commuter policy rests is this: The very nature of the mass transit problem in the great urban areas requires major financial aid by the Federal Government. Many of us hate to see government participation or further subsidization of any phase of our economy. But the Government has already intervened in the transport system and, by the Constitution, has a special right to do so when interstate traffic is involved. The Founding Fathers recognized, when they wrote the commerce clause into the Constitution, that States could not cope with matters involving interstate movement beyond their jurisdictions and that inconsistent, independent action by the several States could hamper and burden regional and national progress.

The Federal Government has been aiding transportation in this country for a long time. In many areas the size of the support has reached major proportions. Federal funds build interstate highways, construct airports, dredge harbors, improve river navigation and in one way or another aid many of the carriers that use these facilities.

The newcomers to the field of transportation have received all the attention. We have really taken for granted that the old standbys, such as the railroads, would go on forever. Except for the Transportation Act of 1958, which permitted the ICC to guarantee loans to railroads that were not able to secure loans on favorable terms elsewhere, rail service which should be moving the masses of people has been left out in the cold. But loans will not do the job. The ICC must find reasonable security for their repayment before it can authorize them, and the rail stockholders still must repay the loans plus interest. In addition, they must find enough money to pay taxes, maintain road-bed, equipment and facilities and operate the service with mounting deficits.

The fate of the New Haven Railroad is now uncertain. The trustees are doing a splendid job of trying to work out its financial and economic future. But they have frankly stated that the railroad cannot stand on its own feet with its present losses. It becomes evident that the railroad's problem is not so much its problem as it is a public problem.

Thus, public aid in the realm of commuter service is not aid to the railroads but aid to the public itself.

The interest and labors of the Governors of the States of New York, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, in which I was an active proponent and participant as Governor on behalf of preserving rail service, have helped but they alone cannot provide a long-range cure.

Federal help is a clear requirement. But we must recognize that the commuter problem is a distinct problem requiring Federal funds just for this purpose. Federal dollars have made it possible to drive across the Nation in days, to fly across the Nation in hours, to move cargo on inland waterways faster than ever before. What we need are Federal dollars devoted exclusively to the problem of moving large numbers of commuters in and out of the great urban centers of this Nation.

This brings me to the third and most important principle that underlies an effective transportation policy for commuters. The Federal funds supplied to the States or regions with major commuter problems should be used in whatever way the State or region wants to use the money. Each State or region faces its own problems when it comes to mass transportation. No single answer can or should come from Washington. One urban area may need a new bridge across a river or bay, for cars or trains, or both. In another, the answer may be a tunnel. Or one region may want to send high-speed buses down a special express lane added to a superhighway. Some cities may want to develop helicopter service. Here in New York metropolitan area we would use the funds primarily for rail service, for that is our greatest need.

The only earmarking on the funds would be their use solely for commuter transit. The method of transportation would be the choice of the State or regional authority applying for the funds.

There has already been substantial progress toward this objective. Last year the Housing Act of 1961 provided $25 million to be used for demonstration projects involving urban mass transportation. The allowable uses of the funds are quite broad. Today there is pending the Williams bill to provide a major program of $500 million for 3 years to finance up to two-thirds of the capital costs of mass transit facilities.

Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey are in an extremely favorable position to receive this Federal assistance thanks to the creation last year by the Governors of these States of the Tristate Transportation Committee to develop an action-oriented program.

I believe we must go even further in this direction of providing a completely free choice for the communities and regions faced with commuter problems. The region that must move vast numbers of commuters should decide how this huge task is to be accomplished. It should be able to build rail lines and terminals, roads, bridges, tunnels, heliports—whatever it believes is necessary to solve its own problems.

The Federal share of these expenses should be 90 percent—the same as in the interstate highway program.

And the amount of money devoted to this vital matter must be substantial. We spend billions to reach the moon while we talk about spending millions to move commuters in and out of our great cities. I believe that getting to work and getting home again is just as important as getting to the moon. Applying these principles, I propose a six-point program for the commuters of Fairfield County:

1. A coordinated system of total transportation for commuters—by train, car, bus, or helicopter—with rail service greatly expanded.

The total plan should be developed by each region to meet its needs. It should be carefully planned on the basis of present

population patterns and the likely shifts into and out of suburban areas in the future. And the object of the system must be to move commuters in and out of the center city—quickly, conveniently, inexpensively, and safely.

2. Federal funds on a 90 to 10 matching basis to be used exclusively for transportation of commuters by whatever method each State or region selects to meet its own mass transportation needs.

There is no reason why the 90-40 formula, used so successfully to construct the Interstate Highway System, should not be used to develop mass transportation systems for commuters, especially where interstate transit is involved. But the key point is the freedom of choice by the regional areas to determine for itself what method of transportation it will develop to speed the movement of its commuters.

3. A regional public agency to assure proper commuter service.

The agency should have flexible powers so that its role will be no larger than what is required to deal with the problem it faces at any particular time. The agency should have power to contract with existing carriers for proper service if that is found feasible. Or it should be able to operate rail service if that is ultimately found to be the only effective approach.

Perhaps the existing Trisate Transportation Committee should be given statutory power to assume these responsibilities in the New York-Connecticut-New Jersey metropolitan area. The agency might also involve Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

4. Modern, safe, clean, high-speed rail equipment.

No matter what arrangement is made to operate the rail service, the equipment used must be greatly improved. I am not talking here about visionary plans for monorail service, or automatically operated trains. I think our commuter service can and will be handled by the type of engines and cars that are now in operation. But we can expect newer equipment that is faster yet safe. We can expect adequate maintenance to assure on-time operation. And at the very least we can expect that the cars—and the stations too—are kept clean.

5. Replace outdated bridges and curves along New Haven-New York run to permit continuous high-speed operation.

There are points along this run now where trains must slow down solely because of outdated facilities. The type of financing I have suggested can be used to replace the bridge and curves that require less slowdowns.

6. Run commuter trains with convenient stops to Wall Street and through to New Jersey—no need to change at Grand Central.

Sound engineering studies have shown that through service to Wall Street and New Jersey can be accomplished and the resulting transit network will operate far more efficiently. Much time and expense is now wasted by the cumbersome operation of turning around commuter trains in the Grand Central railyard complex, and the same is true for trains coming to Manhattan through the New Jersey tubes. Through service would eliminate turnaround time. While the capital outlay would be high, the resulting saving in operating funds would be very significant.

The benefit to the commuter is clear. Imagine getting on at Fairfield, New Canaan, or Stamford and riding comfortably all the way to 14th Street, Brooklyn Bridge, or Wall Street. Except for its possible benefit to physical fitness, the twice-daily fight through the throng at Grand Central and into the subway is easily the most unnecessary part of the commuter's weary day.

These six points form a policy I believe can be used to meet the commuter needs of this region. And it is vitally important that we take action and take it soon.

Your families, their education, their living comforts and their health are important to you and to the Nation. You are entitled to have the advantages of living here in Connecticut with light, air, and roominess about you, with good schools available for your children and with easy access to recreational facilities. Those of you who work in the city can't have these advantages during the day but your families and you yourself are entitled to them during nonworking hours.

Recently, there is a tendency to move back to New York, which is chiefly motivated by the frustrations of commuting. Beyond the health and welfare reasons, this has serious economic implications not only for the communities here in Connecticut which depend on the New York metropolitan area but on that city as well.

We in Connecticut and surrounding States have much to offer by way of support to the New York area and ourselves—industrially, commercially, and socially. Let us not destroy our opportunities, as well as theirs, through lack of a precise approach to long-range solutions. I can think of nothing that more greatly influences property values and the course of community development than the lack of mass transportation service. Where rail service has been abandoned—on the west shore of the Hudson, for example—people have been forced to more expensive total cost of getting to and from the city or have moved to the east side of the Hudson. What would happen to Fairfield County if rail service were suspended tomorrow?

You will recall about 2 years ago that a tugboat strike in New York City caused picketing of the rails and disrupted rail service. Industry, business and individuals suffered losses of hundreds of thousands of dollars because many employees could not get to their jobs. We cannot afford to risk such an eventuality.

The commuting public should have the best possible system of total transportation. This problem must be solved, not on the basis of what is best for the railroad or for any special interest, but on the basis of what is best for the people.

Time To Call Nikita's Bluff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people, in ever-growing numbers, demand action against Russian intervention in this hemisphere.

The Florida press has been particularly alert to this threat at our southern door—only 90 miles from our own beaches. Our editors and feature writers report from the vantage point of close proximity to the danger, and with the advantage of contacts with Cuban exiles now living in Florida.

Over the past months I have had reprinted here in the RECORD stories and editorials from Florida so that these events would be called to the attention of all Members of Congress and other Government leaders. As a further indication of the feelings of our citizens on these matters, I insert, under unanimous consent, the following in the RECORD:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Sept. 12, 1962]

"GET OUT OF CUBA AND STAY OUT"—TIME TO CALL NIKITA'S BLUFF

Russia's latest rocket rattling is something new in noise only because it is a "government statement" and not a Khrushchev popoff.

Three times since Castro openly turned the corner the Kremlin's windbag has shouted threats against the United States should it undertake to help tan Fidel's hide.

In July 1960, he cried that the Soviet Union had "rockets which can land presicely in a target land 13,000 kilometers away." Later he called this only a "symbolic" offer to Cuba, but everybody caught the drift.

A world thermonuclear war over Cuba or any other issue is unlikely unless civilization conditions itself for suicide.

The Soviet Union knows this as well as any other power. Indeed, it might be even more impressed, for least of any major country could it afford another blood-letting.

But it does not konw, just as Wilhelm II and Adolph Hitler did not know or did not believe, that once aroused, the American people will assure their security and complete any mission of freedom to which they have subscribed.

By everyone's admission, including Khrushchev's, the Soviet Union is now occupying Cuba—with how many men or whatever weapons, it makes no difference.

"Cuban statesmen (sic) have asked the Soviet Union to send military specialists and technicians to teach Cubans how to master modern weapons," said the Moscow statement.

The presence of this military force in the Western Hemisphere is a clear danger to its security. This is not the wild theorizing of Khrushchev's strawmen, the "American aggressors," but the rational conclusion of the score of states affected. They foresaw this day in treaties and pacts, and now they are reacting to its arrival.

The Soviet Union has blundered.

It has chosen to shore up a regime too weak to command the respect of its own countrymen or inspire the dread of its neighbors.

In doing so, it has introduced its military presence into the Western Hemisphere, and overnight this becomes a fact far more important than the rise of a seedy dictator in Cuba.

It means that for the first time forces of internal subversion in Latin America have near at hand the potential help of Soviet militarism.

It is time to call Khrushchev's ready bluff—which is callable.

It is time to tell the Soviet military coolly and calmly to get the hell out of Cuba and stay out.

Tax Relief for Medical Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as Congress approaches its sine die adjournment for the year and we return home to our districts to inform the voters of the issues which have dominated this session and will face us in various forms in the 88th Congress, it is appar-

ent that the propaganda forces of the New Frontier will attempt to use the medicare issue as a major domestic political weapon.

This is most unfortunate, since sound, constructive proposals have been advanced whereby, with a minimum of job obstruction, sound programs to meet the medical needs of our Nation can be implemented.

The philosophy of sound, proper legislation in this field is expressed in a most effective fashion by an editorial entitled "Tax Relief for Medical Costs," which appeared in the Thursday, September 13, issue of the Chicago Heights Star, Chicago Heights, Ill. I insert it into the RECORD at this point, commending its logic and clarity to all:

AS WE SEE IT: TAX RELIEF FOR MEDICAL COSTS

Congress has been asked to increase the amounts deductible from Federal income taxes for allowable medical expenses. Heads of households, for example, could deduct as much as $20,000, rather than $15,000, if confronted by astronomical bills for medical treatment.

Few will deny that even persons able to meet such monumental expenses are entitled to a degree of tax relief. We think, however, that another aspect of medical expense deductions is in substantially greater need of attention.

We refer to the fact that nothing at all can be deducted by persons under 65 unless doctor bills exceed 3 percent of adjusted gross income, nor can the cost of drugs be applied unless they exceed 1 percent. Only the amounts exceeding these figures are deductible.

Here, it seems, is a change for the breast-beaters to prove there is a measure of sincerity in their pretended concern over the cost of staying healthy—not only for persons over 65 but for those who would like to have a few dollars left in the bank if and when they reach 65.

As far as the demagogues are concerned, it is not difficult to spot the objection. To a certain degree, this would be a substitute for socialized medicine. But there would be no actual socialization—just tax relief; there would be no Government control—no obvious indication that your Congressman and your President were making themselves good fellows every time you encountered a sniffle.

There can be no welfare state if people are permitted to retain a significant amount of their money and spend it as they see fit. So popular political formula in some quarters is to tax the people out of their resources and return to them whatever might be left or borrowed after creating jobs for the party faithful.

In Washington, this fractional return of your money is regarded as a gift.

The ASC Farmer Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the farmer committee system of administering farm programs is under attack due to the shortcomings of a great minority of these groups.

The ASC committee system is not only government of and for farmers—it is government by farmers. The regulatory programs such as marketing quotas and orders rest upon favorable referenda among producers concerned. The farmer committees taking the leadership in explaining provisions and helping farmers understand not only what the program provisions are, but why they exist, and how the programs themselves relate to the total national economy.

Since it was created in 1936, the farmer committee system has weathered many storms and it has done so because of its good record. That record continues to add luster to the role of committeemen. Recently, as a result of the Billy Sol Estes affair, another all-out campaign is underway to undermine public confidence in the farmer committees.

I think the record should show the facts. In addition to 50 State committees, there are more than 3,000 county committees consisting of 9,160 elected committeemen.

And there are more than 27,000 community committees, also elected. Altogether there are about 90,000 county and community committeemen. Are all these to be punished because of the transgressions of a very few individuals? That would be rather like throwing the baby out with the bath.

The men comprising the committee system must be credited with much of the successful operation of the wheat stabilization and feed grain programs of the past 2 years, with their ultimate savings to taxpayers through reduction in surplus buildup of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. Farmer committees are entitled to much of the credit for the $1.1 billion rise in farm income last year. This money is being spent with businessmen in small towns. It helps build schools and educate young folks.

The ASC farmer committees have worked hard and frequently under pressure of time to translate congressional authority into locally adaptable programs. Their dedication is not only to farmers but also to farm communities and to agriculture.

Better living standards go hand-in-hand with farm programs. We in Congress—and all Americans everywhere—owe much to the efficiency of ASC committees and their employees in county offices. Their truly remarkable achievements are helping all of us use our agricultural abundance to build a stronger and increasingly more virile America.

Newburgh: The Record Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a file of correspondence which I had dealing with the NBC white paper on Newburgh, N.Y.—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 11, 1962, pages 18024 to 18040. I have since received a letter from the Federal Communications Commission and, to bring the record of this matter up to date, I am placing this letter and my response to it, in the RECORD at this point:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., September 13, 1962.
Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: This is with further reference to your letter of August 13, 1962, and enclosures, to the Chairman concerning the NBC program, "White Paper No. 9, The Battle of Newburgh." In your letter, you refer to the Commission's letter of July 18, 1962, to Mr. Joseph McD. Mitchell, city manager of Newburgh, N.Y. Your letter was acknowledged by the Acting Chairman, Commissioner Lee, on August 17, 1962.

You refer to a previous letter of April 2, 1962, sent by you to Mr. Robert Sarnoff, chairman of the board of directors of the National Broadcasting Co., a copy of which you furnished to the Commission. In your present letter, you reiterate two questions which you asked of Mr. Sarnoff and you ask for the Chairman's views with respect to: (1) Whether it is fair for the moderator, commentator, or editor to speak as a partisan on a program billed as a fair and objective presentation of a controversial issue without disclosing that said person is a partisan; and (2) if said person is a partisan, whether those who disagree with his position should be given an opportunity for replication. Because of the nature of your inquiry, and since it concerns a matter which the full Commission previously considered, we feel it more appropriate that your letter be answered by the full Commission.

Before discussing the questions you pose, we wish to indicate that we, of course, recognize that in programs such as these, where the issues and the merits are sharply debated and highly controversial, it would be unusual to find everyone satisfied with any single presentation of the subject matter. Almost as a matter of course, criticism of programs of this kind can be anticipated. We find it difficult to conceive of a program format better designed for an exactly equal division of opportunity to express conflicting views than the debate type. However, such a restriction on choice of format, was, we feel, neither contemplated by you, nor is it desirable.

As to your first question, commentary and analysis, as contrasted to straight reporting, should be clearly identified as such in the treatment of news. The program in question, however, appears to have been billed as an examination of Newburgh's controversial public welfare practices rather than as a straight news program. We agree that a serious public interest question would exist if the program had been described in a manner completely inconsistent with its actual content. From a comparison of the program itself with the description of the program given in enclosed copies of press releases issued by NBC prior to the broadcast of the program, we believe that the description therein was accurate—a view which we expressed in our letter of July 18, 1962, to Mr. Mitchell.

With respect to your second question, we wish to point out that neither the Communications Act nor the Commission's rules or policies prohibit the narrator of a program such as the one under discussion from expressing a point of view on a controversial issue of public importance. If he does, our sole concern is to determine whether there has been compliance with the Commission's "fairness doctrine."

The fairness doctrine, enunciated in the Commission's "Report on Editorializing by Broadcast Licensees," requires licensees to maintain a standard of fairness in the al-

location of time to differing viewpoints. Thus, where a licensee has allowed the use of its facilities for the expression of one viewpoint on a controversial issue of public importance, it is under an obligation to afford reasonable opportunities for the presentation of opposing views. In our letter of July 18, 1962, to Mr. Mitchell we concluded that there was no "evidence of an effort by NBC to present a documentary which would deliberately favor one side over the other" and that in applying the fairness doctrine to all of the information before us, we were "unable to conclude that there was a lack of 'reasonable opportunity' for the presentation of opposing views on the subject program."

Accordingly, in the absence of further evidence to the contrary, and in light of the policies set forth above and in our letter to Mitchell, we hereby affirm our action of July 18, 1962.

We appreciate your deep interest in this matter and trust that the views set forth above are responsive to the questions you raise.

By direction of the Commission:

NEWTON N. MINOW,
Chairman.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1962.

Hon. NEWTON N. MINOW,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MINOW: Thank you for your letter of September 13, 1962, which you have written to me by direction of the Commission in answer to my inquiries in respect to the NBC–TV program "White Paper No. 9, The Battle of Newburgh."

In view of the documentation of unfairness which I have set out in my previous letters I can only conclude that the Commission has a different concept of fairness than the one I possess. I am hopeful that the American public does not share the Commission's standard of ethics in this matter.

In my judgment it becomes necessary to make the law very clear as to what constitutes proper standards of fairness in TV and radio broadcasts of controversial issues. As a legislator I shall endeavor to bring this about. It is a sad day for our country when cleverly disguised propaganda can be formally adjudged "fair presentation" by a public tribunal, as has very obviously been done in the instant case. To say that I am highly disappointed in the Commission's judgment is putting it mildly. That too becomes a matter of a proper political issue.

I am placing your letter and my answer in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to complete the public record I have made of this case and the important public issues it raises.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Public Opinion Poll, Eighth District of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the year I distributed 45,000 questionnaires among the residents of the Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina. Approximately three-fifths were sent to residents of rural areas because many people in the district work in town but receive their mail on rural routes, and the remainder went to residents of the towns and cities in the district.

The response to this questionnaire was gratifying—5,321 returned questionnaires or almost 12 percent. The returns came from farmers, laborers, executives, storekeepers, clerks, teachers, housewives, and professional men and women.

Many who returned questionnaires extended their answers by adding explanatory comments. Some discussed issues not even listed on the questionnaire. I have personally read all of these supplementary comments and appreciate the willingness of so many people to share their views with me on important issues facing our country.

Although the final responsibility for votes I cast in Congress must necessarily be my own, and is always based upon a careful consideration of all of the pro and con arguments on a given bill, I believe the people should have an opportunity to express their views on current issues and to know that their views will receive consideration by me. The use of such a questionnaire is the most practicable way I know to give them that opportunity and I am pleased that so many took advantage of it.

Following are the questions and answers indicated on a percentage basis:

1962 questionnaire

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
(1) Do you favor establishing a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing?	16	77	7
(2) Do you favor giving the President standby authority to adjust income taxes without prior act of Congress?	11	86	3
(3) Should the U.S. Government build and supply fallout shelters?	23	66	11
(4) Do you think the House Un-American Activities Committee serves a useful purpose?	65	19	16
(5) Do you favor giving the President authority to reduce tariffs below present levels?	28	63	9
(6) Do you favor spending an additional $5,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 to send a man to the moon?	42	50	8
(7) Do you have a Government-sponsored medical care program for the aged?	44	49	7
(8) If so, which plan to you prefer?			
(a) A compulsory system for all persons under social security, regardless of need, to be financed by increasing social security taxes?	19	25	56
(b) Expanding the present Federal-State medicare program (Kerr-Mills) administered by the States?	29	16	55
(9) President Kennedy as proposed that the U.S. Government purchase ¼ of a $200,000,000 United Nations bond issue to finance United Nations operations in the Congo. Do you favor this proposal?	27	65	8
(10) Do you favor additional Federal aid for education?	38	56	6
(11) If so—			
(a) Would you restrict it to school construction?	20	17	63
(b) Would you provide aid for general operating expenses, including teacher salaries?	16	22	62
(c) Would you favor the Government relinquishing to the States a percentage of individual income taxes, or, say tobacco taxes, and earmark these funds for use by the States only for support of education, without any limitation as to use?	34	18	48
(12) Do you favor extending or expanding the existing Federal program of loans to college students?	44	42	14
(13) Or would you prefer legislation that would grant an income tax deduction for college tuition and expenses?	57	26	17
(14) Do you think postage rates should be adjusted periodically to make the postal service self-supporting?	75	18	7
(15) If so, do you believe each class of mail should pay its own way in accordance with cost ascertainment figures compiled by the Post Office Department?	69	15	16
(16) Or should some of the costs of certain classes of mail be provided out of general revenues because of their educational and cultural values?	21	50	29
(17) President Kennedy is proposing a $10,000,000,000 increase in the national debt limit. Do you favor this?	19	73	8
(18) If a Communist takeover could be prevented only by sending U.S. troops, would you favor doing so in—			
(a) Latin America	72	12	16
(b) Southeast Asia	49	22	29
(c) Africa	48	25	27
(d) Elsewhere outside the United States	59	14	27
(19) With respect to Berlin, would you—			
(a) Maintain our position at all costs	74	10	16
(b) Negotiate a settlement on the best terms available	18	27	55
(20) With respect to Cuba, would you—			
(a) Accept the status quo	9	37	54
(b) Support an invasion with enough forces to win	44	18	38
(c) Impose all possible economic sanctions	65	5	30
(d) Continue to seek support of the Organization of American States for strong cooperative action	70	6	24
(21) Do you favor the United States resuming nuclear bomb testing in the air?	71	18	11

Cuban Solution a Tough Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an eidtorial entitled "Cuban Solution a Tough Question," which appeared in the Tyler Courier Times, Tyler, Tex., September 23, 1962. I feel it is a constructive discussion of the serious Cuban problem.

Certainly I am in favor of bringing about a sound solution of the serious Cuban problem—a sound solution favorable to the United States and the free world.

The editorial follows:

CUBAN SOLUTION A TOUGH QUESTION

What to do about Cuba?

At the advanced stage things have now reached, this is a very difficult question to answer.

The Russians and Red Chinese have sent thousands of technicians into Cuba, and millions of dollars worth of war materials

and weapons. They are constructing an armed camp on the island. Castro has invited them in and they have virtually taken over from him, it appears.

What should we do now?

The Bay of Pigs fiasco, in which this country of ours withdrew its promise of air support after the Cuban refugees had launched their attack, was probably the last chance of doing something about Cuba that would have been effective without use of our own troops in goodly quantities as far as going into that land is concerned.

So Congress and the President are now fishing around for some way to stop the Cuban buildup without starting a war.

Congress has taken several steps, some of which have the blessing of the administration and some of which do not.

The Senate passed Thursday a resolution serving notice on the Kremlin that the United States will fight, if necessary, to prevent Cuba from being turned into a military threat to any of its neighbors.

The declaration was drafted by leaders of both the Republican and Democratic Parties and is described as being intended as an expression of determination and solidarity by the Congress and the President.

The statement is strong—but it is merely a statement. The measure of its effectiveness lies in whether or not the Communists choose to test it. If they do, and we have only additional words to offer, it will be meaningless.

The House is expected to pass this resolution promptly.

Meanwhile it passed one of its own in cutting hundreds of millions of dollars from the administration's foreign aid bill.

The House tacked three amendments on the aid bill. All are aimed at stopping shipments of war materials to Cuba.

One would deny foreign aid to a nation whose vessels transport arms or strategic materials to the Castro regime. Another would prohibit any ship that carried war material or other economic goods to Cuba from entering a U.S. port to pick up foreign-aid shipments.

And a third, by Representative WALT ROGERS, of Amarillo, would deny foreign aid to any country whose ships carry trade of any kind to Cuba.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk quickly asked the Senate to remove the last amendment, claiming that it would cause too much friction with our allies. It "puts us in a straitjacket and makes it more difficult to do our job along with our allies," he said. He said it also threatens mutual allied work on the Berlin crisis.

Be that as it may, we need to do something to make it forcefully clear to our allies that we consider their help in hauling Red goods into Cuba an unfriendly act. If it takes a "straitjacket" to do it, let's have the straitjacket.

Another suggested alternative is a blockade of Cuba. A blockade is considered an act of war, as opponents to its usage claim.

It is well and good to say that "something should be done" about Cuba. Something should be. But what?

"Neglect" is one word which must be applied with meaning to the Cuba situation, being shared by both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. Responsibility in relation to U.S. foreign affairs is a greater term which remains elusive through a mixed layer cake of State Department people, Presidents and their staffs, Congress, and those who commit us in the U.N.

It is one thing for Members of Congress—and Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH is the only voice in the House whom we can choose by vote—to holler "fight," and quite another thing to be the guy on the firing line. Especially if the guy and thousands like him have the sick feeling down inside that the years of bungling have been compounded beyond the excuse of human error in judgment.

An equally welcome firm stand from Congress and from the President would be one which takes action to give the boot to the softheads, at all levels. With nuclear threat as close to the continental United States as Wills Point to Carthage, several million citizens deserve a chance to have the same pride in their leaders as in their country.

In speaking out plainly that we view most gravely further military arming of Cuba, Congress is taking a strong step. But it must be prepared to take a stronger one to back up that step.

And a stronger step than that is very likely to be, whether blockade or landing of marines or what, an act of war to one degree or another. The American public should realize this fact and be prepared to live with it.

Hon. Kathryn E. Granahan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with adjournment, the legislative branch of our Government will lose one of its most distinguished, respected, and beloved public servants. Although she has been a Member of Congress for only 6 years, KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN has a record of accomplishment that merits acclaim in every book on American history and American sociology.

Mrs. GRANAHAN'S achievements in behalf of her fellow men date back far beyond her election to Congress on November 6, 1956. Her sympathetic interest in the indigent, the sick, and the crippled prompted her participation in numerous charitable organizations, statewide as well as local, from her early youth. Her many awards include a doctor of laws degree from St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia.

Dr. GRANAHAN'S husband was William Thomas Granahan, a veteran of World War I, a successful business executive, a Pennsylvania State official, and himself a Member of Congress. He died on May 25, 1956, and his widow was then elected.

America will never be able to repay KATHRYN GRANAHAN for her vigorous crusade against indecent literature. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, she fought constantly for stringent legislation to protect our homes and families from the despicable invasion of pornographic and licentious material which came to threaten the Nation's morality. As the father of a teenage boy, I am one of the millions who can appreciate first hand her outstanding work in this field.

Mr. Speaker, numerous publications have commended KATHYRN GRANAHAN for her dedication in the cause of decency and virtue. Other Members will join me in paying tribute to her as she prepares to leave the Congress. Yet I feel that what would mean most to her is a pledge by Members of both the House and Senate to continue her work with firm resolution and persistence until her objectives are realized.

Actually, our efforts in this direction will probably never be completed. The selfish peddlers of smut have made this perverted industry a highly paying business. Alined with this selfish element is the ever-menacing subversive who seeks to destroy the Nation's moral standards through corruption of our youth. This threat was recognized long ago by the editor of the Johnstown-Altoona Catholic Register, who said that there is no doubt but that much of the obscene and pornographic literature distributed in this country is inspired and financed by Communists as a part of their plan to destroy America's moral fiber.

With these evil forces relentlessly attempting to prey upon the minds of our youth, Congress must all times remain alert to the problem. If we make such a promise to KATHRYN GRANAHAN, I know that she can walk out of this Chamber with an even greater feeling of accomplishment.

The battle against salacious printed material is but one of the outstanding marks set by our colleague. She has voted with a deep sense of responsibility on every issue that has come before us. Moreover, her refreshing personality and quick sense of humor have made Capitol Hill a better place to work.

We thank you, KATHRYN GRANAHAN.

A commendation from the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 24, 1962, follows:

CASE HISTORY: KATE GRANAHAN

(By John M. Cummings)

Pennsylvania's failure to keep the pace of progress set by the country as a whole has brought about a loss of three Congressmen. While the State in the 1960 census showed an overall increase, 22 counties, including Philadelphia, were on the minus side, this city by a round 70,000 by comparison with the figures for the 1950 census.

The city of Pittsburgh, home of Governor Lawrence, fell to the tune of 72,000.

It should be noted these are cities under overwhelming Democratic control, cities dominated during the greater part of the decade by the fancy Dans who now tell you we have been making great progress with better times to come.

Neither Mr. Dilworth, the Democratic nominee for Governor, nor Senator CLARK, seeking a second hitch in Washington, has a recipe for winning back the three seats in the House. In fact, they say nothing about the loss, but day by day they ask you to put on your rose-tinted glasses and believe their tales of progress.

Because of the decrease in its population, Philadelphia suffers the loss of one of the three Congressmen. Oddly enough—or was it so odd?—the Member forced by Bill Green to step aside, was the woman who has won national fame by her courageous crusades against pornographic literature, photographs, and other forms of filth.

KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, who became a Member of Congress in 1956, succeeding her late husband, by her persistent fight against the vicious reading matter, established herself firmly in the hearts of women the country over. And men, too, for that matter, if they were interested in the campaign to wipe out this sort of poison.

She was by no means the junior member of the Philadelphia delegation of six members. Two Johnnies-come-lately had more influence with Bill Green, who, as chairman

of the Democratic city committee, had the deciding voice.

Influences outside the political domain are understood to have played a part in Green's showing the gate to KATE GRANAHAN. After all, there's a lot of dirty money to be gained in the pornographic racket. Whether any of it went into the coffers of the Democratic city or State committee is difficult to determine. Especially since the city machine refused pointblank to permit an inspection of its records by the prosecutor named by Judge Alessandroni to handle the grand jury investigation—if one is ever conducted.

It has been acknowledged that the city committee got $4,000 from the coin operator's association for "value received," as the saying goes.

It's to be regretted that there was no great outcry from substantial Democratic leaders in protest against the dropping of Mrs. GRANAHAN. She is a supporter of Mr. Dilworth. But the "great reformer" had his own fish to fry. In the furtherance of his decade-old ambition to be elected Governor, he could not afford to annoy the city leader with a good word for the doomed lady. But Mr. Dilworth could find time to join Green—who despised him—in a tear-jerking plea against a grand jury investigation of the iniquities in city hall.

President Kennedy has come forward with the medicine to ease the pain in the heart of KATE GRANAHAN. He is going to make her Treasurer of the United States, a pleasant, well-paying job. When she takes office sometime after the first of the year, you'll see a facsimile of her signature on the debased paper money you use. The President owes this to Mr. Green. After all, Bill surprised the country with the size of the vote his machine turned in for Mr. Kennedy in 1960.

Still, a lot of folks, fearful of the effects of pornography on the children of the Republic, can hardly be blamed if they continue to wonder at the source of the influence that resulted in the roughhouse treatment for their champion in Congress—KATHRYN GRANAHAN.

Pork-Barrel Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the September 13 issue of the New York Times appears an editorial commenting on the recently enacted law which gives the President broad discretionary powers in the field of public works. The emphasis on the request was economic, the result was purely pork-barrel, as the editorial points out. I think the editorial does a fine job of pointing out the weaknesses in the proposal which the Congress has passed.

It follows:

DIPPING INTO THE PORK BARREL

Congress has just passed a bill to authorize $900 million in Federal spending on public works during the current fiscal year. Its avowed intention is to counter unemployment and stimulate economic activity, but the bill is still redolent of the pork barrel.

The administration had sought a new flexible approach to public works, one that would give the President standby authority to accelerate or restrain spending based on prevailing economic conditions. It felt that it could cut down on waste and make the impact of the public works projects more positive, by long-term planning.

This appeared a commendable experiment, but the Senate insisted on following its traditional pork-barrel approach. The present emergency public works bill has little in common with the administration's proposal. Congress is against any change in the pork-barrel system, which is aimed at producing votes rather than jobs.

Buying Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party attempts to give the public the idea that it has some sort of monopoly on seeking fair salaries for Federal employees. This is strictly contradicted by the strong statements by the Honorable Marion Folsom, many former members of the Eisenhower administrations, and businessmen who have endorsed the position of the National Civil Service League, a nonpartisan organization which seeks comparability of pay between public servants and private executives. I would like, if the House so wishes, under unanimous consent, to insert an editorial from the June 5, 1962, Cleveland Plain Dealer on this subject into the RECORD, accompanied by a factual article on the matter from Monday's Washington Post:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, June 5, 1962]

BUYING GOOD GOVERNMENT

The National Civil Service League, represented as a nonpartisan citizens' organization, is seeking editorial support for H.R. 10480, a measure now before Congress. The proposal would overhaul thoroughly the salary arrangements in the Federal Government structure. The league says it would increase the competence and efficiency of Government operations by providing greater rewards at the higher levels of service.

The contention is that private business, State and local governments and universities drain off our top scientists and administrators.

Can good government administration be bought?

The league believes so—at a price. Under the proposal, the cost for the first calendar year, 1963, would be an increase of $448 million. By 1965 the increases would pass the billion-dollar mark. But the league assures that the increased competence of better direction would more than outweigh in value the total cost of the program.

The people affected would be all graded civil service employees.

The Government in Washington spends over $80 billion annually and this calls for responsible leadership. But it is doubtful if Federal Government employment, except at the top, can be as attractive as private employment even though the salaries are comparable. The virtue of personal initiative, for one thing, recognized in private business but necessarily restricted in Government employment, often is as much a lure for the bright young man or woman as immediate cash.

On one item the league oversells. It states the new Government employee can look forward to increasing his beginning pay only 3½ times—if he rises to the very top. People of the same caliber, with equal training, who enter industry can expect to multiply their annual earnings as much as 8 or 12 times their starting salary. With Government, a $6,000-per-year starter can go to $18,500, the league says, but no further. How many people do you know in private industry making $48,000 to $72,000?

While we are aware of the needs of civil service protection and the dedication which competent Federal Government employees bring to their jobs, we aren't sold on the idea that the taxpayer must come up with another billion dollars so that more people shall be supported at public expense. Or that an employer should, in effect, subsidize a rival for the services of his employees.

The aim of the league and the proposal appears too high.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 24, 1962]

ADMINISTRATION'S PAY REFORM PLAN WINS ENDORSEMENT OF BIG BUSINESS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Big business leaders and alumni of the Eisenhower administration have thrown impressive support behind President Kennedy's Federal pay reform plan, which emphasizes comparable pay rates in Government with those in industry.

The alliance is one of the first tangible examples of the kind of cooperation between the business community and Government on a domestic issue which Mr. Kennedy says he so urgently seeks.

It is also a rare occasion when alumni of the previous Republican administration have teamed up to endorse publicly a program of the administration in power.

The agreement was coordinated by the National Civil Service League, a nonpartisan group dedicated to better Government and it could supply the spark the stalled pay program needs to pass Congress before it adjourns.

The Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee meets again today on the bill by its chairman, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, which embraces the comparability principle and other salary reforms sought by Mr. Kennedy. JOHNSTON is optimistic of passage this year.

"The Senate bill is not perfect," James B. Watson, executive director of the league, said, "in that it places a little less emphasis at the top and a little too much emphasis at the bottom of the pay scale. But generally speaking, it is a wise and constructive measure. A few years hence, or even today, it can lead to our having a farsighted, hard-hitting and dynamic career service."

Marion D. Folsom, an official of Eastman Kodak and a former HEW Secretary in the Eisenhower administration, conducted a poll of industrial bigwigs on their reaction to the President's pay reforms. A similar project was conducted by Rocco C. Siciliano, a former personnel adviser to President Eisenhower and now a partner in the law firm here of Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker.

Their responses were virtually unanimous in support of the President's plan in specifics as well as in principle. Nearly all of them stressed the urgent need of that part of the measure which would pay key Federal administrative, scientific, and technical personnel salaries in line with industrial rates.

So far, neither Folsom nor Siciliano has received any real dissent from members of the business community or of the Eisenhower administration.

The Johnston bill blunts the comparability principle by making sharp cuts in pay rates advocated by the President for employees in the middle and top brackets whose

salaries lag furthest behind industrial salaries.

The Senate committee "understands" however, that the President early next year will recommend to Congress a new upward adjustment of these salaries, plus those of Cabinet members and other Federal executives. The President's plan also will be an invitation to Members of Congress to raise their $22,500 salaries.

Folsom sent business leaders a copy of his statement in support of the President's pay plan and asked for their reactions to it. These are among the responses he received from them:

John A. Barr, chairman, Montgomery Ward & Co.: "I would fully endorse the proposition as reflected in your statement and am hopeful that it will receive favorable action by the Congress."

William Benton, publisher, Encyclopedia Britannica: "My own prejudice out of my own experience in Washington is that the salaries for top men in the Government are much too low."

Joseph L. Block, chairman, Inland Steel Co.: "I personally heartily approve the recommendations of your group which I think are essential to give the Nation the competence it should have in the higher echelons of Federal service."

Carter L. Burgess, chairman, American Machine & Foundry Co.: "I heartily agree that there is definite and immediate need for salary reform in the Federal Government."

George Champion, chairman, Chase Manhattan Bank: "Our Government, being as big as it is, should surely compete with the best minds and I am delighted to see you present this so well."

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, chairman, Continental Can Co.: "Thank you for the copy of your report on Federal pay system. I find myself in complete agreement with the views it expresses."

John T. Connor, President, Merck & Co.: "I agree with you completely that we shall continue to have mediocre Goverement administration, or worse, until we take the necessary steps to attract and retain qualified people on a career basis."

Charles O. Mortimer, chairman, General Foods Corp.: "I wish you success in your efforts to attract more capable people to key Government positions."

T. S. Petersen, former chairman, Standard Oil of California: "I am heartily in accord. You know, as I do, how vital to the business and industry is the matter of equitable salaries."

Philip D. Reed, chairman, Federal Reserve Bank of New York: "I read with the greatest interest the statement you made on the subject of Federal salary reform. It is clear, and, in my judgment, compelling."

Harry Scherman, chairman, Book-of-the Month Club: "It is difficult to ask a citizen to serve the Government at a considerable financial sacrifice. Many cannot afford to do so."

Gen. C. R. Smith, president, American Airlines: "I agree with your conclusion that the addition of competent people to the Government service is much more likely if the income scale is reasonably comparable with industrial standards."

Adm. Lewis L. Strauss: "I am in complete accord with the policy you advocate in respect to salary reform in the Federal service."

Leo D. Welch, chairman, Standard Oil of New Jersey: "I cannot think of anything more constructive than efforts to upgrade the caliber of the men who are attracted to the higer levels of the Government service. I strongly support your recommendations and hope that they will be accepted."

Frazer B. Wilde, chairman, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.: "Your talk to the salary group in Washington was outstanding. I hope it made an impression."

Siciliano received similar prompt and energetic responses from those close to the former Eisenhower administration. Generally, their statements agree with former Budget Director Percival E. Brundage who wrote: "I agree 100 percent with the incerase in top level salaries."

Robert Dechert, former General Counsel of the Defense Department and now a Philadelphia attorney, said: "I thoroughly agree with the importance of carrying out the plan referred to in your letter and will do everything I can to help."

Other Eisenhower alumni who endorsed the President's pay reforms were John A. Hannah, president, Michigan State University; Richard Jackson, vice president, Fram Corp.; Neil H. Jacoby, dean, graduate school of business administration, University of California; G. B. Kistiakowsky, Harvard University; Arthur Larson, director, World Rule of Law Center, Duke University; Robert E. Merriam, president, Spaceonics, Inc.; George T. Moore, consultant; Robert D. Murphy, president, Corning Glass International; James T. O'Connell, director, industrial relations, Hudson Pulp & Paper Corp.; Clarence Randall, former chairman, Inland Steel Co.

Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriations, 1963

SPEECH
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13175) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, our foreign aid is a terrible mistake in policy and practice. Like a broken record we keep repeating these charges and yet our Government keeps demanding and spending the money anyway. I am opposed to the waste, mismanagement, and inefficiency. More, I am opposed to the policy or underlying philosophy which indicates a reliance on dollars, on gifts, on buying support instead of moral and spiritual concepts and the cooperation of allies through the strength and leadership of the United States. We spend as apologists and defeatists. We seem to lead from weakness. Actually, we do not lead, we follow in a do-as-we-are cowed appearance or do-as-we-must-to-create-an-image conduct. Our policies are self-defeating, if we still treasure and believe in freedom, dignity, and respect for the finest of human values—our moral and religious beliefs. But all these matters we debated during the foreign-aid authorization.

Any proof needed for the foregoing, or my other briefs in the futility of foreign aid can be found in the report accompanying the bill and the criticism of the members of the Appropriations Subcommittee, chairmaned by Mr. PASSMAN, of Louisiana. I compliment him for the views he expressed in his presentation and identify myself with these views. Hence, I must oppose this sorry, sorry bill, this self-defeating and suicidal foreign-aid appropriation.

Football and Politics: The Kennedy Harrisburg Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, with the football season and the political campaign season now fully upon us, Dolph Simons, Jr.'s sharp and witty comments on the similarity between the public statements of coaches and campaigners are especially well timed.

I am pleased to be able to bring his "Saturday Column," from the Lawrence, Kans., Daily Journal-World of September 22, to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the attention of anyone else here in Washington who may happen to read it:

THE SATURDAY COLUMN
(By Dolph C. Simons, Jr.)

Have you ever noticed how much politicians and athletic coaches resemble each other in their efforts to mesmerize an unsuspecting public?

Men in both occupations are experts at clouding an issue, distorting a given situation, and they try to obscure the obvious. In many cases they are successful. In a great number of instances, facts are conveniently shoved aside or ignored.

Since many major league fotball teams swing into action today, look at some of the more common statements often heard from coaches prior to season openers. Dan Devine, of Missouri, says, "We still aren't ready to play from a technical standpoint. It's always that way, I guess, but it seems to be more true this season than in any other year I have coached. We still only have one experienced man at right guard." He doesn't speak about the experienced men at all other positions, only the right guard, and statements such as this are designed to handle either a loss or a win. If he loses to California, Devine can say, "I told you so," and if he wins, alumni will think, "That Devine is a heck of a good coach, winning that game with no experience at right guard."

KU's Jack Mitchell isn't any different. "If they're (KU) ever going to be scared, they ought to be now. They (TCU) could beat anyone in the Nation." Again, this helps condition the alumni, and Abe Martin, TCU coach, is probably saying the same thing about KU, i.e., "They (KU) could beat anyone in the Nation."

Coaches always want to talk about weaknesses and troubles, rather than telling about players who are extremely good. Or they ignore the overall strength of their teams. And, the public too often seems to go along with the distortions.

Politicians are no different. The only major difference might be that politicians like to keep denying charges made by members of the opposition party—or sometimes even members within the same party.

President Kennedy kicked off his personal campaign Thursday night to help in the election of Democratic Representatives and Senators. If this is just the start, coaches like Devine, Mitchell, and others will look as if they are still in kindergarten compared to the graduate school student in the White House in this business of clouding the issues and ignoring the facts.

The President said, "I hold a great responsibility for the conduct of the Nation's campaign for progress. And one fact is clear beyond dispute: That this country requires,

if it is to move ahead, a progressive Congress—in short, a Democratic Congress." Maybe some wide-eyed, head-in-the-clouds listener would say, "That's right, Jack—we are for you." Just as a professional downtown quarterback member will swallow anything a coach might tell him.

But just what does Kennedy want? He has had a Democratic-controlled House and a Democratic Senate, yet he still isn't able to get passage of many pet bills. Does he want a rubberstamp Congress which will give him an automatic OK on any program he might dream up? The Nation has been told time and time again about the need for a Democratic Congress. Maybe top Democratic leaders are going along with the idea that if you tell a lie often enough, there are bound to be some who will believe it. But the fact remains, Kennedy has had a Democratic Congress since he first took office.

But after his statement about the need for a Democratic Congress, Kennedy came back in the same speech, before the same audience, and said, "No Congress in recent times has matched such a record of progress and compassion. And only a Democratic Congress could amass such a record. For these were Democratic bills, sponsored, guided, and enacted by Democratic majorities."

Evidently when something is passed that the President likes, all credit is due to the Democratic majority in the House and Senate. When something is stopped, it is generally blamed on the Republican minority. This is a little difficult to figure out.

Kennedy told his Pennsylvania audience about Strategic Air Command jets now being on alert throughout the world. This is nothing new—it was the same under the past administration, but it is the same old trick of the crafty football coaches, telling the public what they want to hear.

After this session of Congress is completed, the record will probably show it rates with the alltime great do-nothing sessions. The President boasts about passage of a bill which protects "unsuspecting housewives" from the purchase of "harmful or worthless drugs." But his Democratic-controlled Congress probably wouldn't have even passed this bill if it had not been for the tragic birth deformities caused by thalidomide.

For months the President and his top aids denied there was a Communist build-up in Cuba, yet Friday they reported as many as 65 to 75 Soviet ships have docked in Cuba since July. How can the public have confidence in their leaders when one day they say one thing, then the next day do a complete about-face?

As stated earlier, there really isn't too much difference between athletic coaches and top politicians such as Kennedy. Win the confidence of the public, gain support, win the battles if possible, whether it be on the gridiron or in Congress, but if you can't win, blame someone else.

The only trouble is that it is a much more critical game when played by the elected leaders of the country. Coaches can get by with it and there often is no serious damage. It is a different story for the "coaches" of the country. The stakes are too high for such artful dodging.

Blueprint for the Coast Guard

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this House know, the U.S. Coast Guard is one of the prime areas of the jurisdiction of my Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It is a great arm of our Government, performing invaluable services in a variety of important ways in time of peace, and as a vital element of the Navy in time of war. My own personal interest in this important agency is well known throughout my career in the Congress.

As time has gone on and new developments have occurred with increasing frequency in recent years the importance of the functions performed by this agency has increased. Yet, I regret to say that I feel that the agency has not been allowed fully to meet its increasing responsibilities.

For the past several years I have frequently expressed the view that we must modernize our Coast Guard to meet its new responsibilities in regard to their duties in coastal areas, in the field of pleasure boating in which around 30 million people are now engaged, increasing sophistication in navigation technology and ship construction, advanced safety requirements for ships at sea, participation in improvement of navigation on a worldwide basis, participation in our newly emphasized oceanographic program, and activities in the frozen waters of both poles.

The Coast Guard has been hampered by the availability of facilities to meet its widespread obligations. Its vessels are aging and in large part are World War II surplus from other services. Only recently has there been some improvement in the aircraft they need for their vital part in our national search and rescue program. Their polar capability is clearly inadequate with the few World War II icebreakers now in service.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am greatly gratified to read the splendid speech delivered to the Propeller Club, Port of Washington, D.C., on Wednesday, September 19, 1962, by the able and experienced new commandant of the Coast Guard, Adm. E. J. Roland, in which he sets forth the needs of the Coast Guard to meet its responsibilities in the immediate future. Under his command I know we will see the progress that is needed. I commend this excellent speech to all Members of the House.

The text follows:

SPEECH GIVEN BY ADMIRAL ROLAND AT PROPELLER CLUB LUNCHEON, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 19, 1962

The Coast Guard represents different things to different people. The resulting public image usually depends on limited contacts in special fields. These may range from merchant marine safety functions to flood evacuation or from supervision of explosive loading to a helicopter assist. Those present today represent broad and varied interests in maritime affairs and are basically familiar with the Coast Guard's overall operations.

In deference to this familiarity and with an eye on the clock, I'll limit myself to a short review of only those Coast Guard missions directly concerned with our ship operations, develop the multiplicity of individual operations, tie these to planning factors affecting ship numbers and ship design, and finish with a review of present and planned new vessel construction.

Search and rescue, operation of ocean stations, aids to navigation, law enforcement, icebreaking, oceanography, and war readiness are all statutory functions requiring ship operation.

The support of these functions by ship operations may vary in character from a 2-hour buoy tender trip to an 8-month Antarctic cruise. The locale may be the western rivers, coastal waters, any of the oceans or the Great Lakes.

Climate extremes extend from the heat and humidity of the tropics to the cold and ice of the Arctic. I mention these factors to emphasize the variety of tasks and conditions which must be considered in programing Coast Guard ship operations.

If it were possible to design a ship for one mission, to operate in a fixed geographic location and then limit it to that function and location, ship design and ship numbers would easily be determined by simple formula. However, except in a few special cases, Coast Guard ships are all assigned multiple missions, even those specifically designed for a primary task.

To illustrate, picture an imaginary stretch of coastline with one good-sized port. It is in the northern part of the United States and supports a large offshore fishing fleet. Trade is primarily foreign and the area attracts a large seasonal boat population during the summer months.

The port and coastline flank a major ocean shipping lane which is well offshore. The port city is also a major air terminal for transocean flights. From these assumed factors we will now program units to cover statutory functions.

The commercial ship, fishing boat, and yacht population will require search and rescue coverage. This will suggest major cutter capability for offshore ship and plane incidents, medium patrol cutter coverage for the fishing fleet, and small patrol boat coverage for the yacht population.

The aids to navigation including buoyage, offshore structures, lightships, et cetera, would require buoy tender support. The concentration of foreign trade shipping develops a requirement for law enforcement which would be provided by harbor tugs. The northern climate suggests the need for icebreaking services during severe winter weather. By utilizing only single purpose units a modest-sized fleet would be required to meet these statutory missions. The actual assignment of units might be somewhat as follows:

Homeport, three major cutters with the primary mission of manning ocean stations. Transit and underway training time, together with 2-hour standby periods, would provide a ready major cutter for search and rescue.

Station, one ocean buoy tender for aid to navigation purposes. Although the aid to navigation workload represents only 70 percent of a normal ship standard, distance to the next closest port precludes economical servicing from another port. Add an icebreaking capability to the buoy tender, and this mission, together with an occasional search and rescue assist, will keep the ship fully productive.

Station one medium range cutter and one patrol boat for search and rescue in connection with the fishing fleet and yachts. Assign the additional tasks of enforcing fishery treaties and routine boarding. The larger ships listed above would back up this search and rescue mission.

Assign one or two harbor tugs the primary law enforcement mission, add icebreaking capability to provide backup icebreaking when required. These tugs would also have special firefighting capability to augment the local fire departments in marine and dock fires.

The foregoing assignment of units is obviously a compromise. Resources are limited. Many of the tasks are not susceptible to 100 percent accomplishment; an infinite number of search and rescue units for example, would not always prevent loss of life or property.

However, I believe this imaginary example underlines a basic Coast Guard operational concept, that units must be versatile and multipurpose.

I have purposely omitted up to this time another statutory charge which has loomed progressively larger in Coast Guard ship operations. I refer to "assistance to other Government agencies."

This is on a not-to-interfere with primary mission basis. These requests are always in support of legitimate U.S. objectives, often of a high priority nature and made because the Coast Guard is the only source of the aid or the only source without excessive expenditures of Federal funds.

Responsible management of those U.S. resources entrusted to the Coast Guard entails acceptance of these missions which available capability will permit. Many can be accomplished in connection with a scheduled operation; on the other hand, many can be carried out only by scheduling a special operation.

These functions are not reflected in the Coast Guard budget; however, they are not mentioned here as a plea for more funds but rather as a complicating factor in ship operations and future planning of facilities. The decision on acceptance of these tasks would be considerably easier if a work standard for a ship were fixed at a finite limit. The variety of tasks each unit performs contributes to maximum utilization but this variety militates against a planned finite utilization. This problem is under continuous review and bears heavily on future ship replacements as well as ship design.

I've wandered around the subject of ship operations briefly touching a good many subjects without fully developing any. Again, I'll plead your general knowledge of maritime affairs and the clock.

I would like to mention a few of our special operations which are not common knowledge before proceeding to the ship construction programs.

At the request of the Federal Aviation Administration deep-sea buoys are being maintained on selected ocean stations. This is in connection with Operation Accordion which is a study directed toward reduction of air space assignment on transocean flights.

The Saturn missile engines are under continuous Coast Guard escort from Huntsville, Ala., to Cape Canaveral, a 10-day trip.

During extreme weather the Texas towers off the east coast are evacuated. The Coast Guard maintains a ship patrol in the vicinity to discourage visitors.

An icebreaker is now en route to the Arctic Ocean for an oceanographic cruise along the Siberian coast. Seven U.S. agencies or U.S. contract universities are participating.

Radioactive waste disposal for the U.S. Public Health Service is routinely performed in the Atlantic.

Ocean station vessels routinely are collecting water and air samples for measurement of carbon 14 and strontium 90 for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Ship support for a radioactive survey of certain areas of the Marshall Islands is being provided next summer to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Ocean station vessels are supporting a bathymetric sounding survey for the Navy Oceanographic Office. Annual production is approximately 26,000 observations with 350,000 miles of track observations.

The operations I have just mentioned have been selected at random to illustrate the versatility which we feel we must demand from our units. Design of new construction must contribute to this versatility.

The new construction since the war has been primarily 95-foot and 82-foot patrol boats, 76 in number. We are operating 36 major cutters built from 1937 to 1945, average age is over 20 years; 4 major icebreakers, average age 20 years; 43 ocean buoy tenders, average age over 20 years; 15 patrol craft, average age over 30 years. Without going into a further recital of numbers the problem faced is serious, block obsolescence of the major part of the Coast Guard Fleet.

This block obsolescence was not unforeseen. Concentration of building programs just before and during World War II obviously was going to result in many units reaching retirement age at the same time. It is difficult to justify retiring ships early, while they still have a useful life, in order to forestall block obsolescence.

It does make a replacement problem expensive and difficult when so many units reach old age at the same time. In anticipation of this development the Coast Guard has made a detailed and searching study of vessel requirements. The study was based on present missions, and attempted to reflect predictable future requirements. As a result we believe that we know what we need in the way of ship types and numbers.

A summary of building requirements based on a modern and adequate fleet by 1970 using obsolescence figures from the Ebasco report of 1948 would require: 38 high-endurance cutters; 28 medium-endurance cutters; 3 large icebreakers; 17 coastal buoy tenders; 21 inland tenders; 4 harbor tugs, large; 14 harbor tugs, small; 12 lightships. It is estimated that this program would cost somewhat more than $700 million.

A very modest start has been made on this building program. Fiscal 1962 funds include 2 medium patrol cutters now under construction, 10 82-foot patrol boats, of which 5 have been delivered, 3 small inland buoy tenders, and 6 small harbor tugs. Fiscal 1963 funds have been provided for 1 medium patrol cutter, 3 82-foot patrol boats, 1 coastal tender, 1 inland tender, and 1 small river tender.

The high-endurance cutter is the planned backbone of a new Coast Guard fleet. Preliminary and evaluation designs have been completed. The constructural contract design is to be completed in May of 1963. None of this class is yet authorized, although a prototype is being requested in the fiscal 1964 budget. The high-endurance cutter will have twin screws powered by a combination diesel-gas turbine plant. Each shaft will have 3,500 diesel horsepower and 9,000 gas turbine horsepower. She will make 20 knots on diesel power and under full power have a sustained 25 knots. This ship will displace 2,688 tons at a draft of 14 feet; length, 372 feet; and beam, 42 feet. The stacks will be in the masts. She will be able to support a helicopter from a retractable hangar. The electronic installation will be of an integrated design for her missions and will include an antisubmarine capability. All control spaces and living spaces will be air conditioned. Habitability is being stressed. Boat handling gear will include hydraulic-ram davits which will put gas-turbined surfboats in the water in 3½ seconds. We believe that this ship will adequately perform the various duties which are required to offshore operations.

The medium endurance cutter is now established as a class. The first launching will be in April of next year. She will have the same diesel-gas turbine combination described above. Twin screws, variable pitch propellers with a 1,500 horsepower diesel and 1,000 horsepower gas turbine on each shaft. She will have a sustained speed of 19 knots. Length, 210 feet overall, beam 34 feet, and draft 10 feet displacing 900 tons. Exhaust will be through the stern in order to clear deck space for a helicopter deck. She will not carry a helicopter but will be able to operate one from her afterdeck. Boats and boat handling gear will be similar to those of the high endurance cutter. Living and control spaces will be air conditioned. Habitability has been stressed.

The coastal buoy tender is another new design. One hundred fifty-seven feet overall and some 500 tons displacement, she is designed to fill the need for a tender intermediate between the seagoing 180 footer and the small inland tenders.

Some of her interesting features include light icebreaking ability, twin controllable pitch propellers, bow thruster unit to further increase maneuverability, steering and engine control stations on each bridge wing in addition to the pilothouse station, lever steering control (instead of the usual wheel). Her 10-ton boom will be hydraulic powered and controlled from either of two enclosed stations incorporated in the superstructure just below bridge deck level. Most of these features have been individually developed and service tested in other ships, but this is the first ship to incorporate these new design ideas in one package.

The inland tender is a 100-foot vessel which reflects refinements in the design of our *Azalea*, servicing aids to navigation in the intercoastal waterway since her commissioning in 1954.

The small river tender is being developed for working aids on the Missouri and is a highly specialized 75-foot river towboat and 90-foot barge combination—the first of a fleet of six river tenders which the Coast Guard needs in order to assume responsibility for buoyage in the navigable portions of the Missouri River.

I have attempted to give you a quick rundown of our ship operations and ship requirements for the future. We believe that we get good mileage out of the resources entrusted to our management and further feel that in order to maintain and improve our service to the United States, we need a modern fleet. We look forward to the future with confidence that the necessary resources will be made available.

Self-Employment Pension Plan

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us, on H.R. 10, to establish a so-called self-employment pension plan, has been changed and adjusted to provide us with a most equitable bill which should merit our earnest consideration.

The Senate amendments which would have had the effect of damaging pension and profit-sharing plans already in effect have been eliminated and, in its present form, this bill will not be as costly in revenues of the Federal Government as the original House version.

This conference report represents a conscientious effort by the committee to equalize any existing inequality between the pension situation of the company employee and that of the self-employed individual.

This is the best compromise on this bill that can now be accomplished and while the expressed fears of opportunities for tax avoidance or evasion maneuvering appear to have been successfully answered, such developments can be readily corrected in the future, if they do occur. As now constituted and revised, the bill is worthy of our confidence and recommends itself to our approval.

Gov. Otto Kerner, of Illinois, Presents a Formula for Dealing With Welfare Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure Sunday to attend the Czechoslovak Day observance at the Bohemian Home for the Aged in my district, with the Honorable Otto Kerner, Governor of Illinois, as the main speaker.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues the excellent speech which the Governor presented at this observance. It should be of particular interest to all of us who are concerned about the mounting cost of our Nation's welfare program.

Governor Kerner's remarks diplay the great compassion he has for the problems of the less fortunate. At the same time they show a keen awareness of the fact that our welfare programs are designed to serve the needy and not the greedy.

Governor Kerner has won statewide recognition in Illinois for his determined effort to serve the interests of those who really need government assistance, but remove from the roles those who have abused this program in the past.

Governor Kerner's excellent remarks follow:

REMARKS OF GOV. OTTO KERNER, CZECHOSLOVAK DAY OBSERVANCE, BOHEMIAN HOME FOR THE AGED, CHICAGO, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1962

As I know you realize, I am called upon many times to address any number of different groups. I have spoken to gatherings throughout the State, both large and small, and while each is a stimulating experience, some have a deeper personal meaning than others. Today in the company of many old and dear friends, this occasion is one of those wonderful moments.

The days and months have quickly passed since our family took up residence in Springfield. Amid the busy tasks of government, it is surprising how quickly a family grows. A small part of it is chronological. Much more is an even greater awareness of the problems of others.

Among these is a category of people who are known as senior citizens. This is not altogether an accurate definition, for in truth, these persons have a right to be known as our honored senior citizens, each of whom has done his responsible share in building all that our State and our Nation are today.

The State, the Nation, and each individual owe much to such honored citizens; and that is why I am particularly proud of the Bohemian Home for the Aged. Here, 130 men and women, ranging from age 67 to 99, live in the confidence that comes from knowing that they are wanted, that they are needed, and that their birthright is being protected by those who care.

Unfortunately all who should be so honored are not respected, given the care, and treated with the dignity which is due them. In recent months we have seen examples of those who seek to exploit the infirmities of age for the sake of financial gain.

During recent months, we have been examining many phases of our State assistance programs, such as those which come under jurisdiction of the Illinois Public Aid Commission, as well as others. This is not being done with any thought of withholding aid to those who really need and deserve it.

But it must be clear to everyone that we are charged with the responsibility of protecting the innocent needy from the undeserving greedy. State welfare money is provided for those who are subjected to hardship and handicap.

It is not provided for those who seek something for nothing.

It is my personal concern that no person in need, whether poor, sick, disabled, or bowed by the weight of years, be caused a single moment's sorrow or pain as the result of a harsh or inhumane State policy.

On the other hand, I will not condone any instance where there are abuses of human frailty or cases of blatant mismanagement of programs designed to aid the poor, the helpless, or needy.

With the assistance of a management consultant firm, we will exercise strict control of State aid funds which are provided for the necessary care of those in need. We intend to insure and protect our citizens receiving aid, and will do our utmost to see that all services due them are actually received by them.

We have long since passed the day of any loose policy in State relief and aid programs.

Our policy has been administration with a firm hand. And this tough-minded policy, if you want to call it that, has as its primary purpose the interest and welfare of those who deserve aid.

The results of such vigilance will be evidenced in greater dollar savings to our State and will thus enable us to do more good for more good people who are entitled to extra consideration when unemployment, sickness, or the burden of years falls upon them. Therefore, while this position may be characterized as toughminded, it is at its very core, tenderhearted. And it is a program that finds comparison in your efforts.

The people who, now and down through the years, have made this home possible are the kind of people for whom I have a most high degree of affection. These are the people who have, and do, understand the meaning of service to humanity.

I know many of you here today have experienced that exhilarating feeling which comes at the end of a day when you realize that you have truly served your fellow men.

I want each of you to know how much I appreciate the value of places such as this Bohemian Home. I want you to realize that I know you for the good works that you have done—works I am confident you will continue to do.

The support you have received here from many friends, many who have helped, not with extra large contributions, but to the best of their ability and with loving devotion, are examples of the respect which you have earned down through the years since your founding in 1893.

I thank you on behalf of your fellow citizens of Illinois. We will strive to imitate you in providing thoughtful, loving care for our honored elder citizens.

I do want to thank you for inviting me to your observation of Czechoslovak Day. We do sincerely appreciate the honor, and we wish you every future success.

Congressman William H. Harsha Announces Results of Public Opinion Poll of Ohio's Sixth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, for the past month I have been conducting a public opinion poll in the Sixth Congressional District of Ohio, which I have the honor to represent here. It has been my purpose to solicit the opinions of the people to determine their feelings about important issues that the awaiting action by the House of Representatives so that I could give the best representation possible. Participation in the poll was not limited to any special group. Through the mailing of a questionnaire and the cooperation of district newspapers, which kindly reprinted the questionnaire as a public service, the opportunity to participate was made available to all of those interested in expressing their views.

The poll contained nine questions relating to matters of domestic and foreign policy. The results of this opinion survey are now available. It is surprising that the tabulation indicates such definite trends in the thinking of the people of the district. The results show that opinions on over half of the questions registered more than 75 percent support or opposition.

The people expressed great concern over the weakness of our foreign policy and the concessions being offered to the Soviet Union by relaxing inspection requirements on nuclear testing.

Another issue of vital importance and concern to the citizens of the sixth district is the activity of labor leaders who have encouraged strikes at our missile bases, thereby placing our national defense program in jeopardy. The citizens of the district want such strikes outlawed.

Of course, there was considerable opposition to the Federal Government subsidizing transportation facilities in urban areas. Apparently the citizens of the sixth district feel this is a matter of local concern that should be handled by private enterprise with the users of the facilities paying for the service as is customary with utilities whether it be a commodity or a service that is being sold.

Likewise considerable opposition was expressed to the construction of fallout shelters.

Every survey has its limitations. Brevity in questioning does not permit comprehensive answers embracing all facets of an issue. It is extremely difficult to answer a question by a simple yes or no.

Many thousands of persons returning the questionnaire added comments discussing the issues. Although these comments are extremely helpful to me in assessing the feelings of the people of the district, it is not possible, unfortunately, to reflect them in statistical form. However, I wish to point out that a very large proportion of those making comments expressed serious concern and outspoken opposition to increasing the powers of the President and greater Federal expenditures that are producing mounting deficits and adding to the burden of the national debt.

Following are the detailed results of the poll:

1. Do you favor Federal aid for construction of public fallout shelters? Yes, 14 percent; no, 77 percent; undecided, 9 percent.

2. Do you favor a program of matching grants amounting to approximately $1 billion for construction of new medical and dental schools? Yes, 12 percent; no, 57 percent; undecided, 31 percent.

3. Do you favor the Urban Mass Transportation Act providing for $500 million in Federal grants for mass transportation facilities and equipment in urban areas? Yes, 10 percent; no, 79 percent; undecided, 11 percent.

4. Are you in favor of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide employment for the unemployed young men of America? Yes, 54 percent; no, 35 percent; undecided, 11 percent.

5. Do you favor a law that prohibits racial discrimination in federally assisted housing? Yes, 42 percent; no, 45 percent; undecided, 13 percent.

6. Do you favor legislation outlawing strikes on missile bases? Yes, 82 percent; no, 12 percent; undecided, 6 percent.

7. Do you favor a firmer attitude in U.S. foreign policy? Yes, 89 percent; no, 6 percent; undecided, 5 percent.

8. Do you favor relaxing inspection requirements now demanded by the United States in a nuclear test ban treaty? Yes, 8 percent; no, 84 percent; undecided, 8 percent.

9. Do you favor an across-the-board cut in income taxes? Yes, 43 percent; no, 45 percent; undecided, 12 percent.

Responsibility in Cuban Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose the following article by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Star of Tuesday, September 25, 1962:

RESPONSIBILITY IN CUBAN AFFAIR—ACCOUNT OF COMMAND DECISIONS IN THE INVASION ATTEMPT IS GIVEN

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy in his speeches likes to refer to his troubles—particularly Cuba—as having been "inherited" from the Eisenhower administration. Former President Truman says in his political outbursts that Mr. Eisenhower was a "lazy" President. The real question is not how much time a President gives to golf or yachting or campaigning or social events, but how he uses the time he does give to official business—the kind of decisions he makes.

Members of Congress have in the last few days put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a lengthy article that was published 2 weeks ago in U.S. News & World Report giving a comprehensive account of the fateful decision President Kennedy made when he first withdrew and then—when it was too late—actually approved air support for the Cuban exiles in their invasions of their homeland in April 1961.

Ever since that time there have been attempts to blame the whole fiasco on the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff or on the Central Intelligence Agency. But President Kennedy told the truth when he himself assumed full responsibility. What hasn't been generally known, however, is how he came to make the mistake he did. The magazine article was the result of many weeks of investigation and research among official sources, particularly among persons who were in the know at the time. Certain administration officials have since conceded the accuracy of the article. It reads in part as follows:

"A fateful decision, made by President Kennedy on Sunday, April 16, 1961, is rising now to plague the United States. On that Sunday evening, an armed force of Cuban refugees, trained by the United States, was at sea, sailing secretly to invade Fidel Castro's Cuba. The American President, a few hours earlier, had given final approval to that invasion.

"Only the day before, on April 15, a surprise attack by B–26 bombing planes belonging to the invaders had knocked out all but seven planes of Castro's tiny air force.

"A second air strike was scheduled for Monday morning, April 17. It was to coincide with the landing of the invaders. It was supposed to finish the job of wiping out Castro's planes and to provide air support for the invasion.

"Secure in the assurance of air support, the invaders went ashore in the early-morning darkness of Monday, April 17. Their landing was successful: 1,400 armed men reached the beaches of a place called the Bay of Pigs.

"In the battle that followed, Castro's troops suffered heavy casualties. Castro's tanks, coming up to the battle, were sitting ducks for an attack by air. Confidently, the little invading force waited for its air support to arrive. Its leaders had assurance of that support. It was provided in the pre-invasion planning.

"Hours before, on Sunday evening, a small but potent force of B–26's was sitting in readiness on an airfield 500 miles away (in a Latin-American country), waiting to take off for the Bay of Pigs. Those were planes of the invasion force, with Cuban pilots. But those planes didn't take off. The reason: President Kennedy forbade their use.

"When the invasion began, in the predawn hours of Monday, the need of air support became apparent. Worried, the nonmilitary officials in Washington who were running the invasion went to President Kennedy for a new decision. They suggested that U.S. Navy planes from a U.S. aircraft carrier be used to fly air support for the invaders.

"In the planning of the invasion—planning begun under the Eisenhower administration—the Joint Chiefs of Staff had recommended the use of air support. President Kennedy vetoed the idea. He insisted that there was to be no direct American participation. Now, with the outcome possibly hanging in the balance, military and nonmilitary men joined in renewing the plea.

"Once again, in the early morning hours of Monday, April 17, President Kennedy made a fateful decision. He said 'no' to the use of U.S. planes.

"With no air support, the invasion soon began to run into trouble * * *. In the face of this situation, President Kennedy took the wraps off the Cuban fliers. On Monday noon he said they could go into action. But bad weather interfered at first. Finally, an air strike was set up for early Wednesday.

"On Tuesday, however, the situation continued to deteriorate * * *. By Tuesday night, April 18, a crisis was clearly at hand. Once again there was an appeal to President Kennedy. On this night the President, in white tie and tails, was playing host at a congressional reception in the White House. He left advisers—both civilian and military. Again it was proposed to use U.S. planes to save the invasion.

"This time the President relented slightly. He consented to using one carrier's planes for just 1 hour on Wednesday morning—just long enough to provide cover for the invaders to land some supplies and for their planes to make a quick strike. U.S. planes, still, were not to attack land targets.

"Even this limited plan for U.S. aid went awry. There were communications mixups. The Cuban flyers mistimed their strike. The U.S. planes never got into action. And anyway, it developed, it was too late. By sundown of Wednesday, April 19, the invasion was a failure. The invaders inflicted close to 2,000 casualties on Castro's forces, suffered only a hundred or so casualties of their own. But without air support, the invaders could not hold out. Most of them wound up as Castro captives."

Criticism and analysis in retrospect by those who know the whole story is concentrated today on one point—full authority should be given in advance and a military operation should be handled by military men near the battle scene and not many hundreds of miles away in the White House or even in the Pentagon.

Human Freedom and National Independence Are Every People's Most Precious Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of the resolution adopted by the Organization for the Rebirth of the Ukraine—ODWU—at its annual convention September 1–3 at Lehighton, Pa. It is well for us to pay attention to the views of these people who know the Soviet Union best. Until its captive peoples are free, there can be no relaxation or real peace for anyone, including ourselves:

MEMORANDUM AND RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE DULY ELECTED DELEGATES OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR THE REBIRTH OF UKRAINE (ODWU) AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION ASSEMBLED ON SEPTEMBER 1–3, 1962, AT THE UKRAINIAN HOMESTEAD, LEHIGHTON, PA.

We, the American citizens of Ukrainian descent, representing all of the ethnic areas of Ukraine, homeland of our ancestors, while attending this convention have unanimously passed the following resolutions:

1. Human freedom and national independence are the most precious values of every people in the world. They have stimulated the boundless progress of man and have inculcated higher concepts of life as well as contributed to the economic welfare and have given vision of peace for the benefit of all mankind.

2. If human freedom and national independence are priceless possessions of free nations, then they must be equally dear to all of the conquered and enslaved, persecuted and disfranchised nations and peoples now living under the totalitarian regime of Soviet Russia, which, as history proves it, is the world's greatest colonial empire with many non-Russian peoples held in bondage as captive peoples through aggression, terror, subjugation and ruthless slavery within the present boundaries of Soviet Imperialist Russia, known as the U.S.S.R.

3. Efforts on the behalf of freedom for humanity should not be restricted to the peoples of Asia, Africa and the Caribbean islands, but they also should include the liberation of the non-Russian peoples in Eastern Europe from Communist domination, where formerly free and independent Ukraine and neighboring countries were forcibly occupied by the Red troops for the Russian imperialistic exploitation of human and natural resources for the further world conquest, using Communist ideology, accompanied by the denationalization, depopulation and pauperization of native peoples for the aggrandizement of Communist strength.

4. The liberation of the subjugated peoples in Eastern Europe from Communist domination is the prime necessity of the present day. Such unequivocal demand by the free world upon the Government of Soviet Russia is not only legal and justified, but it is urgently needed for the preservation of freedom and sovereignity of the rest of the world, otherwise the existing free nations may suffer the loss of their own freedom and may meet the unhappy fate of Ukraine and other non-Russian states and peoples, who are now suffering the colonial existence under the imperialist regime of the U.S.S.R.

5. Ukraine has already determined its national status by the declaration of its independence in January of 1918, and united all of the ethnic territories in January 1919, by the will of the duly elected members of the Ukrainian Parliament, Central Rada, many members of which are still living as witnesses of those heroic events, and therefore, the freedom and sovereignty of Ukraine constitute truly democratic and legal acts of self-determination as sovereign state beyond any question or doubt. Subsequently, independent Ukraine was recognized by the Government of Russia and a score of other sovereign nations. Ukraine, by her historic events after the Russian reconquest, has eloquently attested to an indomitable will to be free.

6. In view of this, the U.S. policy toward Ukraine and the non-Russian peoples within the U.S.S.R. is unrealistic and erroneous with its nonpredetermination attitude toward the conglomerate Soviet empire. In reality it displays disservice to the principles of human freedom, unwittingly condoning Russian imperialist aggression and plays into the hands of Communist colonialism against the interests of human freedom and endangers the survival of the very principles of American democracy.

7. We regret, therefore, the unfortunate statement recently made by officials of the Department of State in regard to Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, and other formerly independent countries, now enslaved by the U.S.S.R., that they are traditional areas of the Russian empire. Such statements violate historic truth and doubtless depreciate the scholastic standing of American diplomatic officials in the eyes of scholars of the world and public opinion. Such statements create confusion, display contradiction to oft made American official pronouncement in regard to the principles of freedom, self-government, and independence "as universal ideas and the common heritage of mankind" and they certainly contribute to the lowering of American prestige in the opinion of the captive and disfranchised peoples, who in common struggle with common enemy are left uncertain, and in their doubts cannot rely and depend on American national will to defend the principles of human liberty and dignity of human being. Such results are nothing less but direct aid and comfort to the imperialist Russia, the historic enemy of the United States of America and of freedom loving mankind.

8. Peace at any price will never endure. It is indeed worse than the acknowledged existence of brutal aggressive occupation with slavery of conquered peoples. It is indeed worse than slavery itself, for in addition to slavery, it also contributes to distrust and fear and it condones foreign rule and brutality without any recourse to any world organization which would be able to establish a true peace with justice.

9. Free nations of the world cannot win for freedom and world peace by surrendering their positions or by hesitation to act against the growing menace of Communist aggression. Communist rulers are experts in their use of devious methods with mixture of smiles, words, and threats to allure their victims. Only firmness with no concession or retreats can impress the Communist commisars, who well know that they cannot wage war against America and her allies. How can the U.S.S.R. wage war, when she has failed in 45 years of absolute dictatorial rule to give her own people sufficient bread and other essential needs for decent living? They have failed to increase agricultural production in spite of the fact that the U.S.S.R. has an enormous natural wealth and human resources. The Communist system since 1917 has had unlimited power of command and authority inherent in the autocratic totalitarian regime, which has shown to history and the world that it can put many millions of people to death, but has failed to learn how to feed the remaining starving millions of their own people. How can Soviet Russia wage a successful war without food, with poor transportation and enslaved, dissatisfied peoples, whom she cannot trust and guards them from the light of Western freedom by Iron Curtain, concrete walls, barbed wires, mined fields, vicious dogs, and huge armies, as well as by the concentration camps and strict censorship of every printed page and information medium to keep her own people enslaved in Soviet "happiness"? America and all other free nations of the world must be courageous and resolute without the sacrifice of principles of freedom to meet every challenge as it arises.

10. The Organization for the Rebirth of Ukraine and its affiliated organizations are astounded that during the present world political crisis in relation with Soviet Russia, our Government as well as some other free nations of the world apparently do all they can in upbuilding Russian aggressive imperialism and its barberous colonialism at the time, when the rest of the world is on the march to freedom and sovereignty in the colonial areas of yesterday. We appeal to the Government of the United States and to the representatives of free nations, members of the United Nations, to take cognizance of heroic strife by the people of Ukraine to their national liberty and instead of silence or neglect to show a genuine concern and dynamic action about the liberation of the conquered and subdued, silenced by fear people, who want to enjoy freedom and the blessings of the free world. They are our best hope and most reliable friends and allies.

11. It is not only the Slavic nations, such as Ukraine, Byelorussia and Cosackia that are still held enslaved by the U.S.S.R., but also the non-Slavic nations of Caucasus, Turkestan, and Siberia, such as Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Udel-Ural, Tadjik, Turkmen, Uzbek, Kazakh and others, embracing Christian, Buddhist, and Muslim religions that are kept in slavery. Why should they be left under the Russian domination, when their kinsmen in Asia and Africa are now in the process of national liberation? Why should all of these peoples be discriminated against? In whose interests their colonial existence under the Communist regime of Soviet Russia is left unchallenged? It seems that the recently liberated nations of Asia and Africa, for their own security, should be interested in freedom of these unhappy disfranchised Asian, Muslim, and Buddhist peoples. Some of these areas were conquered less than a hundred years ago by Imperalist Russia.

12. We deplore the unfortunate and mistaken efforts of the Government of the United States and of the American press to apparently Russify the public opinion of the American people by considering the Ukrainians and other non-Russian peoples that happen to be subdued against their will within the U.S.S.R. as Russians, instead of referring to them by their own rightful names. Similarly, the provinces and towns in Ukrainian geographic areas are called Russian, instead of Ukrainian. This is indeed very irritable and objectionable to be called by falsely identified name, and worst of all by the names of one's aggressor. We wish to remind the State Department and the press of recent objection by the Scottish people and their press to a similar error in referring to Scots and to their town as being English. It should be pointed out that there is a separate Ukrainian Republic with its people, culture, literature, art, history, territory and other distinct national attributes, even though Ukraine is enslaved, yet it is a distinct political entity which is recognized by Russia and by over a hundred sovereign States in the United Nations. It may appear that historians and the present leaders of American political life are lacking courage to defend the truth and freedom and are apologetic about the unmistakable stand in defense of human liberty. It looks as though they are apologetic for the love of freedom and for the acts of our Founders of the United States and for the American democracy "with liberty and justice for all."

13. We appeal to the Government of the United States of America to open its full inquiry into the Soviet Union's highly heterogenic demography and Soviet's monopolization of three votes in the United Nations without full sovereign rights for Ukraine and Byelorussia on the par basis with all other members of this august body. If Ukraine and Byelorussia are admitted as sovereign nations and are voting in the United Nations as such, with participation in its agencies, then they should be adjudged by the members of the United Nations to full sovereign and equal rights.

They should meet the United Nations Charter specifications for self-determination and sovereign equality with all other members. They should be self-governing states without dictates from the Kremlin and not just subordinated provinces of the U.S.S.R. colonial empire. They should correspond to the will of their people free from coercion by the Communist regime. Other recently liberated nations of Asia and Africa are enjoying full sovereign rights in the United Nations and in the community

of free nations of the world. There should not be unjust discrimination in this matter against Ukraine and Byelorussia. All nations in the United Nations should have equal rights, not only in the United Nations, but should also have freedom, independence and self-government on their territories with their own army and navy and with accredited embassies and consulates abroad. Ukraine should take her place that is due her not only in the United Nations, but also among the free nations of the world.

14. We implore the United Nations and all free governments of the world to compel Soviet Russia to leave the non-Russian territories in Eastern Europe and Asia and to withdraw Soviet troops from the satellite countries, from Baltic states and from all of the non-Russian territories in Europe and in Asia, such as Ukraine, Byelorussia, land of the peoples of the Caucasus, Turkestan, Korea, Mongolia, and other non-Russian ethnic areas. These territories were occupied by the Soviet military forces by aggression at the end of the Russian Revolution or at the end of World War II against the will of the peoples of these territories, and Russians in these areas are in a decided minority as usurpers, exploiters, aggressors and unwanted colonialists, who rule these peoples by forceful occupation.

15. We vigorously support the House Resolution 211, introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD for the creation of a House Captive Nations Committee. This committee can be of great service to humanity the world over by rendering a new insight in the depth of inspiration to the sources of the founders of the United States in our appreciation of the true values of freedom. The Ukrainians are deeply inspired by the American dream and are committed to its ideals.

16. We also support the Senate Concurrent Resolution 82, submitted by Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, and House Resolution 718 by Congressman DON L. SHORT, requesting the President to make necessary efforts through the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to place on the agenda of the United Nations Assembly the question of the deplorable persecution and destruction of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches within the U.S.S.R.

17. We are vowing that Ukraine's struggle for her freedom and complete independence will not abate. The world must be aware that without sovereign Ukraine and the freedom of other non-Russian peoples from Russian imperialism and colonialism, there can be neither world peace with justice, nor economic stabilization. No amount of misleading efforts for containment, peaceful coexistence, concessions, and policies of nonpredetermination will stop the Russian imperialism and Communist colonialism from their ruthless aims and efforts of world conquest. Without rich Ukraine and non-Russian territories, the imperialist Russia will not be able to menace the free world. Free and independent Ukraine, therefore, is the prime prerequisite for the survival of freedom in the United States and in the rest of the world. To that end all of our peaceful, but dynamic, efforts should be directed with vigor and manly determination.

18. We urge all of the Ukrainian organizations throughout the world and the organizations of other nations, be they free or subjugated, to cooperate and to redouble our united efforts in common creative purpose for the achievement of these aims. Ukraine must be liberated in the interests of freedom and security of all peoples of the world.

For the Resolution Committee of Organization of the Rebirth of the Ukraine.

ALEXANDER A. GRANOVSKY,
Chairman.

Time To Stand Fast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, in these parlous times for the United States and the free world, I would like to draw attention to the following excellent editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer of September 25, 1962. The strong stand taken by this great newspaper is a reflection of the feeling of an ever-increasing number of Americans. No; we cannot afford to be shoved back another foot by Soviet Russia in Cuba, Berlin, southeast Asia, or any other trouble spots in the world.

The editorial is as follows:

TIME TO STAND FAST

How do we really stand with Soviet Russia? Will Premier Khrushchev keep trying to push us around in Berlin, in Cuba, in Laos, or will he realize he may have already reached the point where we will no longer be pushed?

The real danger period for the world, in the opinion of U.S. News & World Report, will be during the remainder of this year and the first months of 1963.

"We must be on our guard in Berlin to maintain the rights which we now possess," Gen. Lucius D. Clay, former U.S. commander in Europe and reecntly the President's personal representative in Berlin, wrote in the October issue of the quarterly, Foregin Affairs. "There, as elsewhere, we must be prepared to interpose our troops step by step as threats materialize, so that these threats can be carried out only by the use of force. If this involves the risk of war, it is a risk we must take."

Yet everything in Russia is not clear sailing for Mr. Khrushchev. He has his troubles there, as Allen W. Dulles, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, observed in the Plain Dealer's This Week magazine, Sunday.

"It is my impression," wrote Dulles, "that there is slowly building up inside Russia a latent pressure for more freedom, for a fairer sharing of the produce of their labor than the sytsem now allows. Life in the Communist world is drab compared to our own."

Certainly, as East Berliners and other East Germans continue to risk their lives in attempting to escape to the West, they have exploded any possible fiction that life under the Soviets is worth living. High Red officials are among the East Germans who have fled to the West.

This much has been proved: When we stand firm, Russia backs down. It has done so repeatedly. And if it becomes necessary to crush communism in Cuba by force, a great many astute people feel that though she might howl and threaten, Russia would not risk nuclear war.

To be sure, nothing is certain in this world. Khrushchev could make a fatal miscalculation. But it has become increasingly apparent that he is far less likely to do so if he is confronted with calm determination on every front and in every sticky situation.

For the fact is that we have reached the point where we cannot afford to be shoved back another foot.

Dental Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, because dental disease does not often have the dramatic consequences of death or crippling disfigurement, its importance in relation to the total health and well-being of our people frequently is overlooked.

Recently the dental profession through its national organization, the American Dental Association, submitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the following rather startling statistics:

Almost 160 million people in the United States have dental disease or face the certain prospect of suffering from tooth decay, periodontal disease, oral cancer, malocclusion or cleft lip and palate.

The best estimates are that 97 million persons have tooth decay; 23 million have periodontal disease; 21 million persons are without teeth; 16 million have malocclusion; 65,000 children under 18 have cleft palate, cleft lip or both.

Twenty-three thousand persons develop oral cancer each year.

It is estimated that 85 million man-hours of industrial production are lost annually owing to oral disease.

The total amount of dental service provided each year is not sufficient to treat the new dental needs occurring during the year. The accumulated backlog of need for dental service is so large that to remove it would require a year's full-time service from a dental force five times its present size.

Over the years of my service as chairman of the appropriations subcommittee tee dealing with health matters, I have become acutely aware of the significance of dental diseases, and I have attempted to assure that this important segment of health receives the attention it deserves.

With the support of other members of the Appropriations Committee and the Congress, funds have been provided to establish an outstanding dental research program at the National Institutes of Health. The National Institute of Dental Research was founded only a few years ago, but I am pleased to say that its accomplishments since then have been remarkable and have paid rich dividends to the betterment of the health of our people.

The discovery that fluoridation of public water supplies would reduce the incidence of dental caries by as much as 60 percent has alone prevented untold suffering and saved millions of dollars in dental bills. Other contributions too numerous to mention here also have been made through research into the causes and cures of oral diseases.

Last year, with the approval of my subcommittee, a new dental health center was established by the Public Health Service in San Francisco in order to accelerate the practical use of new research findings. Significant new pro-

grams are now underway in that institution. Top level research and training programs are going forward in all dental schools in the country; students are learning how to provide more and better dental care for all our citizens as a result of the Federal grant programs authorized by Congress.

It is to the great credit of the members of the dental profession that they have taken the lead in initiating and supporting these and other measures in behalf of better dental health. I know of no other professional group that has a finer record in seeking actively to improve the health of the public.

But the dental profession believes, and I agree, that not enough is being done. The American Dental Association currently is strongly supporting Federal legislation to provide grants for the construction and expansion of facilities for training health personnel and to strengthen State and local dental public health program. I have cosponsored and supported both of these badly needed bills and will continue to do so.

The dental profession also is attempting to extend the availability of dental care by extending coverage under dental prepayment plans. The dental association in my own State of Rhode Island recently has pioneered a program in this field.

Vigorous work also is going forward in bringing dental care to the handicapped, the aged and other unfortunate people who are institutionalized or otherwise unable to receive conventional treatment.

In these and many other ways, the dental profession is recognizing and attempting to carry out its responsibilities to the people of this Nation.

In my opinion, these efforts deserve the commendation and wholehearted support of all Members of Congress.

American Blood Is Spilled in Far Places While Reds Get Stronger 90 Miles Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people, in ever growing numbers, demand action against Russian intervention in this hemisphere.

The Florida press has been particularly alert to this threat at our southern door—only 90 miles from our own beaches. Our editors and feature writers report from the vantage point of close proximity to the danger, and with the advantage of contacts with Cuban exiles now living in Florida.

Over the past months I have had reprinted here in the RECORD stories and editorials from Florida so that these events would be called to the attention of all Members of Congress and other Government leaders. As a further indication of the feelings of our citizens on these matters, I ask that the following be printed in the RECORD:

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Sept. 5, 1962]

AMERICAN BLOOD IS SPILLED IN FAR PLACES WHILE REDS GET STRONGER 90 MILES AWAY

Now that Russia has formally confirmed the fact that large quantities of Soviet war materials, supplies, and technical aid are going to Cuba, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the American people to understand why our own Government is standing by and apparently doing nothing about this blatant breach of the Monroe Doctrine.

We are supposed to be dedicated to combating the spread of communism. As of this date some 14 American fighting men have been killed in far away Vietnam and scores more have been injured. We are maintaining strong forces in Formosa which are dedicated to prevent the Chinese Communists from trying to enlarge their foothold in that part of the world. In Berlin and in dozens of other places our Army, Navy, and Air Force are standing watch and are ready to fight the moment the Communists launch an aggressive attack.

But just 90 miles away the Commies are building a bridgehead in our own hemisphere and constructing an armed camp which threatens vast sections of this country and we are literally doing nothing.

Soothing words from Washington are no answer to this appalling inconsistency. What is transpiring in Cuba right now violates not only the Monroe Doctrine but the principles espoused by the Organization of American States. It should be met not with meaningless and futile words but with forthright action. Yet there is no such action either from Washington or from the OAS.

Why should this be? Have we become so timorous and afraid of the Russian bear that we can't stop his marauding right into our own backyard? Have we become so weak and insecure in our military posture that we don't dare prevent the construction of a Soviet-inspired military base just 90 miles from Key West? Are we so overextended and committed in other areas of the world that we can no longer take positive action to eradicate a menace close to home?

These are sober questions that deserve a better answer than they are being given in Washington today. They are questions that deeply concern millions of Americans who are becoming sick and tired of seeing billions of their dollars thrown away in far corners of the world supposedly to contain the Communists while they thumb their noses at us from nearby Cuba.

This is a paradox that literally belies understanding. We are asked to trust our Government but what is our Government doing to encourage this trust? It speaks in procrastinating words and in riddles. It asks us to swallow and believe that the Communist menace in Vietnam is worth the lives and the blood of American boys while the spectacle in Cuba is not of overriding concern.

In recent days more and more voices are joining the clamor of dissent over our Cuban policy. They are demanding to know how far are we going to let the Russians go in their aid to Fidel Castro before we have the guts to say enough is enough. Do we intend to wait until Castro has enough rockets, missiles, jet fighters, and other war materials, not to mention Russian troops and technicians, to make an invasion as bloody and as difficult as some of those we had to mount against the entrenched Japanese in World War II?

We hope not, but the words coming out of Washington are not encouraging in this respect. They are vacillating and not inspiring of confidence. They bespeak leadership that is not at all certain of where it is going or what it wants to do.

We are supposed to be the bulwark of the free world but a bulwark is massive and strong and unyielding to the pressures mounted against it. Today we are acting like anything but a bulwark as, instead of standing stanch and strong, we are bending against the pressure being applied by the Communists and changing our policies from day to day according to the expediencies of the moment rather than standing firm on the principles that made us a great and respected nation.

Certainly, there are risks involved in telling Russia to get out of Cuba and stay out. But since when have we been afraid to take risks in defense of our own security and our own longstanding principles? Have we become so wedded to the U.N., to the OAS, and to other international debating societies that we have forsaken the virtue of being able to act on our own whether anybody else likes it or not?

We don't have to ask the U.N. or the OAS permission to invoke the Monroe Doctrine. Those organizations weren't even in existence when this doctrine was made a part and parcel of our foreign policy. We could have been rid of Castro and his commie followers right now if we had had the guts months ago to send our own Air Force to the support of the Bay of Pigs invaders. But horrified Adlai Stevenson protested that couldn't be done without sacrificing his reputation with the U.N. so President Kennedy never issued the order which could have turned the tide and permitted freedom-loving Cubans to recapture their country from Castro.

Now we face a much tougher task and the longer we wait the tougher it is apt to become. It is a situation which cries aloud for forceful and direct action from Washington but Washington fiddles and dances while the American people wonder what's going on when we can afford to fight Communist guerrillas in Vietnam and ignore Soviet guns and missiles in nearby Cuba.

Hey, Mr. Congressman, Is Washington, D.C., a Tourist Trap?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Lapeer County Press in my State of Michigan on September 6, 1962. The editorial reports a situation that has concerned me for some time—the treatment received by the tourist visiting the Nation's Capital.

Because I think private commercial interests benefiting from the tourist trade had better give serious consideration to the problems discussed in this editorial, I have sent copies of it to Clarence A. Arata, executive director of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade.

Because the treatment of visitors to national shrines is of interest to him, I have sent a copy of this editorial to the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall.

It behooves the Members of Congress also to give serious thought to this problem. The people coming to visit Washington are our constituents. We have an obligation, I think, to do all that we can to see that the services provided them are the very best possible, that they are afforded an opportunity to visit their national institutions at reasonable cost, and that they are extended courteous treatment while they are here.

The editorial follows:

[From the Lapeer (Mich.) County Press, Sept. 6, 1962]

HEY, MR. CONGRESSMAN, IS WASHINGTON, D.C., A TOURIST TRAP?

We don't like reports we are getting from vacationers to Washington, D.C. "Tourist trap" and "clip joint" are two of the mildest expressions we have heard.

Two friends recently took their 15-year-old son to see our national shrines and the home of democracy. We doubt that the young man was impressed. Between the looting of the family purse and the herding of sightseers through famous shrines like sheep through a dipping vat, the young man must have been thoroughly disenchanted.

The three started on an economy trip of 5 days. They figured that $30 per day might see them through. By the time the highbinders had finished with them, the trip cost $50 per day. And they didn't see a third of what they had hoped.

At Gettysburg they were stuck $21 for an ordinary motel room. The proprietor said they'd have to pay as much anywhere in the area. A nice room in New York's Waldorf-Astoria would have cost less.

The motel man sold them on a "fine private trip over the battlefield" for $2.50 each. "They pick you up here and bring you back," he added.

They were picked up. They were delivered to a bus loaded with other visitors at the entrance to the battlefield. The bus tore through the battlefield in 45 minutes, making only one stop, while the tourists listened to a monolog. And that was that.

With Gettysburg behind, Washington only a short distance farther along wasn't quite as bad. Not quite. Just shopworn accommodations, dull food in dull places, and jams of people at first-class resort prices.

At Mount Vernon (admission 75 cents) they took places at the end of a long slow-moving line. Once inside the herders kept prodding, "Move along please. Others are waiting." Their impression of George Washington's leisurely and gracious way of life was indeed confused.

It was ditto at the FBI, the Treasury Building, Washington Monument, and other places. The White House, widely advertised as open to the public, was open for only 2 hours daily. The line was so long an hour before opening that they didn't even line up.

A small thing, just a two-bit charge to follow a guard through the Capitol Building, is an item that for some reason offends us the most. Migosh. Two bits for a young man to see where his laws are made and have it explained to him.

Not patronized, but ever-present, were the "runners" for private privileged tour people. They show up frequently, soliciting. For $25 they'll drive your car and sneak you in "by special arrangement." Sort of back-door stuff—no waiting with the peasants. A black market seems in operation in our holy-of-holy governmental shrines.

It's easy to see why senior class high school trips to Washington have been practically discontinued. Too much for too little. It is a shame.

The crowds, perhaps, are inevitable. And gypsters follow the crowds. The same clipping and gypping exists in and around nearly all our national parks.

But it does seem that price racketeering right under the noses of Congress should at least be investigated. Some sort of licensing program for protection of people who can't afford Miami Beach prices to see their National Capital shouldn't be difficult.

Congress runs Washington. The District is under Federal control. So is Gettysburg. Congress is investigating everything else. Why not their own front yard?

Postal Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has reported out the new postal rate and pay raise bill. Included in this bill is a section which empowers the Secretary of the Treasury to confiscate mail deemed "Communist political propaganda." Although the Senate committee watered down the Cunningham amendment contained in the House version, this section still presumes that Americans are not intelligent enough to evaluate material they receive in the mail and still retains a concept which is alien to our basic freedoms. On September 25, the New York Times outlined the issue in an editorial which I hope all my colleagues will read.

The editorial follows:

NO POSTAL CENSORSHIP WANTED

Should Congress write into the statutes of this country a system of political censorship and screening of the mails? This is the real issue posed by one section of the new postal-rate and pay-raise bill reported out yesterday by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The Senate committee was seeking to meet the problem raised by the House-approved Cunningham amendment, which would go far toward preventing American citizens from receiving mail from the Soviet Union and other Communist countries. The Senate version is more reasonable, since it contains important exemptions. But it still declares, in effect, that there are two kinds of Americans: those who can be trusted to receive any kind of mail from the Communist world, and those who cannot. The Senate provision, like the Cunningham amendment, is probably unconstitutional, and certainly contrary to the most fundamental traditions of our country.

The Senate version of the postal bill provides, as expected, for higher postal rates and for a pay increase for postal and other Government workers. The rate increases are necessary; and fortunately the Senate committee's proposals do not echo the House's sharp threat to the future existence of some of the country's best periodicals.

Although the U.S. mail service can hardly go anywhere but up, it is not likely that the 1-cent increase in ordinary letter mail will produce any improvement, inasmuch as the increased postal revenues will be more than absorbed by the pay increase. As we have argued earlier, the pay issue and the rate issue should have been separated so that each could have been decided on its own merits. But that would be asking too much of a Congress this close to election day in an even-numbered year.

Who's in Charge in Washington?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous request to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article appearing in the Los Angeles Times of September 24, 1962:

BY THE WAY—WHO'S IN CHARGE IN WASHINGTON?

(By Bill Henry)

LAS VEGAS.—It was one of those quiet moments at the Air Force Defense orientation powwow when nobody was briefing us on military matters or demonstrating anything about the space age. The fellow from Washington was nursing a tall drink. In the background were the click of dice, the crashing levers of the slot machines, the occasional shouts of crapshooters. "Have you ever stopped to think," the man asked, "what has happened to the U.S. Government?" He paused to take a sip from his glass. "Two years ago—give or take a couple of months or so—the Democrats were having their convention in your town." This, with a glance at some of us from Los Angeles. "There was that desperate moment in the convention when a lot of agitated Stevenson aficionados were picketing the joint and trying to break the police barrier to get in. Adlai himself couldn't make up his mind whether he was a candidate or not. Your Governor Brown was wavering like a runaway metronome trying to decide who he was for. There were Kennedy relatives all over the floor wheedling, threatening, pleading, promising—successfully. Their boy Jack got the nomination. The Stevenson rooters looked for tall buildings to jump off of. All was lost as far as they were concerned." He paused, took another sip from his tall glass, looked around the group significantly and finally broke the brief silence. "Has it occurred to you," he asked, "to take a look at the situation to find out just exactly who is running the Government now?" It was an interesting question. We all began to get a faraway look in our eyes as we checked the list, starting with dear Adlai himself.

ADLAI HAS QUITE A DELEGATION

The fellow from Washington finally spoke up. "Don't get a headache trying to think," he said, "I'll list some of the boys for you." He took another sip. "We can start off with Adlai, of course. Adlai is our delegate to the United Nations with Cabinet rank. That's a position of some importance in the field of world affairs. But he's only one of the Stevenson crowd. Most people forget that he isn't just a figurehead down there in New York at the end of a string doing what the fellows at State in Washington tell him to do. The fellow who is really running the State Department, as Under Secretary, is a former Stevenson law firm man, George Ball. Now anybody who knows anything about the State Department knows that Ball is the most positive, aggressive, and powerful figure in the Department. While Secretary Rusk gallops around doing Kennedy's bidding, Ball runs the show at State. And, as further proof of Adlai's grip on the Department, the fellow who handles U.N. affairs in Washington—including the just approved $100 million U.S. contribution to the U.N. bond issue—is Harlan Cleveland, another Stevenson law firm man."

LAW FIRM HAS MOVED EAST

Most of the crowd really hadn't thought about it. The Washington man went on:

"Postmaster General Edward Day is a longtime associate of Stevenson in the law and political fields. He's a Cabinet member. And who was named to succeed Arthur Goldberg as Secretary of Labor? Willard Wirtz, another former Stevenson law partner, of course. And there's Newton Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and William Blair, newly named Ambassador to Denmark—they're both fresh out of Stevenson's law office. Quite a representation, don't you think?" There was a pause. "Maybe," he said quizzically, "with more Stevenson guys than Kennedy relatives in the Cabinet, that's one reason Kennedy seldom seems to call any Cabinet meetings."

Mr. Smith Goes to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of my colleagues both here and in the Senate recall with fondness a motion picture of some years ago called "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington." It was the first of several films which came out of my district in California, dealing with the subject of this Congress. None have dealt with the subject with more warmth, good humor and realism than "Mr. Smith."

It is my pleasant duty at this time to call the attention of my colleagues to a rebirth of this compelling motion picture, but this time in the medium of television. This series, which stars Fess Parker in the role created by James Stewart 25 years ago, will be premiering shortly on nationwide television. I had the good fortune to see an episode of this series recently in my district, and it stimulated some thoughts on the subject which I should like to pass on here.

In addition to being entertaining, it seems to me that the series, "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington" has a real opportunity to bring greater interest in and understanding of our Congress to the American people. This, I suggest, is most important in a system where all of the people are truly and equally sovereign if, and only if, they understand and accept their responsibility. Too often Congressmen and Senators are thought of as different from other people, either put on a pedestal as being all wise and powerful, or relegated to the gutter as crooked politicians squandering the taxpayer's money. The concepts are equally erroneous.

"Mr. Smith" will do much to show the American public that we are all the same—limited by human frailties but sincerely interested in people and in our job, and dedicated to seeing that this form of government of ours survives. Those making the "Mr. Smith" series are substantially helping us here in Congress. I wish them much success, and eagerly await my half-hour visit with the Senator in my living room.

Mary Anderson, First Director of Women's Bureau, Celebrates 90th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following news stories from the Washington Post and Times Herald, the Washington Evening Star, and the Christian Science Monitor, and in so doing pay tribute to a great lady who has contributed much to the advancement of women as workers and as citizens, Miss Mary Anderson:

[From the Washington Post & Times Herald]
SHE WAS NEVER SO SURPRISED IN ALL OF HER 90 YEARS
(By Marie Smith)

Mary Anderson, first Director of the Women's Bureau, celebrated her 90th birthday Monday but the big surprises came yesterday: Congratulations from two heads of Government and an award of merit for her many years of service in promoting the welfare of wage earners in the United States.

The congratulations, with tributes on her 90th birthday, came from President Kennedy and Prime Minister Tage Erlander, of Sweden. Miss Anderson's native country.

Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg read the greetings at a ceremony in his office attended by many of the people who worked with Miss Angerson during the 25 years she headed the Women's Bureau.

As an added honor, he presented her the Department of Labor's award of merit in recognition of her significant contribution toward furthering the work of the Department in promoting the welfare of workers.

In his greeting, dated August 27, President Kennedy expressed his deep appreciation for her long and constructive efforts in behalf of women workers in the United States.

"The effects of your work have benefited not only women of this country but those of distant lands," he wrote. He added, "your career has been an inspiration to all who believe in the principles of fairness and progress."

Prime Minister Erlander, who cabled his greetings in care of Secretary Goldberg, told Miss Anderson "the Swedish Government is happy to know that you are being honored as a pioneer for women's rights in the labor market and for social justice."

Secretary Goldberg pointed out in presenting the framed citation of merit that Miss Anderson was the first "up from the ranks" labor woman to head a division of the executive department of the Federal Government.

She was appointed director of the Women's Bureau by President Wilson in 1920, and was reappointed by every successive President until her retirement in 1944.

The spry, snowy-haired Miss Anderson was not at a loss for words to acknowledge the honors. She said she felt that "all the ones with me in the Women's Bureau at that time should have some kind of recognition."

"Our staff," she said, "was dedicated to the cause. The first thing we did was make a survey of why women couldn't take civil service examinations. Right after that, women were permitted to take a few little examinations but now they can take every examination. * * * I feel that brought about the great employment of women in Government and I think the women have made good too," she added.

In the audience applauding her words were Alice Hager, who was the first chief of information in the Women's Bureau to have "permanent status," and Elizabeth Shirley Enochs who was the first in the Children's Bureau.

In his tribute to the first lady of the Women's Bureau, Secretary Goldberg pointed out that she came to this country from Sweden at the age of 16 and worked as a dishwasher in a Michigan lumberjack boardinghouse, a domestic worker in the employ of several families and later an operator in garment and shoe factories before joining the active trade union movement.

During her employment in the shoe plant, Miss Anderson became president of the Stitchers Local 94 of the International Boot and Shoe Workers Unions, an office she held for 15 years. Later, she served as an organizer for the Chicago and National Women's Trade Union Leagues.

She was also active in the suffrage movement and marched in several suffrage parades in Chicago. Noting this in his birthday message to Miss Anderson, President Kennedy congratulated her on helping to achieve for women "the valuable tool of the suffrage."

Miss Anderson still lives in Washington and is active in the causes to which she has devoted her life. Secretary Goldberg, in concluding his tribute to her, said that the Women's Bureau today seldom starts a project "without seeking her guidance and counsel."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 29, 1962]
J.F.K. SALUTES MARY ANDERSON
(By Isabelle Shelton)

A Swedish immigrant girl who made good, received kudos from her own and her adopted land yesterday.

She is Mary Anderson, sweet faced, white haired and 90 years old, who climbed from menial jobs as boarding house dishwater, domestic worker and shoe factory worker to become the first head of the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor.

President Kennedy and Swedish Prime Minister Tage Erlander sent messages of congratulations, and Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg presented Miss Anderson with his Department's Award of Merit yesterday, in ceremonies in his Labor Department office.

The award was "in recognition of her significant and outstanding contribution toward furthering the work of the Department of Labor," from which she retired in 1944.

LETTER FROM KENNEDY

President Kennedy expressed in a letter his "deep appreciation of your long and constructive efforts in behalf of women workers of the United States.

"Your dedication to the cause of such workers was unswerving throughout your quarter century as Director of the Women's Bureau," the President continued.

"You provided that help as a trade unionist and later as a high official of the U.S. Government. The effects of your work have benefited not only women of this country but those in distant lands."

Noting that Miss Anderson's birthday, which was the day before (August 27) was almost the anniversary of the 19th (women's suffrage) amendment which became law August 26, 1920, the President declared that Miss Anderson was "to be congratulated on your part in helping to achieve for women the valuable tool of the suffrage.

"Women of the United States * * * are deeply indebted to you," he said. "The patterns you established both for women as workers and for women as citizens will be valuable indeed to the President's Commission on the Status of Women, which has as its objective the achievement of the full partnership of women in our democracy."

GOLDBERG SPEAKS

Secretary Goldberg said presentation of the award was "one of the greatest privileges that has ever come to me—the opportunity to pay tribute personally to a woman who has devoted her whole life to the cause of working people—helping to create for them the kind of life that men and women have a right to hope for and to achieve."

Miss Anderson also was presented with a scrapbook full of letters of praise and congratulation from other persons, chiefly leaders of the American labor movement.

Mrs. Goldberg made the presentation on behalf of herself and Mrs. Esther Peterson—present head of the Women's Bureau, who was out of town attending a conference.

Many women with whom Miss Anderson had worked over the years were present for the ceremony, as were such figures as Senator Maurine Neuberger, Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, and Nelson Cruikshank, director of the AFL–CIO Department of Social Security.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 1, 1962]

MANY OWE HER MUCH

(By Josephine Ripley)

In all of her 90 years she had never been more surprised. Not many women at any age receive greetings from the heads of two nations, or even one, for that matter.

But it happened to Miss Mary Anderson, not because of the years, but because of what she has accomplished.

She made no fortune except that which accrues from helping thousands of other women attain better working conditions, better pay and a better deal in the working world.

The greetings and congratulations came from President Kennedy and from Prime Minister Tage Erlander of Sweden, Miss Anderson's native country. Along with them came an award of merit from the U.S. Department of Labor.

Probably no woman in the country has done more for her fellow workingwoman than the 16-year-old Swedish immigrant who came to this country on a $30 steerage ticket in 1889 to find a job.

Many years later, in 1920, she became the first Director of the Woman's Bureau of the Labor Department, appointed by President Wilson. That was fine with Presidents Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt, all of whom reappointed her. She retired from the Bureau in 1944.

Mary Anderson has witnessed, and been a part of, some of the most dramatic years in the Nation's industrial history.

Her first job in the new country was in a lumberjacks' boardinghouse in Michigan, where she was employed as a dishwasher for $2 a week, plus board and lodging. In her third job as a domestic, she had a raise—to $3.

Her next move set the course of her life. She went to Chicago to work in a garment factory, then to a shoe factory still at $3 a week. This was increased eventually to $8.

As work became slack, she went from job to job in various States. At 22, she returned to Chicago where she again went to work in a shoe factory, this time for $14 a week as a skilled worker.

She remained there for 7 years, and it was during this period that she entered the trade union movement.

Here she learned, as she has put it in her autobiography, "Women at Work," that "it was not always necessary to change jobs to get better working conditions. Sometimes we could improve conditions through union negotiations with the employer. That was a better way, because then conditions were improved for a great many people, and not just for the one person who changed to a better job."

This was the beginning of her work in the labor movement, a cause to which she has devoted her life. She was soon elected president of the Stitchers Local 94 of the International Boot & Shoe Workers Union, and remained in that office for 15 years.

She eventually became a full-time organizer for the National Women's Trade Union League. During this time she helped to gain better living wages, shorter hours, and safer working conditions for women.

Miss Anderson was asked one time what she considered the most interesting and important single thing she had done in her life. She had just returned from Paris where she had seen and reported to President Wilson.

To everyone's surprise, Miss Anderson named not her Paris mission, but the work she had done years before on the Hart, Schaffner & Marx agreement which established arbitration as a method of settling labor disputes.

Another thing she likes to remember is her pioneering work in the field of collective bargaining, when she helped draw up and put into effect the labor constitution of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Miss Anderson was largely responsible for inclusion in the Federal wage and hour law of a provision that there be no classification on the basis of sex or age in the drafting of minimum-wage orders. This meant that when committees met later on to set higher minimums, the law prevented differentials for women.

Labor Secretary Goldberg, in presenting the surprise award to her, welcomed "The opportunity to pay tribute personally to a woman who has devoted her whole life to the cause of working people—to helping to create for them the kind of life men and women have a right to hope for and to achieve."

President Kennedy, in his message, said he felt her work had "benefited not only the women of this country, but those of distant lands."

The Prime Minister of Sweden cabled that the Swedish Government "is happy to know that you are being honored as a pioneer for women's rights in the labor market and for social justice."

Communist Military Buildup in Cuba Must Be Stopped

SPEECH

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 230, expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will read the joint resolution passed by the 84th Congress, January 29, 1955, authorizing the President to take such action as he deemed necessary to stop the Red Chinese Communists from making an armed attack on Formosa and the Pescadores.

I will read the resolution in full:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 159

Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area

Whereas the primary purpose of the United States, in its relations with all other nations, is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all; and

Whereas certain territories in the West Pacific under the jurisdiction of the Republic of China are now under armed attack, and threats and declarations have been and are being made by the Chinese Communists that such armed attack is in aid of and in preparation for armed attack on Formosa and the Pescadores; and

Whereas such armed attack if continued would gravely endanger the peace and security of the West Pacific area and particularly of Formosa and the Pescadores; and

Whereas the secure possession by friendly governments of the western Pacific island chain, of which Formosa is a part, is essentian to the vital interests of the United States and all friendly nations in or bordering upon the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas the President of the United States on January 6, 1955, submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification a Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China, which recognizes that an armed attack in the West Pacific area directed against territories, therein described, in the region of Formosa and the Pescadores, would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the parties to the treaty: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress.

Approved January 29, 1955.

Immediately after the passage of that resolution the President sent the 7th Fleet into the Formosa Straits, which proved to the Reds that Uncle Sam was not bluffing, and the result was that, the planned Red attack on Formosa did not materialize.

Why, I ask, do we not pass a similar resolution now, since we are faced with a very similar situation in Cuba, where the Castro and the Russian Communists have joined forces to establish a military toehold only 90 miles from the U.S. mainland?

Our President has not asked Congress to give him authority to deal with that problem effectively and decisively. But instead we are now faced with a weak-kneed resolution which in effect gives the President no more authority to deal with this powder keg Cuban problem than he already has.

Mr. Chairman, it must be pointed out that the President of the United States under his war powers, could and should

have long ago sent a sufficient arm of our naval fleet to patrol the waters around Cuba. Had this been done, I am sure that all ships flying the flag of any foreign nation, Russian included, would never have crossed the line loaded with instruments of war for Castro. The American people are asking, "What are we waiting for?" It is noteworthy that so long as Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower was President of the United States, the Russian Communists were very careful not to show one iota of military cooperation with Castro, for they knew only too well that Ike would not permit a Red military buildup in Cuba's tent which is now going on, full speed ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest the words "Formosa and the Pescadores" in the joint resolution passed by Congress in 1955, be substituted by inserting in lieu thereof, these words: "the United States and all sister nations within the confines of the Monroe Doctrine as originally spelled out."

May I say in conclusion, that, regardless of the nature of resolutions we pass today, I sincerely hope and pray that the Communists will understand and that Uncle Sam is ready to take any means necessary to stop their military buildup in Cuba.

Tribute to the Late Joseph J. Delaney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Joseph J. Delaney, president of the International Union of Operating Engineers, who was respected and admired by many of us on Capitol Hill, recently was called to his Maker. His passing will be a great loss not only to his immediate family, Members of Congress, his countless friends and associates, but especially the Operating Engineers and the building and construction trade for whom he worked untiringly and unselfishly for a good many years. He was not only a kindly man but most considerate at all times, a fine administrator and an honorable, intelligent, able, and capable leader in the trade union movement. We all extend to his family our sincere and deepest sympathy, knowing that he will no doubt be rewarded with eternal happiness. I wish to include a eulogy on Mr. Delaney that appeared in the Building and Construction Trades Bulletin which expresses the exact feelings of all of us concerning this well-known and well-thought-of leader of the workingmen in that industry.

The eulogy follows:

JOSEPH J. DELANEY

This is not an obituary, but an attempt to put into words what every building tradesman must feel at the passing of Joseph J. Delaney, president of the International Union of Operating Engineers. He was like a rock—solid and dependable—for all his friends to lean on and gain strength from when they needed help.

Joe Delaney was a leader. From his youth he showed the ability to break new ground, to pioneer in new paths, and to convince others of the wisdom of following him to greater achievement. He organized the first local union of apprentices in his International, perhaps in any international, and led it to recognition, reward, and security. A man who did not seek personal preferment, Joe Delaney undertook the leadership of his union at a time when it was under attack. Within 4 years he strengthened and rebuilt the organization and erased criticism. As a vice president of the building and construction trades department, Joe Delaney consistently worked for positive goals—such as intensified organization to wipe out nonunion pockets, systematized cooperation with fair contractors, and greater political activity by unions and their members.

He was a man with an outsize heart, always ready and willing to do a good deed for others less fortunate, without having to be asked. Above all else, he was an ardent trade unionist, an organizer of the old school, a true believer in the high principles and ultimate victory of the labor movement, to which he contributed a lifetime of faithful service. He believed that a trade union should be run for the benefit of its members, that all unions should work together for the advancement of all workers, and that the first allegiance of American workers belongs to their country.

A trade unionist of the old school? Yes—and right at the top of the class. There aren't enough left. Joe Delaney will be sorely missed.

Words Won't Solve World Money Woes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as this session of the 87th Congress ends, we find ourselves with the largest budget deficit in peacetime history, a large part of it brought about by the whip that the administration has wielded in an effort to push through its spending programs.

I submit for the RECORD an article by Joseph Ator, columnist of the Chicago Daily Tribune, which appeared in the Tuesday, September 25, edition, which in a clear and concise manner analyzes the situation concerning the safety of our dollar and the gold drain.

WORDS DON'T SOLVE WORLD MONEY WOES—ASSURANCE OF DOLLAR'S SAFETY HAS NOT STOPPED GOLD DRAIN

(By Joseph Ator)

The trouble with international finance is that words don't work. You have to lay it on the line, "it," in these circumstances, being gold.

American monetary authorities have been indulging in a deal of futile rhetoric in recent months designed to ease this Nation out of its foreign financial difficulties. They put out a flood of optimism in connection with the September meeting of the International Monetary Fund in Washington, evoking from Europeans in attendance the polite equivalent of "faugh."

The American theme song was "the dollar is out of the woods." Despite the fact that Per Jacobsson, managing director of the IMF, joined the American chorus, events of recent months served to stimulate derision of the claims.

Back of our fiscal troubles lies the recurring deficit in the American balance of payments with other nations. Any such deficit has to be paid off in gold, and almost constant deficits have consumed a third of our gold store.

Since the end of 1961 foreign holders of claims on the United States have taken more than $800 million in gold, substantially equal to our loss of gold last year. The bulletin of the Federal Reserve System last month disclosed that foreign short-term claims against this country, the principal base of gold withdrawals, leaped from $22,550 million at the start of the year to $24,100 million on July 1.

BUDGET DEFICIT SOARS

A year ago Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon assured the authorities of the IMF, meeting in Vienna, that the American budget now in effect would be balanced. The Treasury's estimate called for a surplus of $463 million, but appropriations will create a deficit of more than $6 billion.

Dillon's and President Kennedy's difficulty is that the present administration persists in lavishing military and economic aid on other nations, some of which are in such sound financial condition that they should well be cooking up some scheme for the economic aid of the United States. Congress, which has applied the ax to some of Kennedy's foreign aid requests was motivated in part by the discovery that one beneficiary nation, having received a foreign aid payment, promptly converted it into American gold.

In this area, American citizens have cooperated in increasing the balance-of-trade deficit by their personal operations. A lot of American capital is going to Europe from American corporations who seek to cash in on the economic benefits of the European Common Market by buying into industry in Euromart companies.

AMERICANS STIMULATE DRAIN

Other Americans have stimulated the gold drain directly, by sending funds to Europe for deposit in Swiss and other banks, or for the outright purchase of gold which is held abroad for their account. They are hedging against devaluation of the dollar, which President Kennedy has repeatedly assured the world will not take place.

The United States has a prosperous economy, but it is a high wage, high cost economy. We are losing export sales to other nations, which have rehabilitated their war-torn factories with American funds. Foreign steel producers and others have even increased their sales in the United States.

The fundamental cause of our balance-of-payments deficit is the payment of billions in foreign aid to "save the world from communism." A logical road to fiscal health would be to cut off foreign aid. Kennedy doesn't follow that road, however. He wants to give away more than Congress is willing to vote him.

Let's Act on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, since Fidel Castro's takeover of Cuba more than 3½ years ago, there have been

voices both inside and outside of the Congress that have warned of the increasing dangers of Cuban communism. These same voices have called for U.S. initiative in the area rather than a policy of drift-and-wait. In an article that appeared in the September 1962 issue of the Militant American, an American Legion publication of San Antonio, Tex., Post No. 402, Mr. Fred Orleans, a well-known international lawyer, economist, writer, and lecturer, makes this point and pays tribute to our distinguished colleague from Alabama, ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN. As Mr. Orleans' article indicates a portion of which follows, no one has spoken more prophetically or more fearlessly in connection with the Cuban menace than the gentleman from Alabama.

LET'S ACT ON CUBA

(By Fred A. Orleans)

The time has come to determine in retrospect how our country reached its present state of affairs relating to the existence of a Communist base a mere 90 miles from the coast of Florida. The question remains as to whether anybody in private or public life was aware of what was taking place in Cuba and if so why the present situation was allowed to develop. The writer, who is by no means a soothsayer, has written many articles warning of the consequences of the policy our country was pursuing toward Cuba and communism in the Western Hemisphere in general. In 1960 I spoke throughout the State of Texas on "The War in Our Own Backyard—The Cold War for Latin America," and this address was subsequently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 26, 1961. Among other things I stated "that the problems that existed in Latin America would not go away if we buried our heads in the sand, nor could we ever hope to divorce our ability to survive as a Nation from its independence on a strong, united Western Hemisphere; that the issue was simple—it was survival; that what was needed was concrete action and that we must show the world that the spirit of 1776, that spirit which made us a great Nation was not dead in the United States, but merely dormant; that the people of America need only to be given a purpose and they would rise to the challenge." I further pointed out that the people of the United States are the makers of our Nation's foreign policy and they are to blame for failures in U.S. foreign policy because they do not make their will known to the Government.

GRAVE PROBLEMS

The purpose of reiterating the above is not to prove that the writer possesses great insight and was able to predict the course of events in Cuba, but to bring into sharp focus that it was common knowledge that developments in Cuba could present the United States ultimately, as they are now doing, with grave problems. The question now remains as to why, with all the evidence openly presented so long ago, has our Nation been allowed to aimlessly drift into our present precarious situation.

It is heartening to learn that I have not been alone in viewing with alarm past and present developments in Cuba and that there are Members of the Congress of the United States who have also been aware of the situation and have over the years voiced their alarm at the growing threat of communism, based in Cuba and spreading throughout the Western Hemisphere. Outstanding among them, for the past 3 years, the clarion voice of ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, Jr. has time after time forcibly and loudly sounded the alarm in the halls of Congress and wherever else the opportunity presented itself. Recognizing that the ultimate responsibility for our foreign policy lies with the executive branch of our Government, he has exercised his right and performed his duty as Chairman of the House Subcommitte on Inter-American Affairs, to try to elert the executive branch of our Government and the American people to the grave danger Cuban based communism posed to the Western Hemisphere.

FIRM STAND URGED

It was ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN who in numerous congressional addresses, spoke out on the gravity of the Cuban situation. His study, work, and knowledge have won for him a position of great respect in the Congress of the United States. As early as January 1960, Mr. SELDEN urged a firm stand against Castro and stated that Democracy did not exist in Cuba. In March 1960, he called for immediate action against anti-U.S. propaganda emanating from Cuba. In June 1960, he clearly stated that the United States could not ignore the fact that the Cuban Government was being used to further the international Communist conspiracy. In August 1960, he criticized the failure of the Inter-American Conference at San Jose, Costa Rico, to recognize the threat to the Western Hemisphere from communism in Cuba. In March 1961, he called for an end of trade with Cuba. In April 1961, he introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives, calling for sanctions against Cuba and its exclusion from the Inter-American Defense Board. The resolution was overwhelmingly approved by the House. In June 1961, he urged collective action against Cuba by the Organization of American States. In October 1961, he pointed out that the failure of the Organization of American States to deal with the Castro threat was weakening the principle of hemispheric cooperation.

In the early part of this year at Punta del Este, it was Mr. SELDEN who demanded that all the Nations of the Americas stand up and be counted, through clearly indicating their position on Castro and communism. He demanded the isolation of Castro and the strengthening of the Inter-American system. To a great degree, Mr. SELDEN'S presence at Punta del Este helped provide the United States with one of the few diplomatic victories gained against communism in the Western Hemisphere. On September 6, 1962, on the floor of Congress, Mr. SELDEN clearly indicated that the problem of Cuba is truly bipartisan since the foreign policy errors, leading to the present crisis, span two administrations. He further stated that to eliminate Castro and communism in Cuba today is beyond the capability of the Cuban people and that in his opinion it will require a military operation that they alone cannot undertake.

Congressman Brewster Addresses Kings Point Club—American Seapower at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the Kings Point Club of Baltimore, Md., Milton G. Nottingham, president, observed Maritime Day with a dinner on September 24. All of the members of the club are alumni of the Merchant Marine Academy. Among the guests of honor were Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock, superintendent of the Academy, Rear Adm. Halert C. Shepherd, USCG (retired), the mayor of Baltimore and several members of the Maryland congressional delegation.

We are privileged to hear an excellent address by our colleague, DANNY BREWSTER, who ably discussed maritime affairs as they affect the Nation, and also the port of Baltimore. Because this is a subject of concern to all of us, I am inserting his remarks in the Appendix for the perusal of the Members:

AMERICAN SEAPOWER AT THE CROSSROADS

(Remarks of the Honorable DANIEL B. BREWSTER, of Maryland, before the Kings Point Club of Baltimore, Monday, September 24, 1962)

Let me begin by stating two categorical imperatives.

First, a strong, modern American merchant marine is vital to our country's interests. Without it, we cannot have a balanced defense capability, and we cannot hope to increase the rate of our economic expansion as fast as we must to compete in today's world.

Second, the port of Baltimore is the most important single factor in our State's industrial community. The continued expansion and improvement of the port's facilities is vital to Maryland's economic well-being.

You who are here tonight represent almost every facet of the American maritime industry—its supporting services, its related industries—and interested local, State, and Federal agencies. You, more than any other group, can vouch for the validity of these statements.

Now, let's examine together some of the varied aspects and the problems of our present situation.

American seapower, in its total sense, is one of our most potent weapons in the cold war struggle with international communism. Today, more than ever in our history, we are, as a maritime nation, dependent upon the combined capability of our naval and commercial fleets.

Our seapower is more than Polaris submarines and high speed luxury liners. It is tankers, ore carriers, tramps, and coastwise carriers. It is our shipbuilding capacity and the technical and design skills of our naval engineers working in concert with the skills of our shipyard workers. It is the know-how and the dedication of the men who man the ships and those who handle them at portside; and behind this, there is our wealth of natural resources and our geographical advantages.

In short, we have all the tools which enable a nation to use the sea to its advantage during peace or in time of war. We cannot, however, take our maritime position for granted. We must overcome past neglect and shortsightedness. We must push forward to new maritime frontiers.

We must proceed without delay to modernize and build up our U.S. merchant marine. We must make maximum use of new technologies. This, of course, means spending substantial sums of money. But, as important as the bookkeeper is, we cannot allow him to be the final arbiter of our national maritime policy.

Recent events make it imperative that we aggressively compete for a larger share of world trade.

The European Common Market is now a firm reality. It has become one of the main bulwarks against the spread of communism into Western Europe. It also represents a tremendous economic challenge to the United States. It can be either our toughest competitor or our best customer. The choice is largely up to us.

Passage of the President's new liberal trade bill represents a significant shift in U.S. trade and tariff policies. It marks a signal victory for the advocates of free trade and promises to materially aid our efforts to secure a larger share of world markets for U.S. industry and agriculture.

The volume of trade between us and our Allies and the uncommitted nations will undoubtedly expand greatly in the years ahead. We must find a way to insure that our merchant marine carries a much larger share of this trade.

In our struggle with the Communist world, trade is a key factor—a potent weapon for the side which uses it most effectively. The Russians were late in arriving on the maritime scene, but it is apparent that they fully understand the importance of mercantile seapower.

Soviet expansion, in both naval and merchant fleets, shows their determination to replace us as the world's number one seapower. The primary position given to submarines in the growing Soviet Navy openly shows their intention to cut our sea links, of trade and supply, in time of war. Growing emphasis on merchant shipping shows the value the Soviets place on world trade for attaining their objectives.

Russia now has a merchant marine of about 900 ships—over 4½ million deadweight tons. Her satellites provide an additional 200 ships, totaling one and a quarter million tons. This fleet is steadily expanding through building in Soviet bloc shipyards and purchases from the free world. Last year, the chairman of the Russian shipbuilding ministry was quoted as saying that the demand of the Soviet merchant marine was increasing so rapidly that Soviet shipyards no longer could fully cope with it and that by 1965 the volume of Soviet seaborne freightage would be almost tripled compared with 1958.

Soviet ships and trade are integral and vital parts of the Communist economic offensive. We need only look to Cuba 90 miles off our Florida coast to see a sobering example of the effective use of seapower in carrying out Communist penetration.

This is not the proper time for me to discuss all the ramifications of the Cuban situation, but I will say this much. I am deeply disturbed—in fact I am boiling with anger over the sight of ships flying NATO nation flags carrying war material and so-called technicians into Cuban ports. It is high time that some of our friends learned that this is a two-way street. Many Members of Congress share my feeling and I predict that unless the governments of these countries take steps to halt this invidious practice some of our programs designed to help these nations are in for rough sailing on Capitol Hill.

The Soviet merchant fleet is a political as well as an economic weapon. Their merchant marine is not hindered by the necessity of trying to make a financial profit. Political profit is their prime motivation.

We must act now to restore our position of primacy at sea. The degree of interdependence between our naval power and the strength of our merchant marine is greater than ever before. One of the tasks of naval power is to protect and control the sealanes in the face of potentially the most massive submarine threat of our experience. It is the job of the merchant marine to bring in the vast quantities of raw materials—imports such as metals, ores and petroleum—which are now vital to our national strength.

Consider the degree of our present vulnerability. Over 1½ million barrels of petroleum per day are imported by ship—less than 5 percent of it in ships flying the U.S. flag. About 99,000 tons of iron ore are daily imported in ships, nearly all under foreign flags. There are, of course, other critical items: the raw materials for the space age must be imported into the United States by ship.

Our capacity to project our limited war capability needs a well-balanced naval-military force working closely with a modern, effective merchant marine, active and in being.

The movement of troops and military material by sea is not obsolete.

There is, of course, no substitute for an adequate airlift. Its ability to rapidly move a few thousand troops and their light equipment is invaluable.

But when divisions and armies are to be moved, sealift can accomplish the job more rapidly and of course much more efficiently, both in terms of military effectiveness—as troops arrive concurrently with their heavy equipment—and in terms of resources expended.

The ships to do the job—the passenger ships, cargo ships and tankers—must be modern, fast, and efficient. More than that, they must be in being and actively employed. If they are to be ready to serve in an emergency, they must be built, manned and gainfully employed before the emergency occurs.

We do not now have these ships, except in limited numbers.

Only 15 percent of our active merchant tonnage is less than 6 years old. Seventy-five percent is over 14 years old.

To make up for past neglect, the replacement rate on our berth line cargo and passenger ships must be increased.

We must determine realistically what appropriate portion of the national budget should be allocated to the strengthening of our merchant marine. We must create the domestic climate of intraindustry cooperation in which that merchant marine can thrive and prosper.

We are all aware of the importance of seapower to the port of Baltimore and the State of Maryland. Baltimore's protected deep water harbor is Maryland's greatest natural asset. It is the most important single factor in our State's rapid industrial growth.

The Baltimore metropolitan area is, of course, most directly affected by the port's status as a major junction in world trade.

Port-related employment exceeds 125,000—over 60 percent of the total industrial labor force in the area. These employees earn over $456 million annually—which is more than 65 percent of the total manufacturing payroll.

Each year some 6,000 ocean-going vessels use our port's facilities. The average ship visit means about $50,000 to our community through the payment of crews' wages, purchase of supplies, service charges, and longshoremen's wages.

Some 6,000 longshoremen, thousands of employees of brokers, freight forwarders, railroads, and hundreds of Federal and State employees in customs, immigration, and public health depend on the port for their livelihood.

These 6,000 ships bring 200,000 seamen into Baltimore each year. Their expenditures benefit many Baltimore businesses—in fact, I am sure that at this very moment some of these hardy seafarers are sampling Baltimore's world renowned hospitality within a few blocks of where we meet tonight. I bid them welcome and wish them good luck.

Many factors have played a part in the success our port has enjoyed. Of these, one of the most important has been a stable, efficient labor force.

The efficiency of Baltimore's labor is recognized in international commercial circles. The handling of cargo by the Baltimore waterfront labor force was the most efficient in the United States during World War II. This efficient labor force directly affects the costs of handling cargo at Baltimore with the result that comparable cargos can be loaded or offloaded at Baltimore at considerably less cost than at competing ports of the North Atlantic and Great Lakes.

We must zealously guard this advantage. Reasonable men—meeting and bargaining in good faith—can solve any problem.

I agree with the view of former Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg when he said:

"We want to preserve the freedom of the right to strike in the maritime industry. But preserving the right to strike does not mean to indicate that strikes ought to be incurred. We ought to preserve the freedom but this ultimate test of economic power which is a necessary attribute of freedom is also an indication that collective bargaining is not realizing its real objective, which is sensible, reasonable settlements arrived at through the process of collective bargaining. A strike may be necessary in a given situation but a strike should be regarded by both parties as a failure to realize the fruits of a mature collective bargaining relationship."

As a member of the Maryland Legislature and more recently as a Member of Congress, I have had the opportunity to play a small part in furthering the development of our port.

When I was a member of the Maryland Legislature, I was Baltimore County's representative on the original commission which drafted the legislation which created the Maryland Port Authority. In the intervening years, I have closely followed the authority's activities and I would be remiss at this point if I did not compliment John Kronau, the authority's chairman, and Joseph Stanton, its executive director, for their tireless efforts in behalf of the port. They have maintained constant contact with the members of Maryland's congressional delegation, and their advice and counsel has been of inestimable value.

As a Member of Congress, I have joined EDDIE GARMATZ and my other Maryland colleagues in the long fight to repeal the 6 percent differential which has allowed west coast shipyards to underbid our yards at Bethlehem-Sparrows Point and Maryland Drydock Co. This obsolete section of the Maritime Act has cost Maryland workers hundreds of thousands of hours of employment, with the necessary attendant loss to the economy of the whole community.

I am glad to report that both the House and the Senate have approved this legislation. West Coast interests will undoubtedly use delaying tactics to stall the final enactment of this long overdue reform, but in the end, we shall prevail.

Your Baltimore area Congressmen, GEORGE FALLON, SAM FRIEDEL, and ED GARMATZ have fought the fight and won the battle to secure realistic appropriations for the widening and deepening of the Baltimore channel. I know I need not impress you with the importance of this accomplishment.

In conclusion, I want to commend and congratulate the members of the Kings Point Alumni. Kings Point, Annapolis, West Point, and Denver all have the same mission—to train, and give to us, the highly qualified officers who must man the frontlines of freedom throughout the world.

These are days of constant change and challenge. We face the challenge of finding the most effective way to assure the development of seapower, and suporting port facilities, that our national policy requires.

The responsibility for doing this falls in some degree on every person in the room and those whom they represent. I know that you and those you represent will meet this challenge. Thank you.

Kremlin Directive on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people, in ever-growing numbers, demand action against Russian intervention in this hemisphere.

The Florida press has been particularly alert to this threat at our southern door—only 90 miles from our own beaches. Our editors and feature writers report from the vantage point of close proximity to the danger, and with the advantage of contacts with Cuban exiles now living in Florida.

Over the past months I have had reprinted here in the RECORD stories and editorials from Florida so that these events would be called to the attention of all Member of Congress and other Government leaders. As a further indication of the feelings of our citizens on these matters, I include the following article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Palm Beach (Fla.) Post, Sept. 13, 1962]

KREMLIN DIRECTIVE

The latest U.S. foreign policy directive—issued by the Kremlin Tuesday—probably removes all hope of any decisive action by this country against the Communist military buildup in Cuba.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev has issued instructions that nothing is to be done to impede the creation of a Communist stronghold in the Western Hemisphere—on pain of nuclear bombardment from Russian bases.

Our State Department will be allowed to sass the Kremlin boss back a little; Secretary Dean Rusk has already done that. But that is about as far as defiance may be expected to go.

Best guess of the week, as guessed by "The Insider's Newsletter," is that President Kennedy will continue to play down the Soviet invasion of Cuba, arguing that the Reds will get tired of the expensive drain of money and manpower needed to prop up Castro, eventually clash with their Cuban comrades, and the whole mess will rot away.

In the meantime, Khrushchev will be fortifying a "new frontier" on Florida's doorstep from which he may, at his pleasure, send either ideological or military expeditions into Latin America. New "Cubas" may be established which will also come under the benevolent protection of Red missiles.

There is no precedent in other parts of the Sovietized world to bolster the theory that communism relinquishes its grip on any nation once brought under Kremlin control. But it is comforting to hope that Cuba may prove to be an exception, if we lack any alternative to hope.

Of course, Comrade Khrushchev has given us an alternative to our expected passive resistance to Communist expansion in the Americas. We can coexist by cooperating with Castro.

The Soviet statement confirmed what President Kennedy has already told the American people: that the U.S.S.R. is sending arms and technicians to Cuba exclusively for defensive purposes, and added:

"Instead of aggravating the atmosphere by such actions as the mobilization of reservists, which is tantamount to the threat of starting war, it would be much more sensible if the United States, displaying wisdom, would offer a kind gesture; would establish diplomatic and trade relations with Cuba the desirability of which has been declared by the Cuban Government."

If we accept the rest of the Soviet statement at its face value, perhaps such a gesture would be the part of wisdom.

If we intend to permit the spread of communism in the Western World, we should be prepared to be on good terms with it. And how better could we signify our good intentions than by embracing the murderous betrayer of Cuba and all he stands for?

Perhaps in such a course lies the "security" which so many Americans of today seem to value above all else.

Once in our history a stout-hearted American asked the rhetorical question: "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"

Is today's answer, "It's better to be Red than dead"?

We say with Patrick Henry: "Forbid it, Almighty God."

Johnny Markas: A Very Unusual Young Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding young man of Morganton, N.C., was the subject of a recent newspaper article which appeared in many newspapers in North Carolina. I speak of Johnny Markas, who is captain of the Duke University football team this year.

While this young man has been outstanding in athletics, this has not been his only cause for recognition. His splendid character and personal conduct has been often commented upon by those who know him. It was, therefore, very pleasing to me to see that these fine qualities of this young man were recognized on the printed pages of our newspapers. I am sure that the sterling record of Johnny Markas is one which will inspire many of our young people to better things.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Markas Is a Very Unusual Young Man," be made a part of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MARKAS IS A VERY UNUSUAL YOUNG MAN

(By Add Penfield, Jr.)

DURHAM.—Johnny Markas, Duke University football captain for the 1962 season, is not cut out of an ordinary mold. Johnny, or "The Greek" as his teammates call him, is a very unusual young man. Football captain and president of the Men's Student Government of a major university—there are not many boys on the college football field today who could hold two such positions.

Markas came to Duke from a small town—Morganton—an almost scrawny 178 pounder amidst the giants of the college football world. His coaches say that he has developed more than perhaps any athlete here in the last few years. A small success story in itself.

Johnny is the kind of young man who inspires confidence in all he meets. An athlete of top calibre, he has been an important member of two straight Duke Atlantic Coast Conference championship teams and one of the driving forces in the forward wall from his guard position. He is a ball of fire on the field and throws his well-developed 200 pounds around with the best of them—even opponents who outweigh him by 30 to 40 pounds.

Off the field, the Markas success story continues. One of the most respected men on the campus, Johnny swept the Men's Student Government presidency with ease in the spring elections. He has assembled an excellent group of men for his staff and the campus feeling is that he will do one of the finest jobs in recent history in this office.

The Markas story goes even further. A devout Christian, Johnny has been one of the key leaders and now is vice president of the growing Duke chapter of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes—a national group which links Christianity with the players in all sports—college, high school, and pro.

In his work with the FCA, Markas has spent many hours touring the State speaking to youth groups, churches, and civic clubs about the work of FCA and making a most impressive appearance wherever he went. He has headed a program of this type in the local chapter which sees other members of the varsity teams also appear in similar meetings.

In addition to all his accomplishments in football and extra-curricular activities, Markas is unusual in another respect. He is a fine student with the odd major of geology. He has consistently rated above the all-men's average on the Duke campus. This past spring he took more hours than any other undergraduate in the university—22—and still maintained his high marks.

Johnny Markas—athlete, fine scholar, school leader, outstanding Christian—truly a credit to football and to Duke University.

McCarthy Speaks for the Old Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Disabled American Veterans, Department of California, recently held its convention in San Diego, Calif. One of the most significant and penetrating addresses presented at the convention was by Past State Commander Charles McCarthy. I call this distinguished gentleman's remarks to your attention and to our colleagues in the Congress and under unanimous consent I insert them in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MCCARTHY SPEAKS FOR THE OLD GUARD

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Among the memorable events at the San Diego convention was the delivery of one of the main addresses by Past State Commander Charles McCarthy. While it is impossible to reproduce in cold type Commander McCarthy's fine delivery, we can reproduce his words. A complete text of his address follows. It is recommended reading.)

Comrade commander, comrades here gathered at this convention, gentlemen, I am not here today to talk to you as a past department commander. I have come here to tell you that I am very, very happy again to have the opportunity to attend a Disabled American Veterans' Convention, and to tell you that these are happy moments in my

life when I can shake hands with a number of fellows that I knew in the old days when I was extremely active in this organization from chapter No. 1 in Fresno. And, then, too, with a tear in my eye and a lump in my throat I miss the many fellows I know and who are now gone. I know it is God's will that one generation shall go ahead and the other will follow. We are of that generation that is to follow.

As I look at this organization I keep thinking in my mind of the thoughts that the admiral who addressed this organization yesterday left with us. I wonder about our public relations and what we have been doing with them to build up our strength. I look around and I see a whole group of we older men—we who are passe—and I wonder why we have fallen down and been unable to add onto our organization the younger group that have come out of World War II. I think there must be some particular reason we do not have these men. They are no different than ourselves. People will tell you that these men are not interested in the things we do. But I can tell you this, they are just as interested in the things we do as anybody could be and if we put up the right sales talk they will join this organization and they will do their part.

And then again I think that it is only a matter of time until a great bunch of us will become wheelchair men. Who is going to take care of us when that time comes?

I can tell you this: a year ago today I probably could be counted as one of the most influential men in the Los Angeles area. I was president of the powerful Board of Public Utility Transportation Committee of the city of Los Angeles. I was district governor of Rotary International. And on the 30th day of June of last year I retired from both positions. Up to that time I had influence enough to grant and get almost anything within reason in the area. Today I am passe. I have no more influence than a total stranger. And that's how fast this influence will leave us.

And the reason that I mention that is this: As we older men pass on and get to the wheelchair age and to the rocking chair age, who is going to appear before these committees and before these commissions and before the Veterans' Administration on our behalf if we don't encourage some of the others to come up?

We thought when this organization was formed we were building an organization that would come to an end when we died. But no. We have another war and we have had a group of men injured in the other war. We have set a pattern for them to make it possible for them to get compensation.

Many of them haven't seen fit to come into this organization. Possibly there is a reason. Maybe that reason was our own. Maybe we didn't do the things we older fellows should have done to encourage the younger ones.

A great, great American general, when he was making his last appearance at West Point, told the Cadets—"They give you a temperate will, a quality of imagination, vigour of emotion, a freshness of the deep springs of life, a temperamental predominance of courage over timidity; an appetite for adventure over love of ease." Then he went on to say: "What sort of soldiers are those you are to lead? Are they reliable? Are they the brave? Are they capable of victory?" Here is what this great man had to say of us: we of all the wars: "Their story is known to all of you. It's a story of the American man at arms. My estimate of him was formed in the battlefields many, many years ago, and has never changed.

"I regard him now as I regarded him then, as one of the world's noblest figures, not only as one of the finest military characters, but also as one of the most stainless. His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen. In his youth and strengthen his love and loyalty; he gave all of that mortality that he can give. He needs no eulogy from me or from any other man. He has written his own history and written it in red on his enemies' breast."

That is what General Douglas MacArthur thought of us—we men who fought in the service.

We are a compensated man now. We draw compensation from the Government. We are a minority group. We are a minority group, but when you hear minorities spoken of politically we are never included. Gentlemen, I am going to tell you something: we are going to be included.

Let me tell you about a little organization that is only 14 years old and has 50,000 members. Do you know what they have been able to do? They have been able to put three men as White House aides in the White House. They have three of their men in as Cabinet officers. They have 31 men as key administrators in the vital areas of finance, labor, civil rights, public works, and power and housing and foreign policy. Do those men believe as we do? Let me tell you what they believe in. I want you to get this:

These men believe in relief and aid to Communist China, diplomatic recognition of Communist China, admission of Communist China to the United Nations, ratification of the United Nations, support of international labor organizations. They oppose the unilateral U.S. attempt to intervene in Cuba.

They also are for the Brennan farm plan, compulsory health insurance, Federal price and rent control, repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, compulsory union membership, giving executive power to modify rates of taxes. And all of those things.

These men—this minority group—is able to do that, and so help me God we wanted a few percentage raise in our compensation and we can't get it because a Senator wants to add some other little proviso onto the deal.

Who are the Americans? Are we the Americans who fought for our country? Are we the ones to be recognized, or are those men who are on the other side of this deal?

I want you to know, gentlemen, that right now your compensation is as close as it can be to being cut off, when I tell you that every minute—every minute that you sit in this auditorium, every minute of each hour of the day for the entire 24 hours of the day—even the time you sleep, that our Government of the United States has to pay $18,000 interest on the debt that they now owe for the money that they have expended.

I just picked up a quip in the paper here the other day. This will be most interesting to you. Representative WAYNE HAYES, of Ohio, has charged that the American taxpayers are bearing the cost of money paid to the Congo officials—the Congo senators, if you please—$3,000 per month, compared to $22,500 per year that our own Congressmen are paid. We are paying those men. Seventy percent of these people cannot read or write, and some of them are still headhunters. And we are paying them that money.

Now, gentlemen, it's going to be up to you if you are going to let this thing carry on any longer. We have to stay on the capitalistic system; we have to stay with the constitutional form of government. If we don't we are going to be the losers.

I am going to tell you gentlemen that an obligation was put on our shoulders the day that we had this organization chartered by Congress. That obligation was to take care of those who were less able to take care of themselves. I have taken this matter seriously. When I see us sending troops into south Asia to prevent the spread of communism, with communism 90 miles from the coast of Florida. When we put Cuba on the financial ban, and find that the United Nations loaned Cuba money and that 62 percent of that mony came out of the Treasury of the United States.

When we have asked for a little raise to help these people who need it, we are held back by a Senator from Louisiana.

Who are the Americans today? Are we the Americans of this country? Or is the group who try to run us down the Americans of this country—the group who try to shove us aside? We are the first people to be shoved aside, and if you don't believe it you are living in a fool's paradise. The first people to be shoved aside are the disabled men.

I well recall when the WPA started they cut our compensation. They paid these men. And I can remember when I lived in Fresno they had a crew of men going out and throwing tumbleweeds from one side of the road to the other. And the next afternoon the wind would blow them back and they would throw them back and forth so often they would wear them out. And still they moaned about our compensation.

There is just no argument that we have to live on the plan—the American plan—the constitutional system—the capitalistic system.

In our capitalistic system we have four freedoms—and I want you to remember them: We have the freedom to try. We have the freedom to buy. We have the freedom to sell, and we have the freedom to fail if we can't succeed.

Against these are offered another four freedoms: The freedom from striving, the freedom from exploitation, the freedom from competition, the freedom from insecurity.

These I give to my dog. I give him a place to sleep; I feed him; I let him go out of the yard when he has to. That's the dog's life.

I want the life as an American citizen where I have the four freedoms where I can try; where I can buy; where I can sell, and if I can't make good, where I can fail.

That's the thing that you men fought for. I warn you today that this is all coming to a close. Do you realize that we handed to the United Nations the sum of $32,204,061 to pay for United Nations troops to fight up in Katanga? And I will ask you one question when we speak of the Congo or of the trouble we are having in Laos.

Did you ever hear of our Government telling any of the governments that we give money to—"If you do not form a coalition government in which there will be people who believe in the Western ideas we will not allow you any money"? You have never heard it. But in Laos, in China, in a number of other countries our friends are told they have to form coalition governments that include communism or we will not give them a dime. Remember that.

And I want you to remember something else—a man named Launchlin Currie in the United States, a naturalized citizen from Canada, was found to be a leak as a spy for the Russian Government. When the Senate went after him he disappeared to Colombia, South America. We are now on a friendship plan where we are going to help the South American Republics. And this man, this traitor to America, this man who was a spy for Russia, is going to be the man who is going to expend your money to stop communism in Colombia.

Men, I am telling you, you didn't fight for that. If you did you were in a different outfit than I was. These are the things that I want you to be interested in. Many of you who are here do not have to depend on your compensation but you belong to this organization and you are guardians of men who cannot get out to defend themselves. If you are their guardians then you have got to take an interest in these things that are going on and find out why we are stepping out of the American way of life and the system that we are accustomed to.

In closing I leave with you these thoughts:

That no man is an island.
No man stands alone.
Each man's joy is a joy to me.
Each man's grief is my own.

We need one another,
So I will defend
Each man as my brother;
Each man as my friend.

I thank you.

Toward Closer Federal-State Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, on September 24 of this year addressed the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture in Grand Rapids, Mich., regarding a matter of closer cooperation between State and Federal agencies. I have been interested in this subject matter for a long time and am the author of legislation, referred to in Representative FOUNTAIN'S speech, which is now on its way to the White House for the President's signature. In view of the importance and the timeliness of this speech, I want all my colleagues to have an opportunity to read it.

TOWARD CLOSER FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION

(Address by Congressman L. H. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, at the Annual Convention of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, Grand Rapids, Mich., September 24, 1962)

Coming as I do from a small town in an agricultural area, I feel right at home with you, the leaders of our State departments of agriculture, and I am grateful for the honor of being invited to participate in your annual convention.

We are confronted at the present time with a host of very real and important problems involving Federal-State relations. I should like to take this opportunity today to talk first about some of the broader considerations in the Federal Government's relationship with the States and then, more specifically, about some intergovernmental problems in the field of agriculture.

More than a century ago that wise and penetrating foreign observer, de Tocqueville, sensed the importance of the American Federal system to the vitality of our democratic political institutions.

In his classic "Democracy in America," published in 1835, de Tocqueville wrote:

"The Federal system was created with the intention of combining the different advantages which result from the greater and the lesser extent of nations; and a single glance over the United States of America suffices to discover the advantages which they have derived from its adoption.

"In great centralized nations the legislator is obliged to impart a character of uniformity to the laws which does not always suit the diversity of customs and of districts; as he takes no cognizance of special cases, he can only proceed upon general principles; and the population is obliged to conform to the exigencies of the legislation, since the legislation cannot adapt itself to the exigencies and the customs of the population, which is the cause of endless trouble and misery. This disadvantage does not exist in confederations. Congress regulates the principal measures of the National Government, and all the details of the administration are reserved to the provincial legislatures. It is impossible to imagine how much this division of sovereignty contributes to the well-being of each of the States which compose the Union. In these small communities, which are never agitated by the desire of aggrandizement or the cares of self-defense, all public authority and private energy is employed in internal amelioration. * * * It is generally believed in America that the existence and the permanence of the republican form of government in the New World depend upon the existence and the permanence of the Federal system."

This commentary, I submit, is as valid today in its general principles as in de Tocqueville's day. In the Federal principle we have an admirable political concept well suited to the conditions of a country as large and diverse as ours. This extraordinary political invention of the Founding Fathers has weathered the tests of time and adaptability to changing conditions.

The clear-cut division of functions between the States and the National Government, while appropriate in the early days of the Republic, in time gave way to a sharing of certain responsibilities in response to the advent of new economic and social conditions. Various methods of intergovernmental cooperation, like the grant-in-aid and the tax credit device, were found to assure the continued workability of our Federal structure. The challenge is now ours to discover practicable methods for further strengthening the Federal system to better serve contemporary America and future generations. Political inventiveness is sorely needed if we are to deal successfully with the newer problems of government, such as those associated with a mobile population and a rapidly changing technology.

It has been said that the extension of Federal legislation into program areas traditionally a State responsibility has come about because of inactivity on the part of the States. While true in part, this is far too simple an explanation for a very complex situation. Unquestionably, the States can, and must, be more responsive to public needs if they are to occupy the position of equality which is rightfully theirs in the Federal structure.

It is not merely a question of shoring up the States to preserve in actuality as well as in theory the division of powers. The Federal Government needs help. With the demands of national defense, international relations, and space exploration increasingly requiring more of the Federal Government's energies, it is only logical that the States should equip themselves to assume more responsibility for domestic programs.

Centralization and uniformity are neither essential for, nor will they necessarily produce, the excellence which our Nation must attain in public programs. But a centralized program sometimes becomes a necessary expedient for satisfying public needs when those who have the primary responsibility wait too long to take effective action. It is axiomatic that the less we solve public problems at the State and local levels, the more such problems will be dealt with at the national level. Whether we like it or not, the consequence will almost surely be a further concentration of power in the Federal Government if the States and localities neglect their responsibilities.

Unfortunately, the notion is still widely held that Government services are of a fixed kind and amount which remain constant as our economy grows. Many Government activities, on the contrary, are intimately related to economic growth and technological progress, both as a consequence and a stimulant.

Witness, for example, the new regulatory problems created by the use of atomic energy and the use of powerful chemical pesticides which contribute so mightily to agricultural productivity. Such advances in technology increase our consumable private income but are not without their social costs. So, too, the growth and concentration of population in metropolitan centers necessitates proportionately larger Government expenditures to cope with the resulting problems of water supply, air and water pollution, traffic congestion, and commuter transportation.

In the perspective of this general discussion of intergovernmental relations in the United States, I would like now to discuss some of the work in which our subcommittee is presently engaged which may be of more direct interest to you as officers of the State departments of agriculture.

The Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, of which I have the privilege of being chairman, has two basic responsibilities. One is to study intergovernmental relations between the Federal Government and the States and their political subdivisions. The other is to study the operation of certain Federal departments and agencies—principally the Departments of Agriculture; Health, Education, and Welfare; and Labor—with respect to their economy and efficiency.

In keeping with both these responsibilities, the subcommittee has been engaged for more than a year in a questionnaire study of consumer protection activities of the Federal, State, and local governments, and the intergovernmental relationships and problems involved. Our first report on this subject, entitled "Consumer Protection Activities of Federal Departments and Agencies," was issued last year as House Report No. 1241 by our full Committee on Government Operations. It is hoped that the first volume of a similar report on State activities will be completed in the near future.

Although departments of agriculture were originally established to serve farmers, they have over the years taken on a number of activities for the protection of the consumers of agricultural products. I am referring to such activities as the inspection and grading of meats, poultry, eggs, fruits and vegetables, milk and other dairy products, and the regulation of pesticides and feed additives. These are some of the most tivities for the protection of the public as a important and far-reaching Government acwhole.

Responsibility for these activities is vested largely in Departments of Agriculture, both at the Federal and State levels. Moreover, these are activities which, by their very nature, require a high degree of Federal-State cooperation.

For a number of reasons, neither the Federal nor the State Governments can do the job alone.

To begin with, the Federal legislation authorizing these activities is based upon the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, and irrespective of the criteria used to distinguish "interstate" from "intrastate" commerce, there will almost always be some of both in specific situations.

Secondly, it would be a physical impossibility for either the Federal agency or the respective State agencies alone to cover all phases in the production, processing, transportation and marketing of food products.

Finally, the high cost of providing such services, which require highly trained personnel and expensive equipment and facilities, necessitates a division of responsibility. This point was made in a recent report by the House Appropriations Committee on the 1963 Appropriation Act for the Department of Agriculture. After pointing out that the cost of Federal meat inspection has risen

nearly 170 percent in the past 15 years, from $9 million in 1947 to more than $24 million in 1962, the report states:

"Unless some changes in inspection procedures and coverage are made, the potential cost of meat inspection will soon expand beyond reason. In this connection, the Department is requested to make a special study to determine to what extent it can certify State meat inspection services and license them to inspect meat which moves in interstate commerce."

Despite the obvious need for close Federal-State cooperation in these activities, the replies to the subcommittee's recent questionnaires indicate there is much room for improvement. These replies also shed light on some of the major obstacles to closer Federal-State cooperation. I should like to discuss some of these very briefly and to suggest some possible avenues for improvement.

One of the greatest difficulties seems to be the tendency to rely on a sharp distinction between interstate and intrastate commerce in regulatory fields. As I noted earlier, the clear-cut division of functions between the State and National Governments established early in our history has gradually given way in many fields to a further sharing of responsibility in response to new economic and social conditions. In my judgment, serious efforts toward closer intergovernmental cooperation are long overdue in the regulatory areas of agriculture.

There is evidence that other Members of the Congress share this view. The passage I quoted from the report of the House Appropriations Committee reflects that committee's concern for greater Federal-State cooperation and economy in the meat inspection program. Moreover, Congressman SMITH of Iowa, a member of our subcommittee, has introduced a bill (H.R. 12802) which would provide for further Federal-State cooperation in programs relating to the marketing of agricultural products, and to the control or eradication of plant and animal diseases and pests, by permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to authorize qualified State agencies to participate in the administration and enforcement of Federal laws and regulations. This legislation was passed by the House last Wednesday, and the identical Talmadge-Aiken bill (S. 3475) was passed by the Senate the previous week. I understand that this legislation has the endorsement of your association.

This measure appears to be a step in the right direction. However, it is only a first step for the improvement of Federal-State relations in this vital area. There are many problems which must be overcome before the cooperative program which it envisages can become a reality.

In describing some of the obstacles to closer Federal-State cooperation in the regulation of agricultural products, the U.S. Department of Agriculture pointed out, in response to the subcommittee's questionnaire, that there are tremendous variations among the States in their laws, administrative arrangements, standards, funds, and quantity and quality of personnel for these activities. The State departments of agriculture, in turn, pointed out that there is a lack of effective communication on the part of the Federal agencies, and in some cases a disregard of State interests and a lack of respect for State programs.

These are indeed serious problems, but they are not insoluble. They can and must be resolved, if adequate protection is to be provided to the millions of consumers of agricultural products in this country.

I am, and always have been, a firm believer in States rights, but I also believe that with States rights go States responsibilities. While serving in the Congress, I have heard many generalized criticisms of the way things are done by Federal agencies and of their condescending attitude toward State agencies. But seldom are we in the Congress able to obtain the chapter and verse necessary to substantiate these charges. If the committees and the Congress are to help improve Federal-State cooperation, we must have full, frank, and specific information about particular problems.

When difficult problems arise, the solution is not to turn back the clock to some romanticized golden age of the past. Nor is there so easy a solution as sending these problems to Washington. The need, rather, is for all units in our Federal system to go forward with imagination, initiative, and determination in dealing with the complex problems of our time.

Throughout our history, we Americans have demonstrated a genius for adapting our political institutions to new conditions and new problems, although the time lags have sometimes given cause for concern. Unencumbered by slavish adherence to rigid political dogmas, while steadfastly devoted to the heritage of our democratic ideals, we have been a Nation of political pragmatists. This national trait is pointedly reflected in Grover Cleveland's famous remark: "It is a condition and not a theory which confronts us."

One recent innovation that deserves special mention in this connection is the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The Advisory Commission, established by the Congress in 1959 through legislation which I introduced, is a truly intergovernmental body that includes in its membership representatives from all levels of government as well as from both the executive and legislative branches. During its brief existence, the Commission had already made a number of useful and significant studies of intergovernmental problems. It is my belief that the Commission is fast becoming an important and constructive force in helping to plot a sound and orderly course for the future development of intergovernmental relations in this country.

I believe deeply in our Federal form of government and in the desirability of preserving and strengthening this remarkable political institution. It is my sincere hope that in the decade of the 1960's we will see an era of close and rewarding cooperation among the levels of government—Federal, State, and local—and a resurgence of State leadership in governmental affairs. I look to you gentlemen to help provide that leadership.

For God and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as the forces of communism attempt to envelope the world, it is not amiss that we Americans turn to the closing words of our first President's first inaugural address in which he asserted the dependence of our new Nation upon a divine being.

Washington said:

I shall take my present leave but not without resorting once more to the benign Parent of the Human Race in humble supplication that, since He has been pleased to favor the American people with opportunities for deliberating in perfect tranquility, and dispositions for deciding with unparalleled unanimity on a form of government for the security of their union and the advancement of their happiness, so His divine blessing may be equally conspicuous in the enlarged views, the temperate consultations, and the wise measures on which the success of this Government must depend.

Every President of the United States has reaffirmed this sentiment.

It is an innate sentiment of the people of the United States.

Most certainly so in the city of Lawrence, Mass., where last Sunday the rest of the Nation witnessed an enormous patriotic parade commemorating a spontaneous demonstration 50 years ago by Lawrence citizens rejecting the godlessness represented by Marxism. The following beautiful editorial from the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune expresses the abiding determination of their city's people to remain steadfastly by the principles enunciated by George Washington:

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

"For God and country."

These words define a purpose for mankind unsurpassed in nobility.

In the mind and heart of the true patriot God and country are inseparable and indivisible objects of his devotion.

The true patriot recognizes God as the Author of his being, the foundation of his earthly career, the hope of all the blessings the endless future holds for him. He knows that all good things flow from the infinite goodness and power of God. His country, he knows, is a good country in proportion to its fidelity to the standards of justice and mercy laid down in God's law. He knows therefore that the highest patriotic service he can render to his country is synonymous with personal service to God and with unremitting endeavors to hold this country true to divine ordinances .

The friends of his country, by these patriotic standards, are also friends of God. And the enemies of his country are enemies of God. His duty is to uphold the one and to resist the other.

Fifty years ago the people of Lawrence dramatically seized an opportunity to demonstrate their fidelity to God and country with truly patriotic fervor.

In the great strike of 1912, ruthless forces of atheistic Marxism had publicly and derisively scoffed God and all the noble principles inherently associated with belief in the indivisible union of God and country. Lawrence people then in a memorable parade reaffirmed their patriotic faith.

Tomorrow Lawrence people commemorate that significant event of 50 years ago. It is right that they should. The forces of atheistic Marxism are mightier today than they were a half-century ago, broader in the sweep of their power, deadlier in their resources for evil.

The great parade in Lawrence tomorrow will be a warning to these forces that the spirit of true patriotism remains strong in America. And it will be an inspiration to all Americans to be firm in their stand for God and country.

The Situation in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we shall today consider legislation already passed by the other body bearing on the present

situation in Cuba. In the past few weeks, we have heard much about what should be done. Some of the recommendations remind us of jingoism of an earlier day. But this is a time for cool, deliberate action, forceful action, to be sure, but action governed by reason. Among the many fine analyses of the situation facing America are two editorials from the major metropolitan dailies in my congressional district: the Newark Star-Ledger and the Newark News.

Since each is worthy of the consideration of my colleagues as we prepare to vote upon the legislation, I have asked permission to insert them into the RECORD at this point. They are as follows:

[From the Newark Sunday News, Sept. 16, 1962]

CUBAN DILEMMA

Only the irresponsible or irrational can contest President Kennedy's decision not to invade Cuba.

Primarily, the threat to this country's or hemispheric security does not justify risking nuclear war.

Secondly, military intervention under circumstances cunningly contrived by Moscow would put the United States in the position of a bully attacking tiny Cuba. The resulting animosity in Latin America and elsewhere would be incalculable.

To ignore this would require not only a reversal of traditional U.S. policy, but a fundamental change in our character.

All this it not to say we may now rest content behind the inconclusive line of no further retreat drawn by President Kennedy. Our predicament remains not only painful, but dangerous.

The Soviet buildup in Cuba has nullified some of Guantanamo's strength as a military base. The surreptitious shipment of longer range missiles could menace the Panama Canal from Cuban pads. Soviet-installed radar and sources of electronic interference are now uncomfortably close to launch sites at Canaveral and Houston.

Should any of these facilities endanger or interfere with our security, then, in the President's words, "this country will do whatever must be done." In the context of this warning to the Soviet Union, "whatever" includes going to nuclear war.

But we cannot ignore the fact that, short of that precipice, the Soviet intrusion into Cuba has expanded the Communists' maneuverability and limited ours. A move against the Soviet pawn in Cuba may now bring a countermove against Berlin and southeast Asia.

At the same time, the defense against counterrevolution within Cuba has been greatly strengthened. Cuban patriots bearing small arms would face a hopeless task.

There is no question that in this dilemma President Kennedy has the support of a preponderant number of Americans, as shown by Congress prompt response to his request for standby authority to call up reserves and its willingness to use force if the President considers it necessary.

But there also is evident a yearning for more initiative, for more positive action short of military engagement. Urgent attention must now be given to economic and political countermeasures for it is becoming increasingly evident that the contest with communism won't be decided by war.

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Sept. 20, 1962]

A FIRM, DETERMINED STAND

A firm, determined stand has been taken by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the volatile Cuban situation. The committee unanimously approved a resolution declaring that the United States will use troops, if necessary, to resist Communist aggression in this hemisphere.

This is forceful, blunt language in a sensitive situation, but this is apparently the only kind that the power-hungry Reds understand.

The joint resolution, which is expected to be approved today by the Senate and House, reflects a desirable unanimity between the White House and Congress. It also reflects the keen awareness by the President and legislators on the inherent dangers of the Cuban dagger that the Russians have pointed at our jugular.

While it is imperative that our actions from now on must be based on the thinking of reasonable minds, it is also painfully clear that our stand must be forceful and strong.

This apparently influenced the thinking of the Senate committee members in drafting the resolution. One passage was couched in this hard-hitting language:

"To prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending by force or threat of force its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere."

The Cuban situation has become unbearably oppressive to the United States. The cold war has suddenly become very warm and very near to us.

The Red threat, poised only 90 miles off our Florida coast, has far greater implications in other areas of Latin America, where Communist agitators can fan the flames against us as a result of the Red foothold in Cuba.

Our national security depends on our forthright actions on the Cuban menace. We must raise a powerful and reasonable voice against Communist aggression in this hemisphere if we are to save our diplomatic face in Latin America and the rest of the world.

It is for these very real and imminent dangers that the timely Senate action should be strongly commended by Americans who are deeply concerned with their Nation's future. We must stand fast and united against this threat.

Old-Fashioned Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, a fine example of old-fashioned free enterprise was recently called to my attention in an article which appeared in the Evening Star of September 24. Mr. Duke Klein, who lives in my district and is employed by Pan American Airways in Washington, has revived the old autumn tradition of making apple butter in the backyard of his Hallowing Point home. With the help of neighbors and friends, Mr. and Mrs. Klein have rejuvenated an age-old recipe and, putting copper kettles, wood fires, and muscles together, have managed to produce 143 quarts of smooth, creamy spread which is to be bottled and sold at the Pohick Church Country Fair.

In these days of hotrods, twist music, and frantic living I would like to congratulate the Kleins and their neighbors on this refreshing return to the wholesome traditions of our forebearers and to wish them well on their venture. Under unanimous consent, I include a copy of this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

TRADITION LINGERS—APPLE BUTTER MAKIN' TIME

(By John Sherwood)

Autumn is in the air and it's time again to linger in the afternoon shadows and make apple butter in great copper kettles over slow wood fires.

But this traditional rite of autumn has moved from the farmyard to the backyard. The age-old recipe is the same, but in many cases the cast and staging have been changed.

Saturday was apple butter time at Duke Klein's new brick ranchhouse at Hallowing Point in Fairfax County. Mr. Klein and a dozen exurbanites took turns at stirring the 30-gallon mixture to be bottled for the September 29 Pohick Church Country Fair.

A touch of authenticity was added by Cecil Armentrout, custodian at historical Gunston Hall. He was using the recipe of his parents who, in turn, got it from their parents.

"Apple butter isn't made on the farm much anymore like when I was a boy," he said while pushing and pulling on a wooden 10-foot pole that turned a scraper inside the black pot so that the sliced apples would not stick to the sides. Two women, clad in bright capri pants, were lined up behind Mr. Armentrout and helped work the pole in its slow rhythm.

MUSIC AND CIDER

The apple butter authority spoke of his youth on the farm when the fresh night air was filled with fiddle music, songs, and cider during apple butter boilings, corn shucking dances, woodchopping suppers, and barn raisings.

"Now the kids go to drive-in movies," he added, "and the last thing that's on their minds is apple butter boilings."

The project in the Klein backyard lasted for 7 hours as 200 pounds of Grimes golden apples bubbled in the 75-year-old solid copper kettle. The color changed from a lumpy pea green to a rich and smooth reddish brown seasoned with sugar, and oil of cloves, and cinnamon.

Relaxing away from their stirring chores, the apple butter makers sat down not on the bare ground, but on rustic lawn furniture, and curled their feet in the lawn.

There was no mongrel German shepherd or big collie to bark at strangers coming through the fields, but a small French poodle with its black coat shaped by a veterinarian yapped at every passing motor-scooter.

Cider of moonshine hasn't become fashionable in Exurbia yet, not even when you make apple butter. Bourbon on the rocks is there to stay, even though old water handpumps are being used as mailbox stands, and wagon wheels display family name plates.

PEELED BY MACHINE

Last year the church fair workers peeled and cored their own apples. But this is changing, too; the apples this year were freshly peeled and cored by machines and sealed in plastic bags by a wholesaler.

The talk was not of crops, or local legends that become more involved with each telling around a bubbling vat of apple butter, but of the problems of commuting and expected profits from the church fair.

The 90 quarts from Saturday's cooking were sealed in Mason jars and stored with 43 other quarts made a week ago. The spread—excellent on hot, home-made biscuits or pancakes—will sell for $1 a quart.

As the apple butter was emptied from the great cauldron, dirt was kicked over the wood fire. Mr. Armentrout carried the pot back to Gunston Hall. He cleaned it out with tomatoes, salt and vinegar and it was ready for next autumn.

Remember Little Rock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Anderson Independent, Anderson, S.C., of September 23, 1962:

REMEMBER LITTLE ROCK

Time: September 30, 1952.

Place: Columbia, S.C.

Scene: A platform on the steps of the historic State house.

The chief actor: Republican Presidential Candidate Dwight Eisenhower.

The script: Glowing promises to entice South Carolinians to leave the party of their fathers, forget the scalawags and carpetbaggers, and vote Republican.

Synopsis:

Promise: He would balance the Federal budget.

Result: After 8 years as President, he left the greatest peacetime deficit in history of the United States.

Promise: He would "root out corruption" in Washington.

Result: A passel of scandals, including even his "Assistant President," Sherman Adams, who peddled influence right in the White House—and enjoyed vicuna coats, luxury trips, etc.; and "influence peddling" even among top brass in the armed services.

Promise: To maintain farm price programs, especially those guaranteeing farmers 90 percent of parity.

Result: Quick killing of the 90-percent formula, and adoption of the sliding scale plan—with prices sliding down.

Promise: To "strengthen" the social security program, especially to help guard citizens against personal disaster.

Result: Not even lipservice to the program; such statements that if citizens want security they can find it in prison.

(Note: This attitude hasn't changed. In a recent speech Eisenhower said the medicare program designed to help our old and sick is just a scheme to help "bums and deadbeats.")

Promise: Denied plans to cut back or close Fort Jackson, Donaldson Air Force Base, and other defense installations.

Result: Tried best to cut back or close such installations in South Carolina.

Promise: Pledged to abide by Constitution and States rights, leaving integration of schools to be settled by the States.

Result: In September 1957, ordered heavily armed U.S. military force with fixed bayonets to invade Little Rock, Ark., to force mixing of races in the schools.

The first time Ike spoke in South Carolina he made all kinds of promises—practically all of which went over the dam during the 8 years he occupied the White House.

At hand is text of the speech he made in Columbia just 10 years ago.

He promised that as President he would balance the budget. To quote:

"Isn't it time we had in Washington an administration which knows how to keep spending down; which will put an end to waste; which believes that an unbalanced Federal budget is dangerous to every one of us—and moved to bring that budget into balance?"

What happened when he was elected? The national debt ceiling had to be lifted a number of times. Was the budget balanced? What a laugh. He left the greatest peacetime deficit on record from Washington to Eisenhower.

Candidate Ike told the Columbia crowd back in 1952 that under his benign hand there would be no scandals. To quote: "We are going to change to an administration which will root corruption out and then go on with the kind of men and women who can be trusted to see to it that corruption does not get in."

Shades of Sherman Adams—Ike's "Assistant President"—and vicuna coats, hotel suites, trips and arrogant influence peddled right in the White House.

Oh, Ike told South Carolinians in 1952 that he just loved the farmers. How did he say it? These are his words:

"For example, I believe wholeheartedly and without any 'ifs' or 'buts' in Federal programs to stabilize farm prices, including the present program insuring 90 percent of parity on all basic commodities."

What happened when Ike took over? The program insuring 90 percent parity was among the first to be ditched. Had it not been for such staunch defenders as Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina farmers would have been stabilized by the Ike Republicans, all right—right out in the stable. And interest rates skyrocketed to fatten his Wall Street banker friends.

But, like other Republicans of today, Ike was running for office in 1952 and those bigwigs pulling the strings and dishing out the money operated by an "anything goes" code when it came to promises.

Take this Ike promise made in Columbia in 1952: "We will go on from there (keeping 90 percent parity for farmers, etc.) to strengthen every measure for the social security of our people; to build a strong floor beneath them against personal disaster."

It was another case of promising one thing while running for office and doing another once elected.

Right off, too, he denied what he described as "false" rumors that as President he would curtail activities at Fort Jackson, or any other defense installations in South Carolina, including Donaldson Air Force Base.

It is of record that within months after he was elected, in the name of "economy" activities were curtailed at Fort Jackson and they were about ready to wipe Donaldson AFB off the defense map. Again it was the Democrats—the late Representative Riley of the Second District, Columbia, Senator JOHNSTON and others who succeeded against odds in retaining and restoring to full usefulness such installations.

Ike also told South Carolinians 10 years ago that he was a strong believer in "States rights" and that he pledged "that, if elected, I will support the Constitution of the United States—the whole of it."

What happened? In recent letters to newspapers E. B. Woodward of Bishopville—he is pro-Republican—strongly protested bringing back into the State "the golf-playing former President who has never shown anything but marked dislike for South Carolina and the South as a whole."

"This man," Woodward recalls—and he is not alone—"made several promises that were material to the welfare of the southern people, and that brought him the largest popular vote ever accorded a Republican candidate in our State. Of these promises one was to support the 90-percent parity prices which meant so much to our farmers." He adds:

"In reply to a question posed to Candidate Eisenhower regarding integration, this man stated, 'I think that is a matter which should be settled at State level.'

"After being elected President, Eisenhower hardly had warmed his seat when he appointed as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court one of the most socialistically inclined politicians in America. His tendency toward socialism was well known by every informed person in the Nation.

"Of course we all know now the untenable position the South faces as a result. There we have a most impressive illustration of how little Mr. Eisenhower thinks of the people of the South in turning about face on both these and other promises."

Upshot was Ike's invasion of Little Rock—a city, even as in Columbia and elsewhere, where some people had believed his pledge to uphold the Constitution and States rights—to force mixing of the races under the bayonets and rifles of U.S. Army troops.

The hailing of yesterday's visit of the "Conqueror of Little Rock" who smashed promises without missing a putt, drew from Mr. Woodward—and he's no Democrat—a blast at South Carolina GOP Chairman Chapman. This comes as no surprise. Thousands of this State's citizens feel the same way.

"All of us were delighted when advised (by the National Republican Party headquarters) that our State was chosen to be honored by a visit from President Eisenhower" on behalf of Candidate Workman's Republican campaign, Chairman Chapman stated.

"Honored?" asks Mr. Woodward. "No, Mr. Chapman, my reaction was one of resentment accompanied by a bit of nausea."

Mr. Woodward is not alone.

Ike fooled a lot of South Carolinians in 1952. But the majority saw through him, and they're not likely to fall for yesterday's effort to sell them his boy, W. D. Workman, Jr., the Republican "me too" candidate handpicked by the Republican Party and the "millionaires' club"—who oppose U.S. Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

Fogarty Reports Dramatic Health Improvement Progress—Rhode Island Aids Key Problems Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the closing days of the 87th Congress provide an opportunity to review again the progress that has been made in the quest for better health, to salute those individuals and groups that have made this progress possible, and to consider the opportunities for further progress in the years ahead.

This review is particularly meaningful to me because the 87th Congress brought me to my second score of years in service to the people of the Second District of Rhode Island. In addition, I have had the rare privilege of having served eight Congresses as chairman or ranking minority member of the House subcommittee responsible for the Federal programs for health and other matters. These Congresses—including the 87th—have reviewed the reports of our deliberations, listened to our pleas for adequate funds to support new and expanding programs for health research and related matters, and have strongly voiced the will of the people for invigorated conquests of disease and for improved health.

The 87th Congress, following positive recommendations by my committee, has

taken necessary action to provide for meaningful expansion of on-going programs and for substantial new efforts to improve the health of this Nation. I should like to cite a few:

The vaccine development program has reached the point where scientists believe they can start developing practical vaccines against at least some of the annual afflictions we call colds, and against other virus-caused diseases, such as the encephalitis that recently plagued one of our great Southern States and is an ever-present threat elsewhere.

Second. The general research support grant program, made possible through action of this 87th Congress, enables our universities, hospitals and other medical research and research training institutions to carry on their important research functions with greater academic freedom and flexibility, so that we may expect improved results.

In recognizing the value of increased medical research, this 87th Congress has not neglected the health needs of peoples and communities across our broad land. In the first session passage of the Community Health Services and Facilities Act authorized the Surgeon General to make grants to public or nonprofit private agencies for the development of outside-the-hospital health services, thereby enabling States and communities to modernize various health services.

This Congress has been responsible also for a great expansion of clinical research to bring effective means of treatment for disease to patients faster than before.

I hope that this Congress will also provide for increased research on the health problems of two large and important segments of our population—our children and our older citizens. The bill now pending for creation of a new Institute for Child Health and Human Development also would establish an Institute of General Medical Sciences for increased research on the control of many diseases and disorders.

I look for enactment of H.R. 4999, incorporating the major provisions of a bill which I introduced. It calls for a 10-year program of matching grants to construct teaching facilities for medical, dental and other public health personnel and to provide a student loan program. It also would permit private institutions to enlarge and modernize their facilities for medical research.

These are just a few of the reasons why I salute my colleagues in the Congress and express my appreciation for their knowledgeable support of my subcommittee in its aspirations to keep this country the world leader in medical research.

These past 2 years have also seen heartening changes in the attitude of the executive branch. Over the years, I have had to answer numerous charges that Congress was usurping the budget-making prerogatives of the executive, but the Congress has simply been responsive to the hopes and aspirations of our people for better health and for scientific progress. The past 2 years, however, indicate that the Kennedy administration is seeking to provide the administrative leadership which medical research programs have long deserved. And so I salute President Kennedy—not only for his presentation of the first health research budget in 10 years that even approximated what this Nation could support and needed to carry out, but also for his direct and personal interest in many aspects of disease and disability.

The committee is also keenly aware of the advice, assistance, and support it receives from the hundreds of private individuals and groups interested in medical research and its two related and interrelated components—education and service. An invaluable service is provided by expert citizen witnesses—scientists, educators, and others—who give of their own valuable time to help assure that the recommendations of our committee incorporate a three-way balance between public need, scientific opportunity, and total national goals.

I also salute the voluntary health organizations that reach into every city, town, and village across this Nation—organized to provide health education and community services, and support for research. I am particularly happy to see that increased Federal support for health research and related activities has not stopped the activities of these groups. The voluntary health agencies in my own State of Rhode Island are typical of those that continue to grow in organized strength and effectiveness. May they continue to shine as an exemplary challenge to those who must rely on big brother in a totalitarian state.

Fundamental to the progress of health and medicine in this country are the scientists in search of new health knowledge and the physicians and other health workers who bring the latest in health practice to the ultimate recipient—the patient. In the many years that I have had a major responsibility for congressional action on Federal programs for the support of medical research, tremendous progress has been made in increasing the numbers of young people undergoing training for a career in medical research. Under programs of the National Institutes of Health—principal research arm of the Public Health Service—funds for these programs increased from $70,000 in fiscal year 1946 to $130 million in fiscal year 1962. At the same time, funds for individual research projects increased from $85,000 in fiscal year 1946 to $333 million in fiscal year 1962.

The dividends that this investment has brought to the American people are amply demonstrated by just a few of the advances that have been made. One measure of our gains in health is to be found in the increase of life expectancy of our people. As we have developed and applied vaccines against what used to be called the common childhood diseases—diphtheria and whooping cough, for example—and as we have learned and applied better methods of nutrition, and as the sanitary quality of our water, milk and other foods has been vastly improved, our life expectancy has increased to 69.7 years, almost the Biblical three score and ten. Think back 30 years to the annual crippling and killing toll of polio. Today, polio is a rapidly vanishing disease. Soon we shall see measles disappearing, thanks to the newly developed vaccine against it. Typhoid fever is so rare that few medical students today ever see a case. And smallpox has disappeared to the extent that a single case creates a nationwide stir.

As we have triumphed over the acute infectious diseases, we have turned our attention to the chronic and disabling afflictions. Here, too, we can point to accomplishments such as cortisone and other steroids for treatment of rheumatoid arthritis, surgical operations for congenital heart malformations, antibiotics and other drugs for prevention of heart-crippling rheumatic fever, drugs that are conquering some forms of mental illness, development and widespread use of fluoridation to prevent tooth decay, 5-year cures by chemotherapy of a form of cancer in women.

More recently we learn of a new freezing method for treating stomach ulcers, and of a new test for detecting cancer of the bladder and kidneys. While these and other similar findings must yet stand the test of time before their real value can be told, they are evidence of the advances currently being made in our attack on disease.

This year marks Cancer Progress Year, so designated through a resolution I had the privilege of sponsoring, to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the National Cancer Institute which a previous Congress in its wisdom established. This is the 25th year, also, of the nationwide educational activity of the American Cancer Society, a voluntary organization which has done much to allay ignorant fear of cancer and consequent needless deaths through its campaigns to fight cancer with knowledge. Partly through the educational efforts of this society, and partly through the research we have supported and the advances in medicine and surgery, we can now save 1 out of 3 cancer patients, instead of fewer than 1 of 5 who were saved a few short years ago.

As I think of all these advances toward better health for our Nation, I should like to pay tribute to the many who have made them possible: the scientific researchers, the practicing physicians and surgeons, the great voluntary health organizations, the institutions of higher learning where our researchers and physicians are trained, our public health officers in State and local communities, health workers everywhere—the professionally trained and the skilled technicians and all those who work as part of the research and health and medical teams.

Many of the gains that have been and are being made are the result of an alert, well-informed and health-conscious general public. In the final analysis, perhaps, the informed public represents the most critical factor in the success of programs aimed at improving the general levels of health. And the largest segment of the public—the taxpaying public—makes a direct contribution in the form of about 1 cent of each dollar that comprises the Federal budget, perhaps the best tax buy the American peo-

ple have ever made. The continued support of all our people will be required if we are to meet the current and emerging problems of disease and disability. Despite our tremendous advances, great problems remain.

Each year, for example: over quarter of a million people still die of some form of cancer; over 925,000 die of heart disease; over 250,000 infants are born with some form of abnormality or neurological deficit; 250,000 people begin the long and painful fight against arthritis or related disorders; an estimated 218 million useful days are lost from work and 195 million days lost from school by our children because of upper respiratory infections—or the common cold; and almost 40,000 lives are lost because of automobile accidents.

These are only a few of the problems that today stand in the way of further increases in our life span and impede our capacity for enjoyment of a full and productive life.

I am not only convinced but fully dedicated to the proposition that the answers to our health problems must come through a three-way effort of medical research, education, and medical service. I am pleased, proud, and thankful that during the past 22 years, Rhode Island has emerged as one of this Nation's truly great health and medical centers. Our State institutions and organizations—both public and private—have made giant strides in building medical research and health programs that have not only been of direct benefit to the people of Rhode Island but have also served as outstanding examples of what could be done in other States as well.

Rhode Island institutions have achieved such a high degree of excellence recognized throughout the scientific community that today they are able to compete on the basis of scientific merit with any institution in the world. In contrast to a level of practically zero in 1946, Rhode Island institutions this past year attracted over $1.6 million in funds to help the Public Health Service carry out its programs. For example, research projects are underway in Brown University, Providence College, the University of Rhode Island, and the Rhode Island State Hospital for work on such problems as radiation, genetics, blood factors, neurophysiology, and water pollution.

Our institutions are also building the supply of medical research manpower for the future. Twenty-one young scientists at Brown University have won fellowships from the National Institutes of Health for further research training. Brown University itself has been awarded training grants in such areas as neurophysiology, genetics, and child psychology. Similar training programs are underway in the Rhode Island Hospital, the Emma Pendleton Bradley Hospital, Providence College, and the Providence Child Guidance Clinic.

And further steps are being taken to ensure that our research facilities keep pace with our capabilities. I am pleased to report that four major projects won the support of the Public Health Service during the year. A new health science building and laboratories with the capacity to do shellfish and stream pollution research are now beyond the dream stage and approaching reality. Completion of laboratories for cancer research and the installation of scientific equipment at the Rhode Island Hospital will be possible through a grant of over $110 million. And Brown University is further enhancing its ability to do research in biology with the addition of new equipment.

Perhaps one of the most heartening developments in Rhode Island this year was the approval in June by the corporation of Brown University of a report authorizing the establishment of a full-scale medical education program here. For a number of years I have advocated taking this important step not only because we have the talent and capacity for such a move, but because Rhode Island needs a medical school. And, according to the best professional minds concerned with the problem, our national needs for physicians and physician-scientists are great and will undoubtedly become greater.

Rhode Island has passed another milestone in its move toward becoming one of the greatest health centers in the Nation. It continues to improve its capacity to help in the nationwide attack on the health problems we face. I am confident that our people will play an important part in some of the dramatic scientific breakthroughs to which we look forward: The causes of cancer, knowledge and treatment of hardening of the arteries and high blood pressure, vaccines to prevent tuberculosis, the common cold and other diseases, answers to the particular problems of both the young and older citizens of our country.

With the continued support of all the millions of people concerned with these health programs, continued success will be ours.

The Present Situation in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following analysis by a brilliant Far Eastern diplomat who writes under the pseudonym of Hawthorne P. Browns. Will the United States be caught unprepared to act decisively in its own national interests, if and when the intolerable situation in Red China explodes? The time to prepare for that possibility is now.

THE PRESENT SITUATION IN ASIA

There was a time when the sun did not set over the British Empire, when London was the center from which decisive power radiated, when all directional designations were orientated accordingly. Thus, when referring to the geographical area Asia, it was customary to divide it into the Near East, the Middle East, and the Far East. Since the world today is no longer London-centered, such designations become out of date. To Australia and New Zealand, what the British call the Far East is near north, and the area covered by Canada and the United States should be the Far East.

The most important fact in the Asian world at the present time is the rapid disappearance of Western European influence in the area. The reluctance on the part of the United States to recognize this overriding fact is responsible in large measure for the confusion and turmoil in Asia.

Since the end of the Second World War, the British have withdrawn from the Indian subcontinent where there are now three independent nations: India, Pakistan, and Ceylon. Burma and Malaya have become sovereign entities. Soon there will be created a new entity known as Malaysia, embracing Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak, North Borneo, and Brunei.

The prospect that Britain may join the Common Market of Europe is destined to loosen the ties of the Commonwealth. Britain has agreed to the phased abolition of the preferential tariff for the Commonwealth members. The Commonwealth countries are looking for new markets for their products. Citizens of Commonwealth countries now require visas to enter Britain. Australia and New Zealand are seriously considering changing their currency to the decimal system, as Canada did long ago. They are even thinking of adopting left-hand driving. Their defense ties to the United States, under ANZUS are much more important than those linking the Commonwealth.

French Indochina has become a historical term. The French, while playing an increasingly important role in Europe, are no longer a factor in Asia.

The Dutch, after losing their empire in the Indies, are now making their last withdrawal from Asia by agreeing to turn over West New Guinea to Indonesia.

This is why two key members of SEATO, Thailand and the Philippines, have consistently advocated dropping Britain and France from its membership. They believe that, with Britain and France out, SEATO will become a much more effective force in countering Communist expansion in Asia.

They have good reasons to support their proposition. Most of the Asian nations have been the victims of European colonialism. Many of their present leaders, such as Nehru and Sukarno, have languished in European jails. It is only natural for them to be highly suspicious of their erstwhile oppressors. To them, anticolonialism is an article of faith.

This anticolonialism, whether justified or not, has permeated down to the illiterate and poverty-stricken peasants. This may be illustrated by the Burma campaign in the Second World War. At the time, the China-Burma-India Theater (CBI) was under the command of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek of China, with the American, Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, as Chief of Staff. The arrangement was to send contingents of Chinese troops to fight the Japanese in Burma. The British at first placed all sorts of limitations to the admission of Chinese troops. When they were finally admitted, they were placed under the command of the British Field Marshal Sir William (now Lord) Slim. To the surprise of the Chinese, they found themselves very unpopular with the Burmese people. Some even had their hands chopped off by Burmese peasants. The Burmese explained that they could not understand why the Chinese, who were their friends, should be fighting under British command.

It is well known that Gandhi and Nehru stubbornly refused to join the fight against the Japanese until the British promised

them independence, which Churchill was unwilling to do. Even Chiang Kai-shek's personal intervention proved to be of no avail. Churchill was also annoyed by Chiang's intervention. Roosevelt was caught in the middle and did little to help.

SEATO is supposed to protect the Asian nations from Communist aggression. But SEATO includes Britain and France as key members. The mere presence of these two European powers in SEATO is grist for the Communist propaganda mill. All that the Communists have to do is to say to the common people of Asia: "Look here, do you realize that you are fighting on the side of the British and the French? Don't you have any sense of shame, fighting alongside your former oppressors against your own people?" The average Asian is in no position to talk back.

From another angle, the British and the French, having lost their power in Asia, are inclined to call for retreat and appeasement. This is not to say that they are prepared to see Asia go Communist.[1] The plain fact is that they have no resources available to commit to Asian defense.

Readers of Anthony Eden's memoirs will recall that he complained bitterly that the late John Foster Dulles did not give his Government time to consult the Commonwealth in the Indochina crisis. Some pages later, when Eden was defending his position in the Suez crisis, he forgot all about consulting the Commonwealth, or even consulting the United States. The difference here is that, while Eden was prepared to commit Britain in Egypt, he was in no position to commit her to anything in Indochina.

It is disastrous to put the Geneva Conference on Indochina under the joint chairmanship of Russia and Britain. Gromyko speaks with authority because the Soviet Union is deeply involved. Malcolm MacDonald, an ex-British colonial official, speaks with no authority at all. The dice are loaded heavily on the Communist side.

On the other hand, the United States is not a colonial power in the eyes of the Asian peoples. The American record in the Philippines is a commendable one. Successive American Ambassadors to the Philippines, from Homer Ferguson to Charles E. Bohlen, have found an enormous reservoir of good will for the United States among the Filipino people.

The Chinese Communists regard the United States as their principal enemy. It may be of interest to recall that, when Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai were in the political wilderness, they were seeking American aid from General Stilwell and General Hurley. They even offered to place their troops under American training. American liaison officers detailed to Yenan were welcomed with open arms.

The Chinese Communists now scream against the United States because the removal of American power from Asia is the only condition under which they can push on their program of aggression and conquest. That is why every Chinese Communist official calls for the withdrawal of the Seventh Fleet from the Formosa Strait.

The free nations of Asia which are defending themselves against Communist aggression know that American power is in Asia, not to conquer them, but to defend them against Communist conquest. They are willing allies of the United States. But they do not see why the United States should be in alliance with their former oppressors who have nothing to contribute. They understand perfectly why Britain and France are so important to the United States in European affairs. They cannot understand why they are important also in the Asian scene.

Therefore, the first step in a reexamination of American policy in Asia is to consider the proposition made by Thailand and the Philippines, namely to reorganize SEATO by dropping Britain and France from its membership. Such a step will greatly increase the effectiveness of SEATO. There is every reason to believe that SEATO's Commonwealth members—Australia, New Zealand and Pakistan—will go along with such a move.

II

In trying to fight Communist aggression and subversion in Asia, the most fundamental task is to convince the people that, by joining the anti-Communist front, they are on the winning side. The people must be made to believe that the fight is going to be carried out with the utmost determination, permitting no compromise or retreat, until the last Communist is taken care of. Under such circumstances, the people will give their all to the campaign.

This proposition is based on a simple understanding of human nature: nobody wants to be on the losing side of a fight.

There are two outstanding examples of successful fights against communism in postwar Asia—in the Philippines under Ramon Magsaysay and in Malaya under Tunku Abdul Rahman. In both cases the fight was carried to the bitter end. Because Magsaysay and Rahman were able to convince their peoples that they meant business and that they would win, they received the support of the people.

The outstanding failure was China. Chiang Kai-shek, of course, was determined enough. But he was always under pressure to call off the fight. Washington's policy at the time was to bring about a Nationalist-Communist coalition. Chiang was severely criticized for being stubborn. Critical military supplies were withheld at strategic moments. Hot pursuit of retreating Communist troops was halted.[1]

Readers of the white paper on China policy, published by the State Department in 1949, may obtain a good picture of the half-hearted measures taken against the Communists in China. Chiang called his campaign against the Communists a bandit-suppression campaign. The outside world insisted that it was civil war, and civil war was something to be avoided at all cost. General Marshall was sent by President Truman to arrange a cease-fire. While Mao Tse-tung violated it with impunity, Chiang's hands were constantly restrained. Chiang was frequently accused of refusing to listen to American military advice. The advice given to him by his American advisers made it impossible for him to win.

All this became clear to the Chinese people in due course. Since Chiang was not winning, the people became indifferent to the fight. The tragedy of China became inevitable..

The China story is being repeated in Laos. From the very beginning, the struggle was declared, in General Bradley's classical phrase on the Korean war, "the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time," as if the Communists would ever be foolish enough to attack in the right place at the right time for the United States. No one on our side was in earnest in the Lao struggle. All measures taken were at best half-hearted. The Lao people were accused of being lethargic and unconcerned. It was the big powers which were lethargic and unconcerned. The Lao people were even accused of harboring Communists and helping them. It was Souvanna Phouma who harbored and helped his brother-in-law, the leader of the Pathet Lao. Why should the Lao people, how could they, fight the Communists when nobody else did?

Now the Lao agreement is signed and sealed. Both the United States and the Soviet Union hailed it as a great achievement. Secretary Dean Rusk shook hands with Chinese Communist Foreign Minister Chen Yi. Cochairman Gromyko went back to Moscow; the other cochairman, Malcolm MacDonald, is going to Peiping.

The stage has now been set for Vietnam. There is no question at all that Vietnam can be saved from the Communists, provided there is a determination to save it. However, Ngo Dinh Diem is being given what may be called the Chiang Kai-shek treatment. He has been accused of being stubborn, dictatorial, reactionary, feudalistic. He has been accused by Washington of practicing nepotism. Reporters say that he is unpopular with his people, even hated by the people. His political enemies have been denouncing him in Paris and Washington and have been given a full run in the press.

It is not contended that Chiang's government in the past and Diem's government today are paragons of virtue. They most certainly are not. But in urging them to reform, great care must be take not to turn their people against them.

The Communists know well that they can always win when their enemy fights them only half-heartedly. Hot on the heels of the Lao agreement, the Communists are now offering to make Vietnam another Laos. Such a proposition is dynamite. Even polite discussion of it will undermine the people's confidence, because it will make them wonder whether or not they are on the winning side.

The fight against communism has its military and its psychological aspects. The Communists are smart enough to preach continuously that their cause is "the wave of the future," "the locomotive of history." Mao Tse-tung has asserted confidently that "the east wind will prevail over the west wind." Their idea is to convince the people that it is the height of folly to buck the inevitable. It is the old American dictum: "If you can't beat them, join them."

The assignment for the anti-Communist front is to tell the people, by words and deeds, that it is the winning side, and it has the determination and the means to make it the winning side. A half-hearted fight is no fight at all.

III

Congressman WALTER JUDD used to stick out his hand and say to his audience that it represents the map of Asia—the palm is the China mainland, and the fingers are the various countries bordering it.

The source of all trouble in Asia stems from the fact that the China mainland is under Communist rule.

The power and potentiality of Communist China has inspired fear, not only in the Asian nations, but all over the world. The fanciful production statistics put out by Peiping were taken at their face value. The former Director-Generdl of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, Dr. Josue de Castro, declared Communist China's victory over hunger as "as startling an event as the conquest of interplanetary space." Dr. de Castro made his statement as recently as 1959, the second year of mainland China's current famine. In the last 6 or 7 years, scarcely a month passes without someone asserting that Communist China is going to set off a nuclear bomb. It takes Chen Yi, the Chinese Communist Foreign Minister, to say in August 1962, that he has not got it.

Now the world has finally come to realize that Communist China is not the big, powerful nation it has been pictured to be. The Chinese people now have less to eat than in the year 1928, when China was still under the much hated warlords. An American magazine (U.S. News & World Report)

[1] After the battle of Szepingkai in 1946, Chinese Communist forces under Lin Piao were in full retreat toward Harbin. Gen. George C. Marshall insisted that Chiang's forces should not chase them toward the Siberian border. Lin Piao was given time to regroup and to receive more Soviet supplies. He later turned back and overran Manchuria.

recently declared: "The Chinese Communists have lost the Chinese."

But Chiang's Formosa, which is growing stronger every day, is still regarded as the danger. He is asked to abandon Quemoy and Matsu because these islands may provoke the Chinese Communists. The American Ambassador solemnly assured the Chinese Communist Ambassador in Warsaw that the United States will not support Chiang Kai-shek in making an attack on the mainland. Back in 1952, President Eisenhower declared before Congress that he was going to "unleash" Chiang. Congress applauded him thunderously. But nothing happened. In 1962, Chiang is still under leash. The United States is acting as if it were trying to protect Communist China, which regards the United States as its principal enemy, while spending billions to help the small nations to defend themselves against Communist China's predatory designs. Such a policy makes sense only when peace, however precarious, is maintained. But there is no peace in Laos and Vietnam. And if Laos and Vietnam are given up there will be no peace in Thailand.

The dramatic exodus of refugees from the China mainland into Hongkong underscores the fact that all's not well in Mao's domain. There is every indication that Mao is in deep trouble. Even Max Lerner now ponders over a China mainland revolt.

When a mass revolt occurs, when millions of Chinese people rise in wrath against Mao's rule, when his armed forces mutiny, Chiang is going across, with or without Washington's blessing. It is the hour he has been waiting for. He is determined to win. Nothing can stop him except brute force.

Is Washington going to stop him? Is it going to remain neutral? Or is it going to help him?

These are no longer academic questions. And it is the part of wisdom for Washington to do some hard thinking about the answers.

One thing is certain. If the China mainland revolts, and the United States does nothing about it, or tries to prevent Chiang from doing something about it, she will have lost Asia. The billions she has spent to bolster defense against communism in Asia will have gone up in smoke.

Lack of Firm Policy Only Invites Aggression and Increases the Danger of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is the tragedy of our time that so many Americans have become so filled with fear that they seem ready to sacrifice dignity, honor, and self-respect in order to maintain peace. No man in his right mind advocates war. I certainly would be one who believes in peace, both from a moral base and because, unfortunately, wars do not solve our problems. But we cannot avoid war by sacrificing our national honor, nor in crawling on our bellies in the dirt to appease a barbaric dictator or to win over a world conspiracy which has as its objective the destruction of freedom of all mankind. The threat of war will not be lessened by appeasement. Indeed, the longer we fail to take a firm stand against Communist aggression, the greater the danger of war becomes. If we had acted when Castro first proclaimed Cuba as a Communist state, the threat of a Red fortress on our doorstep would have been ended and we would not now be faced with the insulting ultimatums from the Red boss in the Kremlin, telling us that the Monroe Doctrine is dead and we dare not do anything about it. If we had acted in the American tradition in Berlin and knocked down the wall on the night it was constructed, men, women, and children seeking freedom would not now be dying in trying to scale it and the cause of freedom in Europe would be far stronger than it is at present. The Russian Communists have made gains every time we have shown any sign of weakness and they have been stopped in their tracks whenever we took a firm stand and demonstrated that we were willing to back it up.

There is risk now in any course we take, but I say to you there is far greater risk in doing nothing about Cuba and Red aggression in this hemisphere than there is in our continued "do nothing," weak, cowardly course we have been pursuing. The following column by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of September 24, 1962, points up the necessity for a firm declaration now that we intend to enforce the Monroe Doctrine. A strong policy may result in all-out war. A weak policy is sure to do so.

The editorial follows:

NO TIME FOR EXCUSES, ALIBIS—NARROW READING OF MONROE DOCTRINE ONLY ENCOURAGES RED PENETRATIONS

(By David Lawrence)

Time was when a President of the United States didn't hesitate to speak forthrightly and to act in support of the principles of human freedom anywhere in the world. Two Presidents, both Democrats—Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt—led the American people as they made sacrifices for that same basic principle in two world wars.

But today there is a strange silence—even a fear that it is "indiscreet" or that it's "loose talk" to urge that America speak and act in behalf of human beings in Cuba or against the cruelty of their oppressors or against the autocratic government in Moscow which is giving military assistance to a tyrannical dictatorship in Havana.

The latest excuse or alibi now given wide currency by advisers of President Kennedy—and fed out to the press here—is that the Monroe Doctrine has been repealed because America entered World War I and World War II. It is averred that the United States, by militarily assisting certain governments in Europe and Asia during the "cold war," has forfeited her right to act in behalf of peoples in this hemisphere who have had their freedoms taken from them by Communist imperialism.

If this concept gains strength, it cannot but encourage the Soviets to penetrate with impunity North and South America as well as every other continent. For, in effect, the advocates of this philosophy are saying that this country has no right to interfere with Soviet conquest of Cuba because the United States now has, under the North Atlantic Treaty, military bases in various European countries. This can only mean that America must, therefore, recognize the Soviet occupation not only of Cuba but of the Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria. Can the Soviets point to a single example of the grant of American military aid that has resulted in any political control by the United States?

The whole thing is an illustration of how expediency leads to one retreat after another. For the United States has just announced, through White House and State Department pronouncements, that America's Armed Forces will be used only to repel military attacks on this country or its neighbors. This is a doctrine of isolation reminiscent of the days when prominent Republicans opposed American entry into either of the two world wars on the grounds that the interests of this country were not directly affected. It was, of course, just a means of appealing to pacifistic sentiment.

Twice the dictatorship government in Berlin misconstrued this attitude as an unwillingness on the part of the United States to fight. In the end, the deliberate attack on American rights on the high seas forced this country into the first World War in 1917. While it was Japan and not Germany that attacked Pearl Harbor in 1941, the United States accepted the challenge as a direct attack by the Nazi regime as well. Indeed, the United States made its main war effort on the continent of Europe and in North Africa.

Thus, the United States in two World Wars has refused to narrow the concept of its participation in world affairs to either the Western or the Eastern Hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine has not been narrowed. It has been broadened. From 1945 till a few weeks ago American policy has been worldwide and has been based on the principle that every people has a right to self-determination and that it is the duty of the United States to help rid the world of any sinister force that now may invade only smaller countries but in the end will invade the larger ones as well. Woodrow Wilson said in Congress in 1917 that "the world must be made safe for democracy." It isn't safe today for any free government.

The Soviets are talking loud because they think they can bluff America into inaction and silence. Foreign Minister Gromyko's brazen speech at the United Nations a few days ago, charging this country with aggression, is an example of how readily American silence can be misinterpreted. If the U.S. Government continues to make excuses for abandoning the people in a little country 90 miles away, how can it ever be expected either to lift its voice or render any aid to the peoples of the captive countries in Europe and Asia? To draw back into "Fortress America" and contend that the United States has no obligation to speak out or act in behalf of the Cuban people because this might offend Soviet Russia means that a bigger test under even more dangerous circumstances may come later on at a time when it will be more difficult, more hazardous and more costly in human lives than it is now.

Today the vocal chords of the U.S. Government have been silenced by a strategy of fear, of hesitancy and of vacillation, which keeps on emphasizing the totality of the world situation—as if this means that the principles of democracy and the aspirations of peoples at present under the yoke of Communist imperialism have become secondary. Yet this Nation could mobilize—by exhortation of foreign peoples—forces that would inevitably thwart the aims of the aggressors.

War or the threat of war isn't the most powerful weapon in the world today. Moral force plus economic force are even more powerful. But if there is fear even to speak, then, in the end, war comes because the enemy misinterprets silence for timidity and inaction for weakness.

Myths Feed American Frustration Over Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include therein an article appearing in the Washington Post under date of September 23, 1962, by Mr. Henry M. Wriston entitled "Myths Feed American Frustration Over Cuba."

Mr. Wriston is particularly well qualified to write this article and the country would be better off if all Americans took time out to read the article.

The article follows:

MYTHS FEED AMERICAN FRUSTRATION OVER CUBA

(By Henry M. Wriston)

(President of the American Assembly and president emeritus of Brown University, Wriston is also well-known as an author.)

The American people are clearly in a state of frustration over Cuba. They want no more tragic fiascoes, such as the Bay of Pigs, but they do want action. To some extent, they are the victims of ineptitude, but to a larger degree they suffer disappointment because of faith in myths and failure to know significant elements in their own history.

The first essential fact is that frustration about Cuba is not new, but is more nearly a normal condition. With only brief respites, Cuba has troubled us for a century and a half. That record should constitute a strong hint that no quick solution is available.

Cuban dilemmas have been wrestled with by strong Presidents and by weak ones; by shrewed Secretaries of State and by others who were inept; by amateur diplomats of the shirtsleeve variety and by seasoned professionals who never lost their aplomb.

There have been grief episodes when faith in the viability of democratic self-government in Cuba seem justified. But there have been longer periods when the choice seemed to lie between anarchy and dictatorship, often of a brutal kind. The masters have been Spaniards in some eras and Cubans in others.

Efforts to meet Cuban crises have taken every form from patience and tact at one end of the scale to force and violence at the other. Sometimes the force has been domestic; often it has been imported by "patriots," like Castro. Sometimes the United States has exerted the force. Frustration was the usual result, if not immediately, very soon.

THE MONROE MYTH

The second basis for blighted hopes has been the myth that the Monroe Doctrine was the magic key to a satisfactory solution. In answer to a news conference question, President Kennedy said: "The Monroe Doctrine means what it has meant since President Monroe and John Quincy Adams enunciated it, and that is that we would oppose a foreign power extending its power to the Western Hemisphere."

It was a response whose apparent precision is not very helpful. If it is to be taken literally, it means that we will take no forcible measures. After Monroe's message was published, no fewer than five Latin American governments suggested treaties of alliance or at least promises of assistance. They got neither; John Quincy Adams said with characteristic candor that it was "obvious" that the United States could not undertake to resist a European power without the cooperation of some other European nation to supply the backbone of such resistance.

That was what Monroe and Adams meant; the historical facts are clear. Equally surely, President Kennedy did not mean any such thing.

Neither Monroe nor Adams conceived of their policy as "doctrine." It did not get that title until a generation later, and even then, no one spoke of 'enforcing" it Both Spain in the Dominican Republic, and France, in Mexico, defied it with some impunity so far as the United States was concerned. How much the collapse of Maximilian's rule in Mexico was due to implicit threats of force from the United States is not established.

ITS FIAT IS LAW

It was not until 1895, in Cleveland's second administration, that a President used the startling words, "The United States is not a country to which peace is necessary." His Secretary of State, Olney, was the first to call the doctrine "public law."

It was he who asserted, "Today the United States is practically sovereign on this continent, and its fiat is law on the subjects to which it confines its interposition." That was a far cry from the ideas of Monroe and Adams—and from those of President Kennedy.

Theodore Roosevelt announced as a "corollary" of the doctrine that we would undertake to keep order in the Caribbean so that there could be no excuse for European intervention. His method was "preventive intervention" by the United States.

Woodrow Wilson carried that policy to its ultimate extreme. He said explicitly that he was ready to violate the sovereignty of the Caribbean nations in order to teach them democracy. The right of this country to supervise Cuba has been embodied in the Cuban constitution and in our statutes after the Spanish War. On that authority, the United States intervened in Cuba several times.

These policies resulted in fiat failure. Democracy was not learned, nor was fiscal wisdom. What was learned was fear of the "Colossus of the North" and hatred of "Yankee imperialism."

These consequences were observable even in areas where strong measures were not employed. Dictatorships flourished, fiscal irresponsibility followed the departure of supervisors from the United States, incursions across national boundaries continued and a path was cleared for Communist infiltration.

TIGHT REIN ON ACTION

With the collapse of U.S. management of Latin affairs, a kind of mutualization of the Monroe Doctrine occurred. The principle of nonintervention was adopted in its most extreme form.

The Organization of American States provides for "consultation," and united action, save in rare instances, is difficult to agree upon and is effect even more rarely. As a reaction from the "fiat" doctrine which Olney himself later called "bumptious," the range for unilateral action on the part of the United States is severely curtailed.

In a sense, we have come full circle. When President Kennedy spoke of the doctrine as meaning what it has meant since Monroe, he cannot have expected his words to be taken literally. We will surely not wait for European collaboration; almost as surely, we must seek Latin collaboration.

That is the meaning of Secretary Rusk's efforts for a meeting of the foreign ministers. The popular myth about the meaning and status of the doctrine needs to be dispelled, and a more lucid formulation of policy should replace outworn shibboleths.

A REVOLUTIONARY BASE

The third fact of history which accounts to some extent for current frustration is that the United States has been used as a base of operations against other nations, and Cuba specifically, in open violation of our neutrality statutes.

Filibusters were often mere adventurers, soldiers of fortune. Aaron Burr, for example, after he killed Hamilton, sought a new career in the West. Before the United States acquired the Floridas, it was said that they were largely in the possession of the frayed edges of society—adventurers, "men of piratical inclination and life, a large part of whom were fugitives from justice."

The great length of our boundaries, disputes as to their location, and the failure of law and order to keep pace with the pioneers, long facilitated the evasion of neutrality laws. Even when caught, violators were frequently protected from punishment by local sympathy.

Moreover, the lawbreakers were sometimes regarded as agents of manifest destiny, a phrase coined in midcentury which became linked in many minds with a twin dogma with the same initials—the Monroe Doctrine.

American filibusters set a pattern for immigrants to follow. Many who sought refuge in the United States from homeland oppression proceeded to abuse our hospitality. Most refugees became good citizens; some acquired citizenship in order to appeal for aid when they got into trouble while attempting to free their native lands.

The Fenians offer a good example. In the second quarter of the 19th century, Irish came in a flood. Unlike earlier immigrants from Ireland who had scattered, the newcomers tended to concentrate in New York and New England.

They showed a genius for politics and for inciting hatred of Britain. Many joined the Fenian society and took an oath of allegiance to the "Republic of Ireland." After the Civil War, they attempted three incursions into Canada.

Their military operations approached farce but led many politicians to propose recognition of their belligerency with permission to outfit privateers in the United States as the Confederacy had done in England a few years before. A number of Fenians were arrested in Ireland while engaged in revolutionary activity, and then claimed the benefits of American citizenship.

Jewish activities were on a different plane. After the repeal of discriminatory laws here, many went abroad, particularly to Russia, and called upon the United States for aid when arrested. As a result, President Taft denounced the treaty of 1832 with Russia, but only after his House of Representatives—with a single dissenting vote—had demanded it.

Jewish influence become more and more potent by reason of swelling numbers, concentration in a few strategic centers and striking successes in trade, commerce, manufacturing, banking, publishing—and politics. This vast, if subtle, influence was dramatically manifested when President Truman extended de facto recognition to Israel only minutes after learning of its proclamation of independence May 14, 1948.

The drama of the action was heightened because no notice was given the American delegation to the United Nations, which was proposing a trusteeship for the area under instructions from the State Department. The subsequent flow of funds and other evidences of favor have greatly complicated relations with the Arab world. There are very few Arab voters in the United States.

Cuba furnishes classic examples of the exploitation of American hospitality. During the administration of President Fillmore, Narcisco Lopez, who had held both civil and military offices in Spain and Cuba, came to New York and prepared to invade Cuba, which he thought was ripe for rebellion.

Foiled by law officers there, he transferred his activities to the South, where he openly recruited men, raised money and enlisted the support of the Governors of Mississippi and Louisiana.

Twice he set out with armed expeditions. Prosecution of Lopez and his sponsors failed because local sympathy was so great that juries would not convict. When at last Lopez was caught and executed in Havana, the Spanish consul was driven from New Orleans and his office sacked.

Before our war with Spain, a Cuban junta operated openly in New York, headed by the man who became the first president of Cuba after its independence. The situation in the island was chaotic; repressive measures by the Spanish administration were brutally harsh.

The junta in New York poured out a stream of propaganda and raised funds to finance expeditions. More than half the expeditions were stopped, but full enforcement of the neutrality laws was impossible. Public sympathy was roused to fever pitch.

Ever since Cuban independence, dissidents have made the United States a refuge—and a headquarters. That is the situation today. The young men who set out from Miami and, after an intermediate stop, shot up a hotel in Miramar which housed Soviet "technicians," were not prosecuted. Instead, they were featured on several coast-to-coast television shows, where they blandly made the appealingly simple request for the United States to supply them with the same kind and amounts of aid the Soviets are giving Castro.

The fourth factor that has long produced frustration is the lack of any viable political system in Cuba. Spain itself has had a series of revolutions; it has endured tyranny, venality and incompetence, but all compounded with a fierce pride.

Its colonial administration was incompetent and often vicious. The colonies lacked educational systems, a native civil service and political experience. Feudal types of land tenure, peonage, exploitation, sharp class distinctions and enormous disparities of wealth combined to produce political chaos. Political parties too often partake of the character of personal factions.

Though it was possible for many dissident groups to cooperate briefly in driving out the Spanish Government, it was impossible for them to work together after victory. When, under the Platt amendment, Cuba was put in leading strings, we did not stay long enough to get education firmly organized or a civil service adequately trained. And too many Americans who were to "lead" the Cubans lacked knowledge of the language, the culture, the ethos of the people.

Our own domestic policies supply the fifth element in a pattern of frustration. The President is responsible for the conduct of foreign relations, but Congress is free to talk, pass resolutions and conduct investigations and the Senate has a veto on treaties. While the structure of foreign policy is essentially bipartisan, its conduct is—and should be—the subject of debate.

During the century and a half that the Cuban problem has been with us, politicians have made violent speeches, introduced michievous resolutions and harried the State Department without mercy. Usually these activities do little harm, and occassionally they do some good. But at tense moments, they gravely imperil constructive action by stimulating public feeling to a fever pitch.

Some Secretaries of State have played politics with diplomacy. Daniel Webster's response to Austria on the subject of Hungary was more like a Fourth of July oration than a state paper. Olney's blatant claim that we ruled the hemisphere made people happy for a moment, but brought on a sharp reaction abroad.

It should be clear, for all these reasons, that there is no miracle tablet that can cure our frustration. The trouble is more like arthritis, painful and occasionally crippling, but which men have to learn to live with, easing the pain as best they can while searching for a long-awaited cure.

We must remember, moreover, that all the great powers, including the Soviets, have their acute frustrations. For a hundred years, from the Congress of Vienna to World War I, the great powers ruled the world. Only acts of folly produced that war. Even then, if they had made a sensible peace, they could have led the world.

Instead, every one of them compounded earlier folly and brought on World War II, and ahe victors in that one never could agree on a peace. The result is that for all their power, their authority is gone.

The great Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset described the consequences: "Every tupenny ha'penny nation starts skipping, gesticulating, standing on its head, or else struts around giving itself airs of a grownup person who is ruler of his destinies." Even the smallest and weakest can play one great power against another, demand aid and fritter it away in all sorts of excesses.

When President Kennedy said that the Cuban problem must be dealt with as part of the larger worldwide issue, it was his most important, and least noticed, comment. Until the great powers exhibit greatness in wisdom equal to their military might, this charade—and the acute frustration it involves—will remain with us.

Kennedy's Fateful Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about the ill-fated Cuban invasion of April 1961. One of the most comprehensive articles I have read on the subject is one which appeared in the September 17, 1962, issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled: "Kennedy's Fateful Decision: The Night the Reds Clinched Cuba."

It reads as follows:

KENNEDY'S FATEFUL DECISION: THE NIGHT THE REDS CLINCHED CUBA

Look at Castro's Cuba now: a Communist base. To see how it got that way: Look back to 1961—to an invasion that failed and left Castro even stronger than before. The story of that invasion, as revealed by insiders, shows the far-reaching effect of a President's decision.

A fateful decision, made by President Kennedy on Sunday, April 16, 1961, is rising now to plague the United States.

On that Sunday evening, an armed force of Cuban refugees, trained by the United States, was at sea, sailing secretly to invade Fidel Castro's Cuba. The American President, a few hours earlier, had given final approval to that invasion.

Only the day before, on April 15, a surprise attack by B-26 bombing planes belonging to the invaders had knocked out all but seven planes of Castro's tiny air force.

A second air strike was scheduled for Monday morning, April 17. It was to coincide with the landing of the invaders. It was supposed to finish the job of wiping out Castro's planes and to provide air support for the invasion.

Secure in this assurance of air support, the invaders went ashore in the early-morning darkness of Monday, April 17. Their landing was successful: 1,400 armed men reached the beaches of a place called the Bay of Pigs.

In the battle that followed, Castro's troops suffered heavy casualties. Castro's tanks, coming up to the battle, were sitting ducks for an attack by air. Confidently, the little invading force waited for its air support to arrive. Its leaders had assurance of that support. It was provided in the pre-invasion planning.

Hours before, on Sunday evening, a small but potent force of B-26's was sitting in readiness on an airfield 500 miles away, waiting to take off for the Bay of Pigs. Those were planes of the invasion force, with Cuban pilots.

But those planes didn't take off.

The reason: President Kennedy forbade their use.

That was the fateful decision President Kennedy made on that Sunday evening. He decided that the anti-Castro Cubans could not have the support of their own air force during the invasion. Without that support, the invasion failed.

When the invasion began, in the predawn hours of Monday, the need for air support became apparent. Worried, the nonmilitary officials in Washington who were running the invasion went to President Kennedy for a new decision. They suggested that U.S. Navy planes from a U.S. aircraft carrier be used to fly air support for the invaders.

Two U.S. carriers, their decks loaded with fighting planes, were standing by not far away throughout the entire invasion. Their planes were readily available.

In the planning of the invasion—planning begun under the Eisenhower administration—the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff had recommended the use of U.S. air support. President Kennedy vetoed the idea. He insisted that there was to be no direct American participation. Now, with the outcome possibly hanging in the balance, military and nonmilitary men joined in renewing the plea.

ANOTHER "NO"

Once again, in the early morning hours of Monday, April 17, President Kennedy made a fateful decision. He said "No" to the use of U.S. planes.

On the beaches, in the Bay of Pigs, the invaders fought on. They did not know that an American President in Washington, 1,400 miles away, was in tight control of their every military move. They were not aware that President Kennedy had taken away their air cover.

With no air support, the invasion soon began to run into trouble. Castro brought up the few planes he had left. Castro jets—made in America—bombed and sank two of the five ships of the invasion fleet. One carried most of the invaders' reserves of ammunition. The other was their communications center. Castro tanks, safe from attack by air, moved into effective action.

In the face of this situation, President Kennedy took the wraps off the Cuban fliers. On Monday noon he said they could go into action. But bad weather interfered at first. Finally, an air strike was set up for early Wednesday.

On Tuesday, however, the situation continued to deteriorate. The invaders, fighting without air support, were driven back under pressure of Castro's superior numbers.

By Tuesday night, April 18, a crisis was clearly at hand. Once again there was an appeal to President Kennedy.

On this night the President, in white tie and tails, was playing host at a congressional reception in the White House. He left the party to confer with his advisers—both

civilian and military. Again it was proposed to use U.S. planes to save the invasion.

This time the President relented slightly. He consented to using one carrier's planes for just one hour on Wednesday morning—just long enough to provide cover for the invaders to land some supplies and for their planes to make a quick strike. U.S. planes, still, were not to attack land targets.

Even this limited plan for U.S. aid went awry. There were communications mixups. The Cuban fliers mistimed their strike. The U.S. planes never got into action. And anyway, it developed, it was too late.

By sundown of Wednesday, April 19, the invasion was a failure. The invaders inflicted close to 2,000 casualties on Castro's forces, suffered only a hundred or so casualties of their own. But without air support, the invaders could not hold out. Most of them wound up as Castro captives.

American military officials who followed this operation closely say that it came within a hair's breath of success. They say: Given early air support, the invaders could have destroyed Castro's air force and tanks. Defections from his militia, which had started, would have spread. Underground forces, waiting for word of success before rising against Castro, would have sprung into action. When that word did not come, they remained under ground.

It was in the White House that the decision was made that guided the course of that unsuccessful invasion.

Out of that fateful decision of the President have flowed many of today's problems. Soviet Russia today is entrenched in Cuba, a few miles from continental United States. Some Members of Congress charge that the Monroe Doctrine which guided U.S. policy in Latin America for 139 years, is now, in effect, being turned into a scrap of paper. With a base in Cuba, Communist forces are penetrating deeply into the Western Hemisphere building up their base for more takeovers.

What lay back of that fateful Kennedy decision?

The record suggests: An important factor was a fear of offending public opinion in Latin America and in the so-called "new nations" of the United Nations.

Throughout the discussions of invasion policy, the idea was put forward repeatedly that the United States must not place itself in the position of using force against a smaller neighbor. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, strongly backed President Kennedy in his decisions.

WHAT MILITARY RECOMMENDED

The U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Nation's top military experts, had no part in the actual military operations. Those military leaders had recommended early that, to insure success, some U.S. Armed Forces should take part in any invasion, and that air cover and support should be supplied by the United States.

The recommendations of the military leaders were rejected. It was the Central Intelligence Agency and the White House that finally ran the show and fixed the terms on which the anti-Castro Cubans could fight.

The fateful decision was a political decision—not a military decision.

One civilian official who was close to the whole invasion operation now makes this judgment:

"In retrospect, the political decision was wrong."

A military man, also close to the operation, said this:

"If you go back to that time and look at the whole problem, you find that this country faced one fundamental question: Can we permit a Communist country in this Western Hemisphere? Now, if the answer is 'yes,' then you do one thing. If the answer is 'no,' you do another.

"But if you weasel on that answer, start compromising, then you wind up in confusion—with no real answer. One thing we should have learned from this Cuban fiasco is this: You can't run a military operation that way."

A Tribute to a Colleague, William J. Green, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during my 4 years in Congress, it has been my great pleasure to meet many dedicated men who, like myself, work tirelessly in the best interests of their districts.

I have found that the Members of this Congress make up a thorough cross section of the American people; and as I sit here in this Chamber listening to the various viewpoints, the various philosophies, the varous attitudes, I cannot help but feel that this great body is like a huge mirror which reflects the many aspects of America's people.

During these past 4 years it has been my privilege to work very closely with many Members, and among them, Congressman WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., who represents the Fifth Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

Throughout the years, many of my friends who reside in his district have told me of the great respect they have for Congressman GREEN. His activities have been particularly singled out by the many Polish-American organizations in his district with whom I have worked very closely at various national conventions.

I was happy to learn that because of their deep satisfaction and sense of gratitude, many of these Polish-American organizations, principally those in the northeast section of Philadelphia, have organized committees in Congressman GREEN'S behalf. This is understandable.

BILL GREEN is more than just their Representative in Congress. For the past 10 years, he, as chairman of the Philadelphia County Democratic Committee, has guided the destinies of his city-county party. In so doing, he has never failed to recognize the active participation of Polish-American citizens in party affairs and their dedicated efforts in helping to achieve the stature and successes of the Democratic Party over the past several decades.

Having spent his entire life in the northeast section of Philadelphia, BILL GREEN knows the Polish people. He speaks their language, and he has a full and compassionate understanding of their special problems. He is well aware of the aims and purposes of their many fine organizations in his city and State and has consistently cooperated in these efforts.

This cooperation has not been limited to his material efforts in the Congress to consistently support legislation in which the Polish-American citizens have expressed their individual interest. He has been an effective arm in consistently supporting national legislation for foreign aid, including Poland; assisting refugees from foreign domination; strengthening the United Nations; in addition to the many economic and welfare programs that have proven beneficial to many of our Polish-American citizens residing in metropolitan cities.

He has always been available for assistance in the many special problems that arise in connection with organizations such as the Polish American Congress, comprising 120-member groups; the Polish American Citizens League, comprising about 70-member groups; the Polish National Alliance; the Polish American Clubs; and the numerous individual Polish American veterans, fraternal, civic, and cultural groups in both city and State. He has long recognized that agreement and unity in nationality groups are the foundation for success in achieving the aspirations and the purposes to which these groups have dedicated themselves.

As Congressman and chairman, his intimate life association with my people has long aroused his deep appreciation of their many fine qualities in the practices of good citizenship, civic pride, loyalty and integrity, and mutually dedicated efforts in assisting their fellow man. This high regard has not lost sight of their many contributions to the advancement of this great Nation from the days of Pulaski to the present generations.

In recognition of these factors, BILL GREEN has consistently and fairly recommended qualified Polish American men and women for positions of responsibility in local, State, and Federal Governments. In positions of trust their exceptional qualifications not only enable them to materially assist their particular groups but further enhance and promote the welfare of the general public they serve.

As an illustration, let me quote an extract from a recent letter received by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman GREEN, from the Polish American Citizens League of Pennsylvania:

Your nomination of Polish attorney Stanley Jakubowski for a Federal judgeship in the U.S. District Court for the Eeastern District of Pennsylvania is warmly applauded. In addition, your influence resulted in the appointment of Theodore S. Gutowicz as commissioner of insurance for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We, and all the citizens of Notheast Philadelphia, appreciate your efforts in securing a sizable congressional appropriation of funds for the Nazareth Hospital under the Hill-Burton Act.

To mention just a few more among hundreds of persons of Polish ancestry recommended and supported by Bill Green for high positions in public service are: Walter S. Pytko, former State senator, managing director, Philadelphia Housing Authority, and now candidate for councilman-at-large; State Senator Peter J. Camiel; Matthew Zagorski, Philadelphia magistrate; Anthony J. Sadowski, deputy county commissioner; Leo J. Kolankiewicz, member of the Phila-

delphia City Council; Joseph Huntowski, State auditor general's office; Dr. Matthew J. Gutowicz, secretary, Pennsylvania State Board of Chiropody; Harvey Szweda, State board of undertakers; Edmund Pawelec, assistant district attorney of Philadelphia, Michael Sura, Superintendent of the Mint, Philadelphia.

If time and space permitted, I could continue at great length with a listing but conclude by adding that the secretary of the mayor of Philadelphia is a young lady of Polish ancestry, Miss Jean Krypel.

It is, therefore, no surprise that the Polish community in Philadelphia will culminate their activities with a huge testimonial gathering to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman GREEN, to honor the many years of distinguished service this able legislator has rendered to his home district, city, State, and the Nation.

My personal association with BILL GREEN in Congress has given me a deep insight to his abiding respect and high regard for the people of Polish ancestry—my people. He richly deserves the full measure of their support.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committeemen Deserve a Vote of Thanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. ABBITT. Mr Speaker, our agricultural abundance has caused many problems in the past several years for farmers, the Congress, and others interested in this most important segment of our overall economy.

There are today several congressionally enacted programs dealing with our agricultural production and conservation of our natural resources. Responsibility for many of these programs is under the general direction of farmer-elected ASC committeemen. These committeemen have a major responsibility for seeing that farmers and others are informed about the agricultural programs that are available and the eligibility requirements to participate in these programs.

The ASC committeemen are key people in seeing the programs involving millions of farmers and billions of dollars are carried out fairly and in accordance with official regulations. The committee's policies and decisions greatly determine the course of action taken by the county office manager and clerks in the ASC county office.

It is essential that correct information be given farmers regarding programs for cotton, tobacco, rice, peanuts, wool, the agricultural conservation program, and all the other programs including the wheat and feed grain programs which we enacted in 1961 and again in 1962. Furnishing correct information, establishing policies and making decisions in connection with these programs is a tremendous responsibility for ASC committees.

The tremendous success of the programs speaks adequately for the way in which committeemen have met their responsibility. I have no doubt but that the same fine dedicated service will be rendered by farmer-elected committeemen in future years. I feel we owe the ASC committees a vote of thanks. This is one way we can let them know they are fully apreciated.

Prices and the Marketplace—Our Secret Economic Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Allen Wallis, president of the University of Rochester and a man well known to many of us in Washington, recently addressed a meeting of the Tax Foundation, Inc., in Pittsburgh. His remarks were reproduced in part by the foundation's August 1962 "Tax Review" and I believe they offer a very sound commentary on the role of the pricing system in the free enterprise marketplace—a system which gives our economy a strength and guidance which cannot be equaled by authoritarian economic systems, despite their ability to gain temporary advantages in limited areas and for limited times. I think Wallis' words bear hearing and discussion, for an understanding of the fundamental truth which they reveal about our free enterprise system is essential if we are to move ahead and make the kind of progress which our economy is capable of making. For this reason, I am placing this statement, as published by the Tax Foundation, in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Tax Review, Aug. 1962]

OUR SECRET ECONOMIC WEAPON: THE PRICE SYSTEM

(By W. Allen Wallis, president, University of Rochester)

The unhappy episode of the rise and fall of the price of steel in early April did not go entirely unnoticed, even outside Pittsburgh. Nor has it been entirely forgotten. But what was noticed at the time was trivial compared with what was not noticed. And what the incident is remembered for today is minor compared with its major permanent effects.

To be specific: At the time, in early April, what was noticed was that the price of steel stayed down. What was far more important was that our whole economic system sometimes described as a price system, sometimes as a system of free market, was shaken.

What the episode is remembered for now is the stock market crash. But a far more serious effect was that our whole governmental system, sometimes described as a system of individual civil liberties, sometimes as a rule of law, was shaken.

First, consider the short-lived increase in steel prices. To an economist like myself, outside the steel industry, this increase did not make sense. I'm not questioning whether the steel industry needed a price increase. What I question is whether market conditions at the time would have supported a price increase. In point of fact, steel was not bringing even the full prices already in the official lists at that time, and the industry was operating well below capacity. Under such circumstances, it just doesn't seem reasonable to think you can get a higher price than the one you are already failing to get. The electric refrigerator industry learned that lesson last spring. Like steel, it announced higher prices, only to have to cut them back.

Furthermore, when costs and market conditions do support price rises, they are not likely to support uniform percentage increases for all products.

Finally, an industry that has been described as "a lightning rod for the wrath of all recent Presidents" would seem well advised to achieve a higher average price by lowering some prices while raising others, in such a way as to provide the White House both with bewilderment and with possibilities for face-saving.

My own opinion is that administration actions had nothing to do with the failure of the price rise to stick. That resulted from weak market conditions, just as in the case of refrigerators. If the President had said to the steel industry, "Congratulations, gentlemen, you need the increase if you are going to play your part in the growth of our economy," or if he had said, "This price increase is due to the wage increase negotiated by Richard Nixon, but no price increase will be necessary when the Goldberg wage increase goes into effect next July," I think that steel prices would still be no higher today than they actually are. I am talking, of course, not about published list prices, but about actual transactions, taking account of extras, quality, delivery, the cash actually paid, and the speed of payment.

So I think the price increase was a mistake. But—and this is the important point—it really doesn't matter whether I (or anybody else) is right that the increase was a mistake. If it was a mistake, it was harmless because it would not have caused inflation, which is a term that refers to a rise in the average level of all prices, not just to a rise in some one price. The notion that when steel prices change all other prices change proportionately is just poppycock.

It was harmless also in a more important way, namely, that if it was a mistake it was a self-correcting mistake. Another piece of poppycock is the notion that the steel industry is characterized by enough collusion and monopoly power to enforce a price rise that the market won't sustain.

That is my first point then: that the real reason why the price of steel returned to its previous level, and in some instances even fell below it, is to be found in market conditions, not in the words and acts of the administration.

Nevertheless, the administration's actions were a blow at the foundations of our economic system because those actions were an overt, explicit move toward the further regulation of individual prices by the Federal Government.

The Federal Government has a right and a duty to control the general level of prices—in other words, to prevent inflation and deflation. That is the duty of the Federal Reserve Board through its control of the quantity of money, and of the Congress through its control of government deficits.

But the Government has an equal duty to see that individual prices remain free and flexible. Our system of market prices is the very heart and secret of our economic strength.

EXCEL IN ABILITY TO DECIDE

It is probably true that the Russian economy can do anything we can do, and even do it better. I mean that they can do any specific thing better, not everything simultaneously. For example, they could unquestionably build a bigger, better supermarket than any now in the United States, or a bigger and more automated bank. All they have to do is take a few dozen top scientists and engineers off their space programs and put them to work on a supermarket or on a bank.

But a far more important capacity, and one in which we excel them by far, is the ability to decide properly whether to build a supermarket and how super to make it, or whether to automate a bank and how automatic to make it.

Consider the problem of distributing food to the residents of a certain area. Is it more efficient to have one supermarket or a dozen "Pa-and-Ma" type stores? The supermarket will involve a good structure, lots of capital equipment, and fairly high quality labor. It will need land for parking. People will come to it from considerable distances in their cars.

The "Pa and Ma" type stores can be in half-basements using little capital and the labor of retired people. Customers will come only from short distances and on foot.

Which is the more efficient way of distributing food? Obviously, that depends on literally thousands of details. For example, it may be that some elderly couples who could do nothing else productive could run small grocery stores. If so, the supermarket has to be enough more efficient to offset total loss of the labor of the elderly couples. On the other hand, the type of employee who works in a supermarket may have many other opportunities that are just as productive. In that case, the "Pa and Ma" type store needs only a small margin of efficiency to dominate.

Again, the small stores can perhaps be tucked into space that has little if any alternative use, whereas the supermarket requires land and good buildings that might be more valuable if used for other purposes. The comparison requires knowing what else could be done with the land and buildings and being able to evaluate the other uses accurately.

Another range of complications arises because not only do the two kinds of stores use up different kinds of resources, whose values must be compared, but they render different kinds of services.

For each kind of store the total value to all the customers must be compared with the total cost. Only then can the two kinds of stores be compared, and the decision made that is best for the country.

Decisions like that must be made millions of times every year. The overall efficiency of the economy and our rate of economic growth are greatly affected by the accuracy and promptness of these millions of individual decisions.

The Russian economy, like all collectivist economies, makes these decisions poorly. But everyone understands the machinery by which the decisions are made. It is an administrative machinery, based on handing down orders from above.

Premier Khrushchev indicated the magnitude of the problem by presenting the following data: As of January 1, there were many millions of square feet of completed factory space that could not be used because the machinery required for those factories was not available. At the same time in other parts of the country there were hundreds of millions of dollars worth of machinery of various kinds standing idle because the factories, mines, and other installations for which this machinery was designed were not yet ready.

The American economy makes these decisions well, but the method of making them is seldom understood and is widely misunderstood. We make them through the price system. The price system, in fact, may be called our secret economic weapon.

In our economy, prices are the messages that tell people what ought to be done. If the price of something is high, that is a message to producers to try to produce more and to consumers to try to use less. How high the price is tells how hard to try. The prices of raw materials, labor, land, and equipment are the messages that tell how things should be produced, for these prices reflect the amounts of the inputs available and the importance of the alternative uses for them.

Prices are self-enforcing messages. A producer who does not produce what is wanted, or produces it inefficiently, or does not adjust to change, soon finds that he is not taking in enough money to continue to buy his inputs. He is forced to stop wasting our resources. He is stopped just as forcefully as if he had received a cease-and-desist order from a Federal bureau of efficiency—indeed, more forcefully, for his Congressman or his trade association might have more influence with the bureau than with his bank.

The price system functions efficiently only insofar as the prices are free and voluntary. If the prices are set other than through free markets, either because of private monopoly or Government intervention, the overall efficiency of the economy is reduced.

The threat of direct price control made explicit by the President's handling of the steel situation, and more recently by the Solicitor General's speech at Harvard, and earlier by bills introduced in Congress as early as 1959, is a very direct threat to hobble and eventually cripple our economy. Not only the administration but the public also are alarmingly willing to move toward direct price controls, at least if the Gallup poll is any criterion. The June 8 poll reported that, of the 86 percent of voters who have an opinion about whether prices and wages ought to be frozen, 47 percent are in favor and only 53 percent opposed.

PROSPECTS OF INFLATION GREATER

So my second point is that the major economic consequence of the steel episode was not the effect on the steel industry; it was to jeopardize the central source of our economic strength.

As to my third point, the relation of the steel episode to the stock market, let me say first that the only thing I really know for sure about the cause of the crash is that nobody knows the cause, including me. (If anyone tells you he knows, ask him whether he sold short last winter.)

We can discard the idea that the collapse resulted from diminishing fears of inflation. For one thing, there has been very little, if any, inflation in the United States in the past 10 years. For another thing, the prospects of inflation within a couple of years are greater now than at any time in a long while.

We have to admit, also, that the market may simply be foreshadowing a recession; it has foreshadowed all postwar recessions, though recessions have not followed all of the market's drops.

But we have to consider—and I myself think this is an important factor—that the basic threat to our economic progress that results from the likelihood of direct price and wage controls may have been a major cause. Furthermore, my fourth point, the threat to our system of government, may be the most important cause of all.

To bring out my fourth point, let me contrast the actions of Presidents Truman and Kennedy when they got mad at steel. President Truman took certain actions to control the steel industry in ways to which it objected. The industry thereupon resorted to the courts. The Supreme Court ruled that the President did not lawfully have the power he had tried to exercise, but that is irrelevant; the important point is that the courts could be appealed to by those who felt that their rights were violated.

President Kennedy, on the other hand, used powers which are perfectly legal, but he used them to achieve purposes that are entirely outside the law. Since the powers he used, such as investigating individual income tax returns, are perfectly legal, redress through the courts is probably impossible and certainly improbable.

Charles Reich of the Yale Law School wrote in the New Republic of April 30: "Each of the powers the President used was a legitimate one, and nothing he did was beyond his lawful authority. That is not the issue. The issue is whether the President made proper and responsible use of his powers. The evidence is overwhelming that the actions taken or inspired by the President were primarily for the purpose of intimidating and coercing the steel industry. The previous indulgence of steel industry practices, the use of so many drastic powers in concert, and the willingness to relent after the surrender all confirm this.

"Such use of power, whether its objectives are good or bad, is dangerous. Income tax investigations are legitimate, but should they be undertaken specially, with dramatic fanfare, to frighten someone who opposes administration policies? Should a man's passport application be delayed if he does not fall into line on some economic issue? Should the goodwill of a business be destroyed by official denunciation if it proves stubborn in collective bargaining? The very immensity of Government power demands, on the contrary, that it be used in a disinterested manner, and only for the exact purposes intended. Any other use gives a President the ability to force people to do things which under the law he has no right to require. It means that people offend the President at their peril.

"The spirit of our Constitution is the spirit of limitation on all powers, of disinterested enforcement of the laws, of equal protection, of due process. It was dangerously wrong for an angry President to loose his terrible arsenal of power for the purpose of intimidating and coercing private companies and citizens.

"The President has no right to force his economic policies on an unwilling industry without legislation. Unless Congress acts, the fact is that in a free society there can be no unitary public interest, no single, authoritatively fixed idea of 'the public good.' Freedom has little meaning if it only allows action that responsibly conforms to the President's idea of the national interest.

"Even if everything that has just been said about President Kennedy's methods and objectives is wrong, his victory is still disquieting. It demonstrates how much power Government has today. Such power, no matter how wisely exercised, is hardly less frightening because the victim forced to surrender was a group of corporate giants and not a small business or a private citizen.

"Much of what Mr. Kennedy accomplished by pressure of Government power he will hereafter be able to command by the subtlest suggestion * * * President Kennedy's victory may have advanced peace and plenty, but it did no service to freedom."

So my fourth and final point is this: Far and away the most important and most distressing aspect of the steel eposide was not the effect on the steel industry, nor the effect on the stock market, nor even the threat to our economic system, but the fact that it represented a long step toward authoritarianism. The very root and essence of authoritarianism is the idea that a Cen-

tral Government has the authority to determine what is in the national interest, and to pursue that interest as defined by itself through any and all means.

But there is a silver lining. A long step was taken toward authoritarianism, yes; but it leaves a considerable distance yet to be traversed. Second, it was not a step from which there is no turning back. I am inclined to believe that it was an inadvertent step, an amateurish step, into which the administration felt almost pushed as an unforseen consequence of earlier steps taken, when they rather naively assumed responsibility for labor negotiations, guidelines on wage settlements, and avoiding strikes.

The job before us then, is to make sure that the turning back occurs. That requires a fuller understanding, by the administration and by the public, of the processes of a free economy, and of the long-run evils of many short-run benefits. Economic education is a difficult challenge but not an insuperable one. I, for one, retain some hope.

A Village Shows Its Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I think most of us have had unpleasant experiences when accident or disaster overtook us far from home, when we were lost and surrounded by strangers, and did not know where to turn for help. Such a predicament came to a couple from Maryland recently, and I would like to take advantage of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to tell the people of America a wonderful story of how a gang of people on eastern Long Island joined together to help a couple of strangers from my own State. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the people of eastern Long Island and their Congressman OTIS G. PIKE, for proving once again that the age-old spirit of the good Samaritan still lives today.

Mr. and Mrs. Delano Smith, of College Park, Md., had long dreamed of owning a big sailboat. In September of this year their dream came true. It was a 56-foot yawl, Cessone by name, far from new, but dear enough to them for them to have spent all of their savings from Smith's salary as an employee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to make it their own.

On Monday, September 17, the Smiths set sail from Essex, Conn., to bring their lovely prize back to Maryland. They were broke but happy. They had sailed across Long Island Sound, around Montauk Point, and were in the Atlantic Ocean off the south shore of Long Island when disaster struck. A boom let go, the engine quit, and a strong southerly wind ran the boat hard on shore. Their ship was high and dry; they were broke; they did not know a soul; and they did not know where to turn for help. Let Newsday, Suffolk County's largest daily, tell the rest of the story:

A VILLAGE SHOWS ITS HEART
(By William Spiegler)

SOUTHAMPTON.—If you're going to be shipwrecked, Southamption is the place to be washed ashore—the natives are wonderful.

Their generosity, hard work and political know-how over the weekend restored the dashed hopes and dreams of Delano Smith, 29, a U.S. Agriculture Department worker from Maryland who most of last week stood on the beach, forlornly watching the sand bury his beached 56-foot yawl. He had used all his savings to buy the 57-year-old vessel only a few days before for $5,500, and didn't have the money to get the boat put back in the sea.

The Coast Guard had made several unsuccessful attempts to free the boat, the *Cessone*, then declared it "salvage" and said it could do no more unless the boat was floated into open water. But on Friday, as the story of Smith's plight circulated through the community, things began to happen. Villagers swiftly raised $1,000, two cranes and three bulldozers appeared on the scene and one man telephoned Representative OTIS G. PIKE, Democrat, of New York, to see whether he could get the Coast Guard to renew its aid.

PIKE, upon hearing of Smith's problem, phoned the New York regional office of the Coast Guard Saturday and made a plea that it send a boat to try for one more day to dislodge the *Cessone*. By noon, two Coast Guard boats were standing offshore. One of them tried to tow the *Cessone* free, but to no avail. Scores of men, using the cranes and bulldozers, loosened the sand around the *Cessone*. Still it remained stuck. Finally, at 5 p.m., the *Cessone* was tied to lines from both Coast Guard boats—despite the possibility that a double yank might wreck the vessel.

The mighty pull of the two Coast Guard boats did the trick. As the *Cessone* floated free, basically undamaged, the crowd on the beach cheered lustily. The Coast Guard towed the *Cessone* to Montauk Point. Today, it was to be hauled behind a fishing boat to drydock at Greenport, for a check and minor repairs.

"I wouldn't have believed it possible," Smith said last night. "I was a total stranger. But I've been taken into homes, given food and clothing. It's overwhelming."

Southampton residents modestly think their efforts were pretty swell, too. "It's something peculiar to small towns, I guess," is the way Mayor Edward Brennan explained the outpouring of aid. No one would take responsibility for organizing the campaign. "It wasn't a committee, it was a gang," Brennan said.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to the gentleman from New York, Congressman PIKE, about this. He has modestly disclaimed all credit. He says he had a telephone conversation with a man named Charles Hall, of Bridgehampton, and a couple of telephone conversations with the Coast Guard.

Whether it was the Coast Guard, the gentleman from New York, Congressman PIKE, or, as Mayor Brennan put it, "a gang" of people, it was a great humanitarian undertaking, and I only hope that if any eastern Long Islanders ever get in trouble in Maryland, they have the good fortune to fall in with a gang like that.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Bottum, Joe H., *S. Dak*
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind* — The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex* — 2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Engle, Clair, *Calif*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Goldwater, Barry, *Ariz*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hickey, J. J., *Wyo* — Room 1251, New Senate Ofc. Bldg.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N.Y* — 1233 31st St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn* — 4929 Hillbrook La.
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 7426 Hampden La., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, Maurice J., Jr., *N.H.*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Benjamin A., *Mass*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis* — 2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Kerr (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Wiley, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case, Hickenlooper, and Capehart.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan of North Carolina, Young of Ohio, Hart, McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Cooper, and Boggs.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Humphrey, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and Javits.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Bush, Beall, Goldwater, and Case.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Tower, and Murphy.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Butler, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Keating, and Prouty.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Hartke, Smith of Massachusetts, Beall, Prouty, and Miller.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Jackson, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Burdick, Metcalf, Hickey, Kuchel, Allott, Miller, Pearson, Bottum, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, Fong, and Scott.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Burdick, Smith of Massachusetts, Pell, Goldwater, Javits, Prouty, Tower, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan of North Carolina, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Smith of Massachusetts, Metcalf, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Miller, Murphy, and Pearson.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Mansfield (chairman), Hayden, Jordan of North Carolina, Cannon, Hickey, Pell, Curtis, Dirksen, and Bottum.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice ———. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Crime by Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as the Senate considers legislation relating to our postal services, I believe it pertinent to call attention to the attempted efforts to cheat unsuspecting folks out of money by use of the mails.

The Congress, I believe, should well consider not only stricter enforcement of existing laws, but further examination of the situation to see whether or not new laws are necessary to prevent this preying upon the public.

Recenlty, the Green Bay Press-Gazette published an article by J. W. Davis entitled "Mail Crooks Prey on Unfortunate—Schemes Exposed."

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette, Sept. 16, 1962]

MAIL CROOKS PREY ON UNFORTUNATE—SCHEMES EXPOSED

(By J. W. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—Some mail fraud crooks are vicious in small ways. They'd cheat a crippled shutin or a poor widow.

Some are extortionists who would even fake a nude photograph to make it appear that a young woman posed obscenely.

Some of the cheat-by-mail promoters are big operators, out to defraud ordinarily hardheaded businessmen.

"The variety of mail fraud promotions is without limit," says Henry B. Montague, Chief Postal Inspector.

"Persons in all walks of life are potential victims."

The number, as well as the variety, of frauds has reached new peaks. So have convictions, engineered by Montague's inspectors with help from the Justice Department's Criminal Division and U.S. attorneys across the country.

MANY SENT TO JAIL

In the last fiscal year there were 524 convictions for mail fraud, a record. Jail sentences of varying length and fines totaling $347,000 were imposed in these cases. Investigations also resulted in the restitution of $1,414,000 to victims.

Montague, 50, a quiet but authoritative sort of man who began his career as a postal clerk in Poughkeepsie, N.Y., talked to a reporter about new and old trends in mail fraud.

Take first the advance fee racket under which, Montague said, millions of dollars have been fleeced from businessmen. It is new, at least in its widespread scope.

Montague pulled out one of his official reports to explain how it works:

"Criminals operating across State lines attempt to induce the owners of small businesses to sell their businesses or real estate or to secure business loans.

"The victim is required to pay an advance fee as evidence of good faith. Oral assurances are given that the fee would be returned if the desired services are not rendered.

"The signed contract, however, reveals in the fine print that the only services provided by the promoter are to bring the victim's needs to the attention of various institutions."

EIGHT THOUSAND BUSINESSMEN BILKED BY ONE FIRM

North American Associates, Inc., in Denver, he figured, collected more than $2 million from 8,000 businessmen this way.

Another scheme that has slipped into widespread operation lately is based on imitating, very closely and very crookedly, the names of reputable business firms.

A crook adopts a firm name resembling that of a well-known company. Sometimes he spells it just a little differently; sometimes he simply uses "Corp." in the title, instead of the usual "Co."

Then he orders merchandise on credit from wholesale houses or elsewhere. Clerks in the supplying firms are deceived by the name on the letterhead or order form and ship out the goods without any question. The crook sells the merchandise in a hurry and then disappears.

To possible future targets of these schemes, Montague suggests:

"Have some knowledge of the people you are doing business with."

It's as simple as that.

Persistent mail fraud schemes that Montague and his men run up against are fake charities, insurance rackets, home repair schemes, real estate promotions, vending and knitting machine swindles, work-at-home schemes of various types and medical cure-alls including fake cures for cancer, tuberculosis, and arthritis.

Postmaster General E. Edward Day has this to say: "Thousands of sharpies annually pry hundreds of millions of dollars out of a guilible and unsuspecting American public through worthless get-well-quick schemes."

In one Louisiana operation called the Scientific Life X-Ray Service, the public paid an estimated $25,000 for voodoo powders and oils. Postal inspectors had trouble lining up witnesses since victims believed the promoter would hex them if they testified.

The following, picked at random from the inspection service's files, demonstrate the variety of cases that pop up from day to day:

Shut-in victims: Work-at-home shutins were the particular target of one Long Beach, Calif., promoter who had a scheme he advertised as paying up to $162 a week for addressing envelopes. Victims sent $10 each—in some cases $16—"and received several pages of instructions without value." The promoter got 3 years in prison.

Mail order deal: At San Bruno, Calif., one Alfred Joseph Crowe was convicted of inducing 53 victims to give him $41,000 for contracts to start their own mail order businesses. The victims were promised fabulous profits, if they would invest $550 to $1,200, but none of them "made enough to pay the the postage on the material they mailed," the postal service said. Crowe got 2 years.

Lonely hearts: From Boyerton, Pa., a man and woman who operated a lonely hearts club corresponded with persons in 25 States and by means of false pretenses and misrepresentations, including promises of marriage, obtained a total of $2,500. Each also obtained a 2-year prison term.

Big joiner: In Philadelphia, one man joined record and book clubs in a wholesale way, using fictitious names, and obtaining merchandise valued at $5,300 without payment. "On occasion," it was reported, "there were so many packages for delivery to the residence that the mail carrier was unable to carry them."

Beauty treatment: At Las Vegas, Nev., a self-styled beauty scientist was arrested on charges of peddling an allegedly dangerous facial rejuvenation treatment. Postal inspectors estimated that approximately $1 million was paid by 500 subscribers to her treatment. Some of them filed disfigurement suits which resulted in judgment awards of $186,000. The "scientist" was released on $5,000 bond.

Tax refunds: In Rochester, N.Y., postal inspectors, Secret Service agents and Internal Revenue agents swooped down on a man accused of filing false income tax refund claims under assumed names. They said he admitted obtaining $20,000 in refunds. He is now out on bond.

Sex pill: In less than a year, Irving Greene, of Jersey City, N.J., took in an estimated $120,000 from the sale of Tigron, described by inspectors as a worthless sex rejuvenator pill. He was given a suspended sentence and fined $750.

Knitting and sewing machine promotions: Thousands of housewives have been victimized by promoters of this scheme who induce them to purchase machines at exorbitant prices ranging up to $500 upon representations that they could supplement their incomes while working at home through the sale of garments.

"The promoters promise to purchase the garments at a substantial profit. Many victims execute chattel mortgages to pay for the machines and lose their household possessions when the expected income does not materialize."

(The knit machine scheme occurred in the Green Bay area several years ago. It followed essentially the outline given by Montague. Several indictments against operators of the organization selling the machines were returned in Milwaukee Federal court, and civil suits were started in Brown County courts to recover the purchasers' costs.)

"The old 'Spanish prisoner' swindle still pops up about every 18 months," Montague said.

In this hardly changed version a fraud that goes back 300 years or more, air mail letters go out from some city in Mexico or elsewhere in Latin America (they used to originate in Spain) to a select list of dentists, physicians, or lawyers, or the like, in the United States. The promoters want professional people who might be expected to have money.

CLAIMS VALUABLES HIDDEN

The signer represents himself as an exbanker, who has been unjustly jailed. He writes that before he was arrested he hid away a trunk full of valuables; $300,000 is the usual valuation.

Help him bribe his way out of prison, the writer says, and he'll split the contents of the trunk with you—just send the bribe money fast. It seems next to impossible that anyone would fall for this, but the very

fact that the scheme persists would indicate it still pays off.

Montague has a special contempt for those who practice the old mail-after-death scheme. These operators watch for death announcements and then quickly send out COD packages, addressed to the deceased.

Sorrowful survivors—perhaps a widow, son, or daughter—will often reason that "this is one of the last things he wanted, and we will pay for it."

Who Deprives You of Your Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, with all the constant talk we hear, particularly in Congress, of our rights, it is well to be reminded of the fact that every right carries with it a reciprocal duty.

I am happy to call the attention of our colleagues to the following statement issued by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America as the Jews of the world approach the beginning of their New Year, Rosh Hashanah. I believe this statement is very meaningful to all people, regardless of their religious persuasion. It is basic to all monotheistic religions.

I also wish to take this time to extend to all of our colleagues my very best wishes for health and happiness in the years ahead, and for a recess that I hope we can soon take, during which they can first make an appropriate accounting to their constituents for their service here, then have a well deserved rest, so that they may continue to serve their people and our Nation with renewed vigor.

The statement is as follows:

WHO DEPRIVES YOU OF YOUR RIGHTS

You have the right to think and speak your mind, the right to have a family, the right to choose where to live, the right to work, the right to a good life, the right to worship God.

We all realize how much these, and many other of our deepest rights, are threatened from many parts of the world, today. And we're ready to struggle in every way possible to protect our rights from being taken from us by others.

Yet we don't always see how the security and enjoyment of our rights can be taken from us—by ourselves.

Let us examine some of the inevitable reasons for this:

There is no way, for example, to enjoy our right to a family, without fulfilling our duty to care for our children.

For how can anyone expect to get fulfillment and pleasure from his children if they are not raised well?

It is no different with other rights. All experience, history and tradition make clear that no right stands alone.

We can enjoy a right only by accepting the duty which is its other side.

THE RIGHT TO THINK AND SPEAK OUR MIND

This is inseparable from our duty to listen; to give those around us the same rights of expression we want so much for ourselves. When we do not listen, how can we expect others to let us speak?

THE RIGHT TO HAVE A FAMILY

We make this right empty and meaningless if we keep postponing the time we spend with our own family. It is a familiar delusion to think that our greatest duty to our family is to provide those we love with material security, however important this may be. They need our presence and our active love still more.

THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE WHERE TO LIVE

Whenever we self-righteously complain and discriminate against our neighbors—whenever we fail our duties as a good neighbor—we undermine the very foundation of our rights to choose where to live.

THE RIGHT TO WORK

In the complexities of modern society, each of us has the right to earn a living for himself and his family, in ways consistent with his talents. But we fail our duty when we do not give, to whatever we do, a full measure of integrity and effort. And in failing this duty we defeat our right to work.

THE RIGHT TO A GOOD LIFE

No one can give us a good life. We are given only the opportunity; there still remain our duty and actions to achieve it.

And we advance ourselves whenever we decide to reflect for a time, rather than to keep rushing through life; whenever we decide to give ourselves to a community action instead of limiting ourselves to giving only money; whenever we decide to seek wisdom from those who can teach us—and don't put off the reading of a book.

THE RIGHT TO WORSHIP GOD

We see everywhere how much the evil in human affairs comes from the tendency to mistake a part of life—power or status or possessions—for the whole of it.

We can make the same error in our beliefs. For our right to worship God is also our duty not to fall into the idolatry of worshipping any part of His creation as though it were the whole.

It is clear, then, that to enjoy our rights we must fulfill our duties. They are the only path to the full possession of our rights. Moreover, we can be sure of living in a society where each individual's rights are insured only when we achieve a society where all are concerned with their duties, and only then.

Proposed Soviet Trawler Port In Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in today's Philadelphia Inquirer be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The views expressed in the editorial I endorse. I would hope that the administration will soon come up with a positive policy in answer to this newest Communist threat to our hemisphere.

The editorial follows:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Sept. 27, 1962]

"TRAWLER PORT" A POOR DISGUISE

If anyone but the Soviets had promised to build a port for Cuba—and to turn over an unspecified number of trawlers for Cuban use—and if anyone but Fidel Castro were nominally in charge of Cuba, we probably could pass it off as progress and get set for more fishing competition.

Unfortunately, it is the Soviet Union which has made the promise and it is the Reds' bearded puppet, Castro, to whom the promise has been made. This changes things.

Russia seems to be getting a reputation as an ever-willing port-builder for other people—other people in strategic spots around the world. They have built a base for Yemen, right on the Red Sea lifeline. There are reports Morocco will have a Russian aquatic project near Gibraltar. The fact that, if these ports should turn out to be naval bases, and the Russians retain use or control of them, they could seriously damage Western shipping seems more than a coincidence.

So, too, the projected trawler port in Havana Bay for Cuba—in neat scoring position to choke off traffic to the Panama Canal and north-south inter-American trade, including United States-Puerto Rico shipping and Venezuela oil tankers.

The additional fact that no Russian fishing has ever been done in the Caribbean or even in that latitude of the Atlantic Ocean, lends all the more suspicion to this latest maneuver. The United States is well advised, indeed, to keep a close eye on it. Increased and closer patrolling and scrutiny by sea and air will obviously be needed. An outright refusal to put up with it, based on the Monroe Doctrine and our national interests, would not be out of order, either.

However, there are some intermediate steps toward stopping the tremendous flow of Russian arms, men, and supplies to Cuba which this Government has not taken yet—so such plain speaking is probably not even considered at this time. Although we have literally begged our NATO Allies to get their ships out of the "supply Cuba" trade, only West Germany has promised, so far, to do anything about it.

And, curiously, American ships which fly flags of convenience have not been seriously inconvenienced by our national needs, nor have foreign ships which take Communist trade to Cuba, then stop off in America to pick up return loads for Europe. These shipments could be curbed by U.S. Government action—and probably should be.

We are not happy with the prospect of a Soviet naval base in Cuba. It is an outrageous affront not only to the United States but to this entire hemisphere. A Communist strong point at that point bodes no good for any of Cuba's neighbors.

Imagine what Hitler could have done to us with a base in Havana.

Negroes Seeking Vote Have Trouble in Delta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Washington Post of September 12 tells the story of what is happening to Negro citizens in Mississippi who are peaceably seeking to exercise that fundamental right of American citizenship which undergirds and is the essence of American government. That right is the right to vote, to be a partici-

pant in a form of government, by constitutional guarantee, of the people, for the people, and by the people.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, were Mr. Robert Baker's story, were the multitude of reports published in our national papers in recent days relating examples of police-state gestapoism, harassment, intimidation, brutality, and violence written in regard to citizens of any other Western nation of the world, the morally shocked and indignant voice of America and its citizens would have trumpeted from the housetops in protest.

American citizens are outraged because of the Cuban situation and Castroism and we are passionately vocal about the right of self-determination of the Cuban people. Right we ought to be. We are morally outraged because the Baltic nations have lost the right of self-determination. And it is right we ought to be. We are morally indignant because the people of Hungary have lost the right to self-determination. And it is right we should be. We deplore certain current practices of infant, newly born nations that we consider oppressive of the right of self-determination, of police-state character. We are vocal in our criticisms of Ghana, the Congo, Asian and Middle Eastern nations. The people ought to have the right of self-determination, we American citizens protest. We loudly protest, despite the analogy, Alan Westin of the New York Times, pointed out to us recently, between the practices of the United States as a young country and the practices of contemporary new nations of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. So unfailing and firm is the faith of the people of the United States of America that man has an inalienable right to the privilege of self-determination and self-government that we have locked in our Constitution provisions:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Article IV, section 2: The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

Amendment 14, section 1: All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enfore any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Amendment 15, section 1: The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Amendment 19: The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

We have fought two great wars and we stand on the edge of the third, trying, as we must, by peaceful means to make the world a place in which the right of self-determination and self-government may safely exist—just make safe the right to choose democracy, the concept of our faith. The abridgement of this right to self-determination, to self-government, we urgently protest is a most grievous threat to democracy itself. And this it is.

It is incongruous; it is a hypocrisy; it is a moral and spiritual lie, therefore, that the voice of American citizenry is not raised from the housetops in such shout as Joshua made to make the walls of the Delta tumble—because in that part of the land, the citadel, of democracy, police state does exist for the purpose of denying to certain citizens of the United States the right of self-determination and self-government, as it exists in Georgia, Louisiana, and the other most flagrantly abusive parts of the Southland of these United States.

I commend this report by Robert Baker to the reading of every American citizen and to his conscience. Mr. Speaker, the Government, the Congress, and the individual citizens of America have a choice. They can open their mouths and act in moral courage and conscience or they can stand in silent cowardice and watch ignoble hypocrisy eat into the foundation on which America stands. Do we have time to wait for the peril point and its accompanying thunder of total crumbling?

The article follows:

NEGROES SEEKING VOTE HAVE TROUBLE IN DELTA

(By Robert E. Baker)

JACKSON, MISS.—Mississippi is tough for Negroes engaged in voter-registration programs.

While violence has been nil, they are subjected to arrest and intimidation and the shout of "Communist."

Negro registration efforts are being concentrated in the delta, around the Sunflower County area, home of U.S. Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, who has few peers if any as the Deep South's "top banana" segregationist.

In Quitman County, a Negro went to the courthouse at Marks, where the registrar sits, and was arrested. When two bondsmen showed up, they were jailed too.

A Negro who uses his yellow bus to transport workers to the cottonfields recently used it to transport prospective Negro voters from Ruleville to Indianola in Sunflower County. The highway patrol arrested him. They said his bus should have been painted green.

BUSINESS CLOSED DOWN

In Ruleville, a Negro who operates a dry-cleaning shop got interested in voter registration. Police suddenly found that his boiler had no protective wall as required by law. His business was closed down. So was the business of another Ruleville Negro, suddenly found to have improper bathroom fixtures.

Last Sunday, officials in Ruleville remembered the Sunday law and forced Negro businesses to close down that day.

A Negro photographer in Greenwood sublet office space to some of the voter-registration workers. The photographer was arrested on a bigamy charge after police questioning.

Recently, Charles McLaurin, of St. Louis, a worker for the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee of Atlanta, was distributing registration literature in Ruleville and was brought before Mayor Charles N. Dorrough.

The mayor explained the ordinance against distributing literature without a license. McLaurin asked if the ordinance didn't violate the U.S. Constitution.

"Boy, you don't know where you're at," came the reply.

The Negroes know where they're at. They're in Mississippi, the heart of the defiant South, and it's been a long hot summer.

One day last month in Clarksdale, where Negroes have been engaged in a boycott of white merchants, Willie Griffin spoke to some Negroes about registering to vote.

A policeman accused her of trying to take the Negroes away from downtown and thus enforce the boycott. She was marched to the police station and put in a cell without a chair or cot.

Finally Miss Griffin was charged with restraint of trade, resisting arrest, destroying public property, and possessing obscene literature. Her bail; $1,500.

The Negro voter push is a coordinated affair, comprising the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, CORE, the Urban League, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the NAACP.

PART OF PROJECT

It's part of the voter education project, operating out of Atlanta and financed by highly reputable foundations to conduct research in the best methods of expanding suffrage in the South.

The Mississippi delta was picked for strategic reasons. Two out of three of its citizens are Negro. Clarksdale is the home of Aaron Henry, State NAACP president, who has built an active NAACP chapter there.

And the fact that it's Senator EASTLAND'S home territory must have played a part.

But into the picture last July popped Carl Braden, field secretary of the Southern Conference Educational Fund of New Orleans.

In a 1954 Louisville trial, Braden was accused in a Kentucky State court of blowing up his own house to foment race unrest and was convicted. The decision was reversed when the U.S. Supreme Court, in another case, ruled that Congress had preempted the field of subversion laws from the States.

BRANDED COMMUNIST

At a House Un-American Activities Committee hearing in Atlanta in 1958, Staff Director Richard Arens accused Braden of being a Communist. Braden, longtime enemy of the committee, invoked the first amendment and served 10 months for contempt of Congress. Outside committee hearings Braden has denied he is a Communist.

Last July, he visted the Negro voter program workers and one of their workshops in Mississippi. He alter sent a report to contacts all over the country. He marked it "confidential."

Beginning last Friday, the Jackson Daily News, perhaps Mississippi's greatest segregationist newspaper, began a sensational series of articles about the "secret" report, which it had "intercepted."

It labeled Branden an "identified Communist" and noted he was accompanied on his Mississippi visit by Robert Moses, of New York, a field worker for Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in the voter-education project. Braden's report told of a workshop near Jackson in Hinds County. Screamed the News in headlines: "Commies Recruiting Members in Hinds?"

State Attorney General Joe Patterson picked up the ball. After comparing U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to a jackass baying at the sky, Patterson wondered aloud about the Justice Department's lack of concern in the activities of a "known Communist in Mississippi."

PAPER SENT TO NEGROES

Negro leaders throughout the delta received copies of the News stories, bound in a wrapper proclaiming: "Communist workers, race agitators arrested in Indianola."

Now it's hard for the Negro voter-registration workers to get a Negro church for meetings.

The Indianola arrests occurred last week, along with arrests in other delta towns, of Negroes on such charges as distributing literature without a permit, loitering (in a moving car) and being on the streets of Clarksdale after midnight "without reasonable cause."

The Justice Department in the past 27 months has filed nearly 2 dozen civil rights actions in Mississippi, about two-thirds of them aimed at clearing roadblocks to Negro registrations. But the courts move slowly here on such matters.

The U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals will decide one case on September 17 in Hattiesburg: what to do about Forrest County Registrar Theron Lynd, who simply has refused to register any Negroes, court order or no.

Few voices of moderation are heard in Mississippi today. The Tupelo Journal raised its voice last July 30 by warning Mississippians that they are "building up serious troubles for themselves when we educate Negroes and then deny them the basic rights to which they are entitled as citizens."

But mostly the voices emulate Gov. Ross R. Barnett. When the Department of Justice recently filed a sweeping suit attacking the constitutionality of Mississippi's voter-registration laws, including one requiring "good moral character" of applicants, the Governor said he assumed the Government wants voters of bad moral character.

"I assume," said he, "the Department wants government of the ignorant, by the ignorant, and for the ignorant."

Editor James M. Ward, of the Jackson Daily News, suggested that the Government's true goal might be to open the way for Black Muslims known only as X to vote 50 times each on election day.

"Sure it's hell for the Mississippi Negro trying to get things done," said NAACP President Henry in Clarksdale. "But we're used to that. We've just started. And I tell you one thing. We're damned tired of this nonsense."

House Resolution 211: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In may cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
September 18, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You are to be commended on your initiative and work on House Resolution 211 concerning a House Committee on Captive Nations.

Would you please send me a copy of the resolution.

Sincerely,

C. J. DRAZDAUSKAS.

WORCESTER, MASS.,
September 13, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD:

Thank you for speaking for the captive nations.

Gratefully,

MILDRED BUDA.

MATTOX LABORATORY,
North Hollywood, Calif.,
September 13, 1962.

Hon. Mr. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Congratulations. We are so glad to know that someone in Washington still knows there is a Monroe Doctrine and heartily support House concurrent resolution to reassert its principles and get the Reds out of, not only Cuba, but the entire Western Hemisphere.

Thank you.

M. B. MATTOX.

WORCESTER, MASS.,
September 15, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please accept the heartfelt gratitude of all Lithuanians for your kind remarks on behalf of captive nations on July 16.

God bless you for your efforts.

Miss MARY KLIMKAITIS.

Unifying Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Hamilton Fish served in the Congress of the United States for a quarter of a century with distinction and with honor.

Recently a letter of his appeared in the New York Times which I think is worthy of being perpetuated by inclusion in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

UNIFYING GERMANY: FORMER REPRESENTATIVE URGES REUNION AS SOLUTION TO CRISIS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

There is constantly increasing talk of war over Berlin. We were involved in the last war by German aggressiveness and our main objective was to destroy German militarism. This we succeeded in doing. In recent years, we have been frantically trying to re arm and remilitarize Western Germany.

I was in Berlin 3 weeks ago and witnessed the stone throwing by groups of young Germans. These fanatical youngsters were embittered and with justification. Berlin is a powder keg. Neither the West Germans nor the Communists want to start a nuclear war. There are, however, frustrated and desperate groups, small in number, including former Nazis, among the 15 million refugees from Poland and escapees from East Germany, who might at any time gamble on war to regain their homes.

Red China also might, through its agents and the use of money, instigate acts of violence in order to provoke war between the United States and Soviet Russia. It is a very dangerous situation. We are sitting on a potential volcano that might erupt despite our peaceful intentions and involve us in a nuclear war. A few hand grenades thrown at Russian soldiers on guard duty at the Russian Memorial monument in Berlin or a mass attack on the wall might ignite the flames.

A nuclear war over Berlin with Soviet Russia would be mutual suicide, with Red China its only victor. It is conceivable and even probable that we may be alined with Soviet Russia against Red China within the next 10 or 15 years.

FORMER ENEMIES NOW FRIENDS

Twenty years ago Germany and Japan were our mortal enemies. Today Germany and Japan are our best and most reliable friends. I anticipate that Red China will produce nuclear weapons within 2 years and will be industrialized along modern lines within 15 years, and by that time will dominate all of Asia.

The free world must not underestimate the potential military power of Communist China. It is estimated that Red China could, with its reserves, field an army of 30 million—twice that of any other nation. She may be only a "paper tiger" today, but given time to develop will become militarily more powerful than any nation except Soviet Russia and the United States.

In a nuclear war China could afford to lose 50 million people. But if the United States, Western Europe or Soviet Russia lost 50 million, it would mean the destruction of those nations and probably the communization of the world under Chinese domination.

The reunion of West and East Germany is inevitable with or without war. When and how will be decided by future causes and events. Germany cannot continue indefinitely a divided nation, any more than the United States or France could, if divided into two parts by a foreign mandate.

Until some better or more constructive solution of the critical Berlin situation is presented to the United Nations, I urge the unification of Germany as a sovereign and independent nation, precisely on the same basis as neutralized Austria, where peace, prosperity, freedom and independence now prevail.

Cuba is a horse of a different color.

HAMILTON FISH.

NEW YORK, *September 14, 1962.*

What a Difference a Few Months and an Election Can Make

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for some years we have heard about the deficit in the Post Office Department. Recent action by the Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service recommends an increase in postage rates which has the support of the administration. In the Eisenhower administration they opposed the same proposed increase in postage which they now seek. We are all familiar with the efforts of the steel industry to increase its price about 4 percent to cover increased costs which met with vociferous opposition from the administration. Revenue from stamps goes to the Federal Treasury—an increase in steel goes to private industry. Both affect us all.

The inconsistency of the administration's support of and opposition to Government and private industry is pointed up in an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune today. I suggest all Members read it. The editorial follows:

POSTAL STAMPS AND STEEL

The Senate Post Office Committee has approved the administration's bill to raise postal revenues by about $600 million and to raise wages of Government employees generally by an even greater amount. A similar bill has already been approved by the House and higher postal rates next January seem almost certain.

It would be a shame, however, to let the administration raise the price of postal service without mentioning the price of steel.

Mr. Kennedy marshaled all of the force at his disposal last spring to prevent an increase in the price of steel, just as he has done to obtain an increase in the price of postal service.

His reason for opposing the steel price increase was partly that the industry tended to be monopolistic. The Post Office is certainly a greater monopoly.

He said that the price of steel affected us all. Certainly the price of postage affects us all.

The increase proposed by a few of the leading steel companies amounted to about 4 percent. The postal rate increase will amount to about 20 percent. First class mail will go from 4 to 5 cents; postcards from 3 to 4 cents, and air mail from 7 to 8 cents. The estimated $600 million increase in revenue would amount to almost exactly 20 percent of last year's revenue from domestic postal service.

The 4 percent steel price increase would have come on top of an increase of about 19 percent over the average for the years 1954–57. The 20 percent postal rate increase comes on top of an even greater increase in 1958.

We do not object to higher pay for postal workers, who receive considerably less than the average Government worker, or to making the Post Office Department self-supporting. But the administration is pushing hypocrisy to an extreme when it demands for a Government department what it has denied to private industry.

The chief difference between selling a postage stamp and selling an ingot of steel, we may conclude, is not in size or in weight or in the economics of the transaction; it is political. The money received from the postage stamp goes to the Government, hence an increase in revenue is good. The money received for an ingot of steel goes to private industry (except for the Government's tax cut); hence, it is bad.

By the same token the Democrats opposed, during Mr. Eisenhower's administration, the same increase in postal rates which they now seek. To increase Post Office revenue in a Republican administration, it seems, is bad; to increase it in a Democratic administration is good.

This sort of logic wouldn't stand up even in a prekindergarten class.

Will Family-Sized Farm Survive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the farm bill, adopted by Congress, holds little promise of substantially improving the economic outlook in agriculture.

Because of this nonpromising outlook, the Congress, as well as the farmers themselves, must further explore to see what can be done to improve the farm economy.

Unless this is done, the diminished farm income may have dramatically adverse effects on the whole economy. Moreover, the trend will create increasingly serious problems for the farmers themselves, particularly the family-size farm.

Recently, the Wisconsin Agriculturist published a special report by Ralph S. Yohe entitled "Will Family-Size Farm Survive?"

Reflecting thoughtfully upon the trends and problems in agriculture, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin Agriculturist, Sept. 15, 1962]

WILL FAMILY-SIZED FARM SURVIVE?

(By Ralph S. Yohe)

Wisconsin farm folks move off the farm at the rate of 12 families a day. We lose 250 farms a day in the United States.

If the trend of the last 10 years continues, we will have 600,000 fewer commercial farms in the United States in 1970 than we had in 1959, says a recent report by the Agriculture Committee of the National Planning Association. National Planning Association is an independent, nongovernment planning organization that watches the economic front.

Here is the percentage of the U.S. labor force in farming over the years:

	Percent
1850	64
1900	38
1930	22
1960	9
1975 (estimate)	6

Fewer farmers can feed our growing population because of dramatic increases in farm efficiency. This pickup in production per man in agriculture has not been matched by industry, says the National Planning Association report.

Output per man hour in farming went up over 5 percent per year from 1950 to 1960. Manufacturing gained less than 3 percent per year. All production increased slightly over 2 percent.

The fruits of this increased efficiency has been passed on to the American public. One hour of factory work would buy:

	In 1947–49	*In 1960*
Quarts of milk	6.5	8.1
Dozen eggs	1.8	3.6
Pork cuts—pounds	2.2	3.6
Choice beef—pounds	1.9	2.5

What reward has this brought the farmer? He is smothered in surpluses. His income has gone down since World War II, while his city neighbors' income has gone up. Hundreds of thousands of farm people are being pushed into cities already plagued by unemployment.

What will happen during the next 10 years? More farm people will move to town, the National Planning Association says, if they can find jobs. The farms left will be larger. Many of them will come from combining smaller present day farms. Some smaller farms will grow bigger.

Many of the farm people trekking to the city will be poorly trained for city or town jobs. In 1959 farm people 18 years or older had 3.5 years less schooling than the rest of the people. Sixty percent of the farm people had only 8 years or less schooling.

What about the the medium-sized family farm? Will it be crowded out by still bigger farms? Farms selling more than $40,000 worth of products a year are growing at a faster rate than farms selling $10,000 to $39,000. Yet the $40,000 or more farms are less than 5 percent of our total commercial farms.

John M. Brewster of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, qualifies family farms as those hiring the equivalent of 1½ full-time men per year. If this is truly a family farm, then the family farm selling $10,000 or more products a year looks in good shape.

Why aren't the big boys taking over? They can't get farm labor, and if they hire labor at industrial wages, it doesn't pay.

"The family farmer quite frequently is willing to take a little less money than he might get in town," says the National Planning Association report. "When a period of low prices comes along, the family farm can out-survive the big farm with a heavy payroll."

Moderate farms still have some advantage over very big ones. Beyond 350 acres you don't gain much on a grain farm. "For practical purposes, farms larger than 350 acres probably have about the same cost per dollar of crops produced," says Earl Heady, Iowa State University.

Another farm management expert says, "We have little reason to believe that any substantial reduction in unit cost is achieved by most types of farming beyond those farms having gross sales round $25,000."

Here's the way the National Planning Association committee foresees the future of the family farm.

By 1970 we'll have about 1.8 million commercial farms—600,000 less than in 1959—if the trend of the last 10 years continues.

If unemployment in town creeps up because of automation, the total number of commercial farms may show little change. Small farmers will share poverty out in the country instead of looking for jobs that don't exist in town.

If unemployment declines, if farm income holds up, if we have special efforts to help some small farmers expand their farming and other small farmers to train for city jobs, then we could have 1.5 million fewer commercial farms by 1970. It would mean a larger number of family farms with a reasonable income.

The greatest menace to the family farm is not the growth of oversized farms. Rather, it is the danger that city unemployment should rise. Coupled with farm surpluses, unemployment could push many now profitable family farms down into the ranks of the unprofitable, says the report.

Kind of farm	Number of farms	
	1949	1959
Family farms (less than 1½ man-years of hired labor)—		
With less than $10,000 marketings	3,100,000	1,600,000
With $40,000 or more marketings	334,000	680,000
Larger than family farms (hiring more than 1½ man-years labor)	150,000	234,000

Responsibility in Cuban Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to place in the RECORD the following interesting analysis by David Lawrence entitled "Responsibility in Cuban Affair":

RESPONSIBILITY IN CUBAN AFFAIR—ACCOUNT OF COMMAND DECISIONS IN THE INVASION ATTEMPT IS GIVEN

President Kennedy in his speeches likes to refer to his troubles—particularly Cuba—as having been "inherited" from the Eisenhower administration. Former President Truman says in his political outbursts that Mr. Eisenhower was a "lazy" President. The real question is not how much time a President gives to golf or yachting or campaigning or social events, but how he uses the time he does give to official business—the kind of decisions he makes.

Members of Congress have in the last few days put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a lengthy article that was published 2 weeks ago in U.S. News & World Report giving a comprehensive account of the fateful decision President Kennedy made when he first withdrew and then—when it was too late—actually approved air support for the Cuban exiles in their invasions of their homeland in April 1961.

Ever since that time there have been attempts to blame the whole fiasco on the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff or on the Central Intelligence Agency. But President Kennedy told the truth when he himself assumed full responsibility. What hasn't been generally known, however, is how he came to make the mistake he did. The magazine article was the result of many weeks of investigation and research among official sources, particularly among persons who were in the know at the time. Certain administration officials have since conceded the accuracy of the article. It reads in part as follows:

"A fateful decision, made by President Kennedy on Sunday, April 16, 1961, is rising now to plague the United States. On that Sunday evening, an armed force of Cuban refugees, trained by the United States, was at sea, sailing secretly to invade Fidel Castro's Cuba. The American President, a few hours earlier, had given final approval to that invasion.

"Only the day before, on April 15, a surprise attack by B–26 bombing planes belonging to the invaders had knocked out all but seven planes of Castro's tiny air force.

"A second air strike was scheduled for Monday morning, April 17. It was to coincide with the landing of the invaders. It was supposed to finish the job of wiping out Castro's planes and to provide air support for the invasion.

"Secure in the assurance of air support, the invaders went ashore in the early-morning darkness of Monday, April 17. Their landing was successful: 1,400 armed men reached the beaches of a place called the Bay of Pigs.

"In the battle that followed, Castro's troops suffered heavy casualties. Castro's tanks, coming up to the battle, were sitting ducks for an attack by air. Confidently, the little invading force waited for its air support to arrive. Its leaders had assurance of that support. It was provided in the pre-invasion planning.

"Hours before, on Sunday evening, a small but potent force of B–26's was sitting in readiness on an airfield 500 miles away (in a Latin American country), waiting to take off for the Bay of Pigs. Those were planes of the invasion force, with Cuban pilots. But those planes didn't take off. The reason: President Kennedy forbade their use.

"When the invasion began, in the predawn hours of Monday, the need of air support became apparent. Worried, the nonmilitary officials in Washington who were running the invasion went to President Kennedy for a new decision. They suggested that U.S. Navy planes from a U.S. aircraft carrier be used to fly air support for the invaders.

"In the planning of the invasion—planning begun under the Eisenhower administration—the Joint Chiefs of Staff had recommended the use of air support. President Kennedy vetoed the idea. He insisted that there was to be no direct American participation. Now, with the outcome possibly hanging in the balance, military and nonmilitary men joined in renewing the plea.

"Once again, in the early morning hours of Monday, April 17, President Kennedy made a fateful decision. He said 'no' to the use of U.S. planes.

"With no air support, the invasion soon began to run into trouble * * *. In the face of this situation, President Kennedy took the wraps off the Cuban fliers. On Monday noon he said they could go into action. But bad weather interfered at first. Finally, an air strike was set up for early Wednesday.

"On Tuesday, however, the situation continued to deteriorate * * *. By Tuesday night, April 18, a crisis was clearly at hand. Once again there was an appeal to President Kennedy. On the night the President, in white tie and tails, was playing host at a congressional reception in the White House. He left the party to confer with his advisers—both civilian and military. Again it was proposed to use U.S. planes to save the invasion.

"This time the President relented slightly. He consented to using one carrier's planes for just 1 hour on Wednesday morning—just long enough to provide cover for the invaders to land some supplies and for their planes to make a quick strike. U.S. planes, still, were not to attack land targets.

"Even this limited plan for U.S. aid went awry. There were communications mixups. The Cuban flyers mistimed their strike. The U.S. planes never got into action. And anyway, it developed, it was too late. By sundown of Wednesday, April 19, the invasion was a failure. The invaders inflicted close to 2,000 casualties on Castro's forces, suffered only a hundred or so casualties of their own. But without air support, the invaders could not hold out. Most of them wound up as Castro captives."

Criticism and analysis in retrospect by those who know the whole story is concentrated today on one point—full authority should be given in advance and a military operation should be handled by military men near the battle scene and not many hundreds of miles away in the White House or even in the Pentagon.

Judge Joe Wicks Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter by Judge Joe Wicks, retired, on the general policies that should be followed with reference to our American Indians, with special reference to the problems in the State of Washington.

Judge Wicks is an enrolled member of the Cherokee Tribe, has had an illustrious life as a lawyer and superior court judge in Okanogan County, Wash. He knows what he is talking about and his comments are well worth reading by all who are constructively interested in Indian affairs:

[From the Omack (Wash.) Chronicle, Sept. 13, 1962]

END SEGREGATION OF INDIANS

(By Joseph Wicks, superior court judge, retired)

It is true that I have some knowledge of the issue of State jurisdiction over our Indian citizens other than my contact with it as superior court judge of this district for approximately 15 years.

In fact, I have been in personal contact with the issue all of my life. This is by reason of the fact that I am an enrolled member of the Cherokee Indians, one of the five civilized tribes of the State of Oklahoma.

On the issue of jurisdiction, I have never been able to see eye to eye with the policies of the Federal Government in its dealing with the Indian and his property and have very often found myself at variance with many people of Indian blood, wherein they have sought to have the Federal Government to continue its supervision and jurisdiction over the Indian and his property.

The fact that the Indian was here before the coming of the white man, the black man, and the Oriental, does not, in and of itself so far as his rights, powers, privileges, responsibilities and obligations, make him any different from the other American citizens.

Specifically, it is my observation that in many instances the more vocal Indian is the first to demand the benefits provided under State laws for its citizens, but is often reluctant to assume the responsibilities those laws impose upon its beneficiaries. This attitude is wrong in any segment of our people.

I find among the people of Indian blood the learned, the intelligent, the stupid, the industrious, and the lazy, just as are found in

those of our people who boast a different ancestry. But I also find an attitude among many people of Indian blood of a wish and desire to have the Government support and supervise their property and actions.

This, I think, has been brought about because of the continued policy of the Government to act as a guardian and in many instances as a nursemaid of the Indian. In my opinion this policy is wrong.

That this policy should be changed, and the Indian placed upon the same footing as any other citizen has been recognized by the Federal Government for more than half a century.

There are many instances where the Federal Government has terminated its relation with many of our people of Indian blood, sometimes as individuals, sometimes as a group. In some instances, this termination has sometimes been on an individual basis by measuring the degree of Indian blood of the individual.

It apparently was the thinking of the powers that be, that if the individual was only of half or a quarter Indian blood, through some mysterious process, he was more intelligent and capable of handling his own affairs than if he were a full-blooded Indian.

This to my mind is fuzzy thinking and reasoning. How can you measure a man's capabilities by the degree of blood he bears from certain of his ancestors?

INDIANS GRANTED U.S. CITIZENSHIP

But, be that as it may, the Federal Government has, as stated above, sought to divorce itself from its paternalistic influence over the Indian. To this end, in 1924, the Congress enacted a law making all Indians citizens of the United States.

This citizenship does and should carry with it responsibilities and obligations. But at the same time the Government held on to the supervision of the Indian and his property. Many States have provisions in their laws, that an Indian, who does not pay taxes is deprived of the right to vote. (Examine proposition No. 19, a proposed amendment to our State constitution to be voted on by you in the election this fall.)

In 1953, the Congress enacted a law enabling the States to assume jurisdiction in both civil and criminal matters over the Indian and the Indian country within their respective borders. ("Indian country" is defined by Federal statute as "Indian reservations, Indian villages, Indian allotments, and lands held by the Government for the exclusive use and benefit of the Indian.")

In 1957, our State legislature enacted chapter 240, which provided the State "assumes, as hereinafter provided, civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indians and Indian territory, reservations, country, and lands within this State in accordance with the consent of the United States given by the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law 280, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)."

If this act had embodied only the portion previously stated, we would not, in this county, be confronted with some of the issues now facing us and which are vital to our local economy and law and order. But the act went further and provided that in the State assumption of this jurisdiction:

"Whenever the Governor shall receive from any tribal council or other governing body of any Indian tribe, community, band or group in this State, a resolution expressing its desire that its people and lands be subject to the criminal and civil jurisdiction of the State of Washington to the extent authorized by the Federal law, he shall issue within 6 days a proclamation to the effect that such jurisdiction shall apply to all Indians and all Indian territory, reservation, country, and lands of the Indian body involved in accordance with the provisions of this act."

Comment: It will be observed that for the State to assume jurisdiction over the Indian and Indian country it had to come about at the instance of the Indian by the "governing body" of the tribe presenting a resolution to the Governor. Upon receipt of the resolution, the Governor had no choice but to issue his proclamation assuming jurisdiction by the State.

The choice is all left up to the Indian, with the State powerless to act, but if the Indian desires to come under State jurisdiction, the State has no choice but to accept. Since when must a sovereign State act at the whim of a small group of men representing a small group of our people?

But the law also has a proviso added to the above quoted section that vitally affects our community. To quote further: "Provided, that with respect to the Colville, Spokane, or Yakima Tribes or Reservation, he shall not issue such proclamation unless the resolution of the tribal council has been ratified by two-thirds majority of the adult enrolled members of the tribe voting in referendum called for that purpose."

Comment: Now we see the question of the State assuming jurisdiction further limited so far as these three tribes are concerned. Not only must the resolution be approved by the tribal council, but it must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the adult enrollees of the tribe who vote upon a referendum called for that purpose. Thus, first who would call for a vote on such a referendum?

Must the vote be called for by the State? The act does not so provide. Must it be called by the tribal council? The act does not so provide. Can it be called by petition of the tribal members petitioning the Indian council or the State? The act does not so provide. Can it be called by the Indian agent? The act does not so provide.

Now, what has been the result of this law? Some seven or eight small bands of Indians who had no means of protecting themselves from the criminal element or any police protection of any consequence, have seen fit to place themselves under the protective cloak of our State government.

The three largest tribes of the State have not only refrained from doing so, but have taken strenuous action to prevent it.

JUSTICE BLACK RULES ON SEYMOUR CASE

Now this has been known to us whose duty as public officials it was to meet and contend with the issue, and these are some of the tools with which we had to work. More than 40 years ago the supreme court of this State handed down a decision holding that what was known and referred to as the diminished Colville Indian Reservation was no longer an Indian reservation and that the State courts had jurisdiction over criminal offenses committed by an Indian when the incident did not occur on an Indian allotment, title to which held in trust by the Government, or on tribal lands.

Under the authority of that decision, your local State court took jurisdiction over cases so long as the offense did not occur on an India allotment of tribal lands by an Indian. In that field the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction.

But recently in the case of *Seymour* v. *The Superintendent of the Washington State Penitentiary*, 368 U.S. 351 (7 law ed.) (2d) 346, 82 Supreme Court 424, Justice Black of the U.S. Supreme Court held our local and State supreme court were in error and that the diminished Colville Indian Reservation is still an Indian reservation, is Indian country over which, so far as criminal offenses committed therein by an Indian, the Federal has exclusive jurisdiction.

The effect of this decision is that though more than half the lands in that portion of the reservation lying in Okanogan County are privately owned, the State has no police powers therein over an Indian who might violate our State laws. He may steal, assault, commit homicide or any other vicious crime against which the citizens of our State are protected by our laws, but the State is powerless to act.

It must rely on the Indian police and Federal officers to protect both the Indians and non-Indians therein. There are four incorporated towns in this territory. They are helpless to enforce their police ordinances against an Indian.

This is an unhealthy and, to say the least, an extremely unusual situation to exist in a sovereign State. It is an unhealthy situation for both Indian and non-Indian. They are both deprived of the police protection of the State against an Indian offender.

Since the Indians and governmental agencies are not equipped to meet this problem, by lack of facilities or personnel, there are many offenses the Indian may commit with practical impunity from punishment. This does not make for good citizenship.

The State having no jurisdiction in civil matters in this territory, the Indian being deprived of the rights to contract, so far as his property is concerned, is to deprive him of one of the basic freedoms of American citizenship.

In short, when he is deprived of the use of our court from the criminal element and deprived of the right of contract, he is made a second-rate citizen and I, for one, do not believe there should be any second-rate citizen in this country, no matter what his origin, so long as he conducts himself as an American citizen.

If he violates our laws he should pay the penalty for his transgression. We give the criminal the right to rehabilitate himself and regain full citizenship, but not so with the Indian.

It is my humble opinion that the sooner the Indian is required to assume the responsibilities of American citizenship as well as the acceptance of its benefits, the better for him and the better for all of our people.

Now this situation could very easily be corrected so far as it affects us locally. The Congress has, by Public Law 280, enabled the State to assume jurisdiction over the Indian and Indian country. A simple law declaring that the State, under the Federal statute does assume such jurisdiction is all that is necessary.

Such a bill was before the last session of our legislature. It passed the senate and the house, but in the dying hours of the session it was referred back to the committee for further consideration, and there died.

During this session, the members of the legislature were pressured by members of the councils of these three larger tribes of the State and their attorneys, and even some of our county offices, not to pass this law. In that they succeeded.

Since then, the Seymour case has brought the matter to a head. It has dawned upon the people of this county the seriousness of the situation.

So today we find many of the Indians themselves advocating the legislature to pass a law whereby the State assume and perform its obligations. It would seem an act of folly for such a law to fail to pass at the next session of the legislature in 1963.

JUVENILE SITUATION IS ALSO CONFUSED

There are many other aspects of the issue not here discussed. For instance, by the case of *Adams* v. *Superior Court*, 57 Wash. (2) 187, it is held that the juvenile court has no jurisdiction over a dependent or delinquent Indian child residing in the Indian country.

The Indian child may be deserted or neglected by its parents or those responsible for its care and education, but your local

State court is without power to protect it. It can freeze or starve, but the State courts are powerless to act.

There is serious question as to whether the State has jurisdiction over the mentally incompetent Indian. May a State court admit him to a State institution for care? May a State court appoint a guardian to protect him and his property that is not held in trust for him if he resides on the reservation?

If the welfare department in its program of aid to dependent children provides a foster home for the child, how can a delinquent parent be prevented from removing the child from such foster home care? If an Indian child is delinquent, the State is powerless to act, if he resides on the reservation. If the parent refused to send the child to school, may the State enforce its compulsory school law? The ramifications of this tragic situation are endless.

Segregation of the American Indian should end. No other segment of our people have been so segregated as the Indian under the policies of the Government, in its dealing with these people. No other people have been rounded up as cattle and placed on a tract of land and compelled to remain there.

No other of our people have had their children rounded up and shipped off to schools hundreds and even thousands of miles from their homes, and compelled to associate with only members of their race, deprived of association and education with those with whom they must rub elbows, if they attempt to take their place in our society where there should be equal opportunity for all, with special privileges to none.

I repeat, to place any man or any group of people in such a category, is to brand him as a second-rate citizen, which is contrary to every principle of our American way of life.

A Job for "H.R."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my privilege to be among a sizable bipartisan group which met to salute our colleague, the Honorable H. R. GROSS, of Iowa's Third District. This group expressed the high esteem with which this able and distinguished Member is regarded by so many Members of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. GROSS' outstanding service and many contributions were further recognized in an editorial in the Omaha World-Herald. Although the tone of the September 22 editorial is jocular, it is without a doubt written as a tribute to Congressman GROSS.

I recommend "A Job for 'H.R..'" to all readers of the RECORD:

A JOB FOR "H. R."

We hope the following suggestion will not offend Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, a Congressman for whom we have high regard. Here it is, Mr. GROSS:

We think the President should appoint you to this country's delegation to the United Nations.

Not permanently, Mr. GROSS. Just for a couple of days, so you can ask a few of those heart-of-the-matter questions such as you ask on the House floor.

A few questions about the U.N. budget, for example:

In the face of a $120 million deficit, how come Secretary General U Thant is proposing a budget $45 million greater than last year's?

Why does the budget have no provision to amortize the proposed $200 million bond issue, half of which money is to come from U.S. taxpayers?

What's this monkey business about raising the already high income-tax-free salaries of U.N. employees?

What's the excuse for a proposed 5-percent hike in personnel?

Why does the dead-broke U.N. propose to build still another building?

Mr. GROSS, you probably can think of more and better questions. But these would do as a starter.

Frankly, we don't think you are going to get any better answers than the ones you get, and more often don't get, when you ask embarrassing questions about the finances of the U.S. Government.

But the asking helps, Mr. GROSS. It causes people to wonder and think about such things, including the big question as to why outfits which can't even keep their books straight believe they are qualified to tell the whole world how to run its business.

Elected ASCS Farmer Committeemen Administer Farm Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, although the farm bill we recently passed was not all we would have liked to have had, I do hope that this legislation will achieve a reduction in our farm commodity surpluses and prevent a further reduction in our farm income. In fact, I would hope that this bill might achieve an increase in farm income.

When the ayes and nays are taken and the final vote counted, our work is then done. There is nothing more we can do to make it work or to make it help the people for which it is intended. Who does make it work? Who does see that it helps the people for whom it is intended? Who does explain it to each of the farmers who might take advantage of its provisions? Yes, there is much more to be done after the bill leaves this Chamber that we never see and often never realize. The men who make it work are our farmer ASCS committeemen who are elected by the fellow farmers to administer and carry out our farm programs at the local level. The farmer ASCS committeemen meet at specified or regular intervals which is determined by the amount and size of the program they have to administer in their individual county.

On such occasions, they keep minutes of their deliberations which are a matter of record in the county office. These meetings are presided over by the chairman of the committee and regular motions are made and passed on and majority rule prevails. Good county committeemen cannot let personal prejudices or favoritism creep into the decisions of the committee. They know they must be willing and prepared to defend their decisions to their fellow farmers.

They approve and disapprove such matters as allotments, yields for farms, agricultural conservation program practices, facility loans, appeals and many other matters which may come before them. They may be called upon to get into a number of other matters which may come before them.

They may be called upon to get into a number of other assignments, including disaster area plans, emergency drought area designations, and civil defense activity. They have been known to be instrumental in many cases in assisting and recruiting voluntary labor for a resident of their county stricken by sickness or other misfortune.

In addition to the county committeemen there are individual community committees. These are the men who carry out the person-to-person, farmer-to-farmer contact which makes the program work.

I would like to ask that each Member of this body look seriously at the tremendous job being done by the ASCS farmer-elected committeemen in each of the counties of his district. I am sure that, if you do not already know, you will be quite surprised at the tremendous workload they carry and the contribution they are making, not only to agriculture but to our entire Nation.

Down at Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the recent airline tragedy in the Atlantic was marked by excellent performance on the part of the pilot of the plane involved and by a concerted effort on the part of ships and planes from many countries to save those who were adrift in the stormy Atlantic.

I would like to express my admiration for the skill of the pilot and for the calmness of the passengers. The accompanying editorial from the Newark Evening News of Tuesday, September 25, recommends that Congress reconsider the policy of using piston-engined planes to transport military personnel and their families overseas. I commend to the attention of my colleagues this excellent editorial, which recommends consideration of a significant issue touching on the lives and safety of our military personnel and their dependents:

DOWN AT SEA

Veteran pilots define flying as endless hours of boredom punctuated by moments of terror. Seldom, fortunately, do passengers share such moments. Yet share them they did aboard the charter plane which ditched off Ireland in the gale-whipped Atlantic.

One can imagine the drama: The announcement that three of the four engines had failed, the directions to put on life vests, and to brace for the impact when the aircraft is finally committed to the desperate landing in the sea.

Discipline would have to triumph over panic. Evacuation would have to be orderly with passengers proceeding to emergency exits to await inflation of rafts. Bobbing rafts would have to be boarded skillfully, and kept away from jagged edges of the crippled aircraft.

All this could not be possible without the skill of the pilot in touching down as delicately as possible, with minimal opportunity to maneuver. Yet no matter the skill, the ocean itself, with its fast-changing wave patterns, held the key to the severity of the plane's impact.

The odds, in short, were not good. It is a tribute to both crew and passengers of the ill-fated Constellation, therefore, that so many avoided panic under the perilous circumstances. Otherwise the tragedy could have been worse.

Use of a Superconstellation for carrying servicemen and their dependents across the Atlantic may be open to question since this piston-engined plane long has been surpassed by jets. Yet while the Military Air Transport Service has a few jet transports, its fleet is still largely piston engined. More, it is by congressional order that MATS allocates a share of its military transportation business to scheduled airlines and to charter carriers.

While the airline whose plane went down has an established reputation for sound maintenance and operational safety, this policy could stand reexamination. Servicemen and their families must be assured the safest transportation available.

Young Democratic Clubs of America Announce Their National Observance Day on Saturday, September 29: Thirty Years' Service for Party and Country—1932–62

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, young Democratic groups had existed in various States and localities for many years prior to the founding of the Young Democratic Clubs of America in 1932, but no national organization existed to coordinate and stimulate the work of these groups. In January of 1930 serious efforts were begun toward the creation of a national organization.

The Honorable Jouett Shouse, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, wrote to party leaders in August 1931, suggesting that they encourage increased activity among the younger members of the party. The 1932 meeting of the national committee adopted a resolution approving the idea. The committee, however, strictly adhered to the position that the young Democrats, if they wished to form a national organization, must do so on their own initiative. The committee felt that it could do no more than properly welcome such an organization and cooperate with it after it was formed.

The Young Democratic Clubs of America will this Saturday celebrate the 30th anniversary of the forming of their national organization. These young people did have the initiative to create their own national group, and I believe we should on this occasion commend the Young Democratic Clubs of America for their organization work and support of their party throughout the last 30 years.

Where I Stand as a Congressman and as a Democrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the issues before this 87th Congress have been complex and varied. I have sought in this session to discharge my responsbility in the interest of the voters of my district and in the national interest. How I have done so is very much the business of my constituents. Where I stand and why, on the legislation upon which Congress has acted and also upon which it has remained silent, should be reviewed by those who will cast their ballot in the coming election. I ask you, therefore, to look at the record and judge thereby.

I insert at this point a number of the major bills which I have authorized and guided through to enactment and which are now the law of the United States. You will find among them acts specifically designed to combat crime, acts to reform the judicial machinery so that the industry of justice may best be served, a constitutional amendment eliminating the poll tax as a requirement for voting in a Federal election. The list that follows is necessarily incomplete since the preparation of this record had to be made before adjournment so that it could reach you before election day:

Public Law 87–20: To designate the 1st day of May of each year as Law Day, U.S.A.

Public Law 87–36: To provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

Public Law 87–216: To amend chapter 50 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the transmission of bets, wagers, and related information.

Public Law 87–218: To provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

Public Law 87–228: To amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit travel or transportation in commerce in aid of racketeering enterprises.

Public Law 87–317: To amend section 4126 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to compensation to prison inmates for injuries incurred in the course of employment.

Public Law 87–331: To amend the antitrust laws to authorize leagues of professional football, baseball, basketball, and hockey teams to enter into certain television contracts, and for other purposes.

Public Law 87–336: To amend section 5021 of title 18, United States Code (Youth Corrections Act).

Public Law 87–338: To amend section 35 of title 18, United States Code (conveying false information).

Public Law 87–409: To reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army.

Public Law 87–681: To amend the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

Public Law 87–664: To authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes.

Public Law 87–668: Extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

Public Law 87–669: To amend section 2103 of title 28, United States Code, relating to appeals improvidently taken.

Public Law 87–673: To amend the act of January 30, 1913, to provide that the American Hospital of Paris shall have perpetual succession.

Public Law 87–677: To amend the Bankruptcy Act in respect to the salaries of retired referees.

The passage of a law is a troubled and uncertain journey. A bill must pass through subcommittee, full committee, sometimes the Rules Committee, pass the floor and sent over to the Senate where, again, it goes through the same process, at the end of which process it must be signed by the President. It is, therefore, understandable why few Members have acts bearing their name. In that respect, I am most fortunate in having been able to secure passage of such a large number of bills. The list you see before you is incomplete since a number of my bills are still awaiting action by the Senate at this time. It is with pardonable pride I refer to this record of achievement. But over and beyond these Public Laws, which bear my name, there are other vital areas of congressional concern which are your concern as well. I want you to know where I stand on these.

IMMIGRATION

While we have not been able to erase from the books the restrictive national origins theory embedded in our immigration law, nonetheless, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am happy to be able to state that every session has brought into being a liberalizing statute making the immigration law a little less restrictive, a little more human. We have enacted into permanent legislation a good bill for alien orphans, permitting their entry into the United States nonquota; we have reunited families; we have waived many of the excluding provisions such as tuberculosis and minor crimes which heretofore had barred immigrants; we have removed from the waiting lists and permitted entry, nonquota, those who have been registered in countries abroad for a period of 10 years; we have liberalized preference sections of the act.

More remains to be done, and it is my hope that it will be done before my service in Congress ends. I have offered

bills to do away with the restrictive and unfair national origins theory of immigration, which discriminates unfairly against intended immigrants, who may have been born in Hungary, Rumania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Greece, and other countries of southern and Eastern Europe. I have every reason to believe that this too shall come to pass.

CIVIL RIGHTS

As author of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, I am still far from satisfied that we have reached our goal of equal opportunities for all of our citizens regardless of race, color, or creed. This year I succeeded in guiding through the House the constitutional amendment to prohibit poll taxes in Federal elections. This constitutional amendment is now before the State legislatures and when 38 States have ratified this proposal, it will become part of our Constitution. I have introduced extensive civil rights legislation and, while progress is slow, it is nonetheless being made. It is my hope that in the next session I shall be able to guide such legislation into enactment, particularly, the legislation which prohibits the use of literacy tests to bar otherwise qualified voters from the polls.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

I have consistently supported President Kennedy's requests for an appropriation to strengthen our national defense and internal security. I have supported appropriations for the procurement of missiles, for space exploration, for emergency civil defense measures. I have supported a step-up in the production of the Polaris submarine and have supported increased research for moon-orbiting projects.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

I have stanchly supported the foreign assistance program and the Alliance for Progress project. I voted for the establishment of the U.S. Peace Corps and for its expansion in the second session of this Congress. It is now universally agreed that the Peace Corps is one of our most effective measures, as important in its way as was, and is, the point 4 program of help through self-help.

Public Law 87–510 which authorizes aid for the resettlement of refugees from Iron Curtain countries abroad, and for Cuban refugees, came from the Judiciary Committee, of which I am chairman, and it is a measure of which I am particularly proud.

I have supported vigorously the President's foreign trade proposal since it is my conviction that only with such a proposal can we compete successfully with Europe's Common Market.

I favored the enactment of the law which established a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, in the interest of peace, and also supported the act to use surplus farm produce to aid the people and the economy of underdeveloped nations.

In the interest of peace and international understanding, I supported the programs of educational and cultural exchange of persons between the United States and other countries and participated in promoting our contributions to the Inter-American Children's Institute, an agency within the Organization of American States.

In my interest in promoting peace, wherever possible, I have urged, and shall continue to urge, that the Middle East be kept free of conflagration and that the United States use its good offices to bring about peace talks between the Arab nations and Israel. I have supported aid to some Communist-controlled countries because I feel that the good people of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia have still within them the passionate desire for freedom. I have supported such aid to these countries for I felt that these people should not be permitted to be punished because they now lie prone under the iron heel of Communist dictatorship and control.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

I approve of the act which authorizes the program to provide 13 additional weeks of unemployment compensation. I feel strongly that the act which provided a 3-year program of training of unemployed in vocational schools or on-the-job retraining to develop new skills, is one of the most important acts of this Congress as is the act granting loans for public works projects in communities with excess unemployment.

I have supported the increase in the lending authority of the Small Business Administration so that in this era of bigness, the small businessman shall not be completely submerged.

In keeping with my philosophy, I voted for and supported vigorously the increase of a minimum wage to $1.25 an hour.

I favored the legislation which became law to develop an Interstate and Defense Highway System. Roads are the arteries of our civilization.

Within the area of national economy I must, of course, stress my abiding interest in the antitrust laws. This has been a continuing interest for the 40 years I have been in Congress. The enactment of antitrust legislation is not easy but through the work of the Antitrust Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, we have kept a watchful eye on all developments from price-fixing activities to unwarranted mergers. A free enterprise system cannot exist without vigorous enforcement of our antitrust laws. I feel fortunate that I have been able to steer through to enactment, Public Law 87–664, authorizing the Attorney General to compel the production of documents required as evidence in civil antitrust investigations. With Senator KEFAUVER, I am coauthor of the Celler-Kefauver Act which prevents mergers of corporations that throttle competition and would elbow small business off the sidewalk.

My Antitrust Subcommittee is likewise engaged in an investigation of the concentration of newspaper ownership, as well as the impact of giant firms on our economy.

We were likewise successful in this Congress in amending the antitrust laws to permit television broadcasting of professional sport games. The Antitrust Subcommittee played an important role in bringing to light 105 violations of the Shipping Act in our examination of the shipping industry, which investigation lead to the organization of a Maritime Commission Administration. Much of our findings in all, influenced amending of the Shipping Act. Public Law 87–346, tightened up the antitrust aspects relevant to the shipping industry.

I voted for the Communications Satellite Act after the respective committees had adopted several of my amendments to strengthen public control over those private interests which are developing the communications satellite.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE

I am in complete accord with the act we passed extending payments to families of unemployed fathers and other needy children and grants for the aged, blind, and disabled to be administered by the States together with State contributions. This has relieved the State of New York from a very heavy burden.

I supported the program of loans to colleges and universities for construction and improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries and scholarship aid to college students.

I supported the program for low and moderate cost housing, urban renewal, and the program of Federal grants to States for the construction of nursing homes, training of public health personnel and improved health services for the aged outside hospitals.

I supported medicare under social security. I do not want older people who are feeble and sick to be cast aside like broken tools. They must have decent hospital care.

Most certainly, I support a strong bill for the regulation of the drug industry and for the distribution of new drugs. As chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have held hearings thereon, and it was before this very committee that the dangers of thalidomide were first made public in May of this year.

CRIMES AND THE COURTS

I am particularly proud of Public Law 87–36 which created 63 additional U.S. court judgeships and 10 in the circuit courts. So crowded had been our court calendars that it had proved that justice delayed is justice denied. I am proud of that part I played in the legislation, now law, putting new weapons into our law enforcement agencies to curb the ravages of organized crime. In the table above are outlined the public laws which I guided into enactment. I am the author of H.R. 8140 which strengthens the Federal criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflict of interest. I did succeed in having the House adopt this bill. It is now pending in the Senate, and I hope before adjournment that this legislation, too, will become public law.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

I supported vigorously the legislation which now permits members of the Armed Forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, and grants, and legislation which extended the period of vocational rehabilitation for blinded veterans. I am proud that the 87th Congress authorized the Veterans' Administration hospitals to offer medical care for peacetime veterans with non-service-con-

nected disabilities. I supported legislation which increases by some 9 percent the compensation of service-connected disabilities and supported the law which increased basic allowances for living quarters for members of the Armed Forces and, of course, I approved the act which increased payments to veterans' widows and blinded veterans.

NATURAL RESOURCES

I approved the 10-year comprehensive program of oceanographic research and service, as well as the water pollution control program and the study for saline water conversion.

NEW YORK

As chairman of the steering committee, a bipartisan group consisting of New York Representatives and Senators, I have devoted a good deal of my time and efforts to obtain defense contracts for the State of New York. In this, the steering committee has had an appreciable degree of success.

The steering committee, under my leadership, likewise succeeded in having the United States participate in the New York World's Fair. We succeeded in having an appropriation of $17 million granted by the Department of Commerce for the defrayal of expenses in connection with Federal participation in the New York World's Fair. I am both pleased and proud to be a member of the board of directors of this fair.

The full weight of the steering committee, as I noted before, has been thrown into increasing New York's share of the U.S. defense business. I have been in constant communication with the Secretaries of Defense, Labor, and Commerce and with the General Services Administration to stimulate the channel of Federal contracts into areas of labor surplus. The steering committee has worked toward the introduction and passage into law creating a New York New Jersey Transportation Agency to serve New York's transportation needs.

We have worked for the transfer of 1,265 acres of the former Sampson Air Force Base to the State for its use in park and recreational facilities.

The steering committee has prevented withdrawal of facilities of the Brooklyn Army Terminal and has prevented Air Force removal of missile-ship work from the Bethlehem Steel Corp. shipyards in Brooklyn, and we have pressed for increased appropriations for the Long Island beach erosion and hurricane protection project arising out of the March 1962 storm damage.

You will note in the above list the enactment of Public Law 87-409, to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army.

I have devoted additional time to the problems of the Brooklyn Navy Yard which are many and which are complex. I have not ceased my labors to see that work is channeled into the Brooklyn Navy Yard. I have sought to do all I could do to prevent a reduction in force.

This, of course, is an abbreviated account of my activities in the 87th Congress. I beg to remind you of some of the basic legislation which I have authored during the 20 Congresses of which I have served. Among such legislation you will find the Federal Register Act; the Celler-Kefauver antimerger bill; the Displaced Persons Act; the Foreign Trade Zone Act; the Celler-Sparkman Act providing for the finality of the Clayton Act orders; the Celler-O'Mahoney Automobile Act; the Federal Tort Claims Act, and many others.

ADMINISTRATIVE WORK

I have taken a deep interest in each of my constituents who have approached me on personal problems of their own. Thus I have been in the fortunate position of being able to help thousands of my constituents. Daily, my office is busy with problems of veterans and their families. Pleas concerning immigrants are carefully perused. Loans for small businessmen are successfully prosecuted through the Small Business Administration. I have aided scores and scores of people in their quests for housing apartments. Pleas of Federal post office and civil service employees never go unheeded. I have secured for New York City numerous public buildings, such as post offices and public works structures.

I was a member of the platform committee at the Democratic National Convention at Los Angeles in 1960 that fashioned the platform upon which President Kennedy was elected. I stand four square behind that platform, and I fully support the policies of President John F. Kennedy.

I have served you for almost 40 years. If it is your wish, I shall continue to serve you with the same vigor, with the same interest in your welfare and the welfare of our country, and with the same pride I have in being the Representative of a district that is alive, not only to domestic affairs but also alive to the great issues that confront us as leaders of the free world.

I do hope that upon the above record I will be approved by you for reelection.

Inaction on Cuba May Be Worst Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Dean Dusk has disclosed that the Kennedy administration will not permit Cuba to export communism to other countries in the Western Hemisphere. He has stated that to accomplish this purpose we will, along with taking certain other steps, intercept shipments of munitions and war materials outbound from Cuba to any other American Republic. The Kennedy administration has thus put its stamp of approval on the implementation of the doctrine of contraband, or search and seizure. The Secretary of State has enunciated a modern application of a peaceful procedure available to us under the established principles of international law.

The foregoing position has met with almost unanimous support in the Congress. The only quarrel which many of us have concerns the point at which we should invoke the doctrine of contraband. Many of us feel that we should use this international legal tool now to peaceably prevent the further flow of Communist warmaking capability into Cuba. Last year the State Department advised us that Castro then had far more arms than were needed for the defense of Cuba, and thus the clear intent of the present massive Communist military buildup can only be to launch armed subversive aggression against free republics to the south of us. Many of us fear that continued inaction can only make our ultimate position less tenable in the eyes of the world and more hazardous for the protection of our own freedom and security.

The distinguished authority, Marguerite Higgins, in the following article taken from the Minneapolis Star of September 26, faces up to the probable ultimate consequences of our present policy:

INACTION ON CUBA MAY BE WORST COURSE

(By Marguerite Higgins)

UNITED NATIONS.—Said the Latin American: "If the United States were to do something effective to checkmate Soviet intervention in Cuba, my government would congratulate you privately and lacerate you publicly."

This quotation, noted on a brief visit to the United Nations, was not offered as a scientific sampling of opinion. Still it did not deviate from roughly similar sentiments expressed along embassy row in Washington.

Therefore it raised some interesting questions about the "new realism" in American foreign policy that Chester Bowles, apparently speaking for once with White House blessing, recently expounded in a speech denouncing those who wish to do something about Cuba.

According to Bowles, the new realism is founded on the contention that if America did something about Cuba it would "undercut our influence in world affairs, blacken our reputation in the United Nations, forfeit our traditional claim to moral leadership * * * set the stage for sweeping Soviet victories in the critically important fields of diplomacy and politics * * * and a lessening of our influence in world affairs."

If this truly represents the New Frontier's assumptions, then the questions needs urgently to be put: Does unwillingness to apply American power effectively in Cuba and elsewhere save us from the dire consequences outlined by Bowles?

To put it another way, does inaction heighten our influence in world affairs, whiten our reputation in the United Nations, and enhance our traditional claim to moral leadership?

Since the New Frontier has taken to labeling its critics in foreign affairs as rash, hotheaded and trigger happy, it would seem appropriate, for the purposes of perspective, to introduce some views on the uses of American power of a diplomat who has never been known to be anything but cool—and even pragmatic.

He is Robert Murphy, former Under Secretary of State, who in a hitherto unpublished commencement address at Boston University reported on a visit to Latin America during and after the abortive invasion of the Bay of Pigs.

Said Murphy: "I was in Brazil at the time of the Cuban operation. I was a bit startled to be told that the reason the United States failed to intervene openly in Cuba was because our Government feared it would provoke war between the U.S.S.R. and the United States. I found little or no recognition of the consistent effort our Government has loyally made through the years to adhere to a policy of nonintervention."

So, if Murphy is a good reporter, the U.S. unwillingness to use its power got the worst of all possible verdicts: Our moral leadership, far from being enhanced, yielded to the suspicion that we were merely motivated by fear of Russia.

"One of the principles to which we have been firmly attached is the collective approach to international questions," Murphy continued, "but again I feel that we have gone too far in our pursuit of a basically sound idea in resorting to the collective approach indiscriminately. There are situations, for example, where we are too ready and eager to merge our national identity in the United Nations.

"At times I believe we do this because of reluctance to face up to a risk on our own national account. Leaning on a collectivity that includes many weak, inexperienced and frankly selfish nations leads us into situations where we are reduced to the lowest common denominator.

"Therefore, we have no alternative to asserting our independent national will and judgment, letting our associates as well as our opponents know that on issues involving our fundamental national security we are capable of going our own way."

Thus, according to the old realism of Murphy, the United States of America, which holds in its own destiny the decline or survival of freedom in our time, should not be deterred from doing anything necessary to that survival because other nations refuse to hold its hand.

AID Administrator in Formosa Makes Headway by Emphasis on Private Initiative, Training of Local Managers, and Self-Reliance as Essential Requirements of Success in Achieving Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the China News of August 8, 1962, commenting on the constructive services in Taiwan of the Administrator of our AID program there these last 4 years, Dr. Wesley C. Haroldson, originally from North Dakota and with a doctorate degree from the University of Minnesota.

The editorial gives two important evidences of real progress in this difficult problem of how to achieve maximum progress in newly developing countries. First, it shows the persistent emphasis of the American Administrator on the necessity of the recipient country to do its utmost to move from reliance on outside help to reliance on itself. It is easier, I can testify from observations in many countries, to give help to people than to help people to help themselves. Second, the editorial shows that the seed sown is bearing fruit. The recipient country is being called upon by its own newspapers to move more vigorously in the direction that clearly is best for all. Commendation is in order for all concerned.

The editorial follows:

[From the China News, Aug. 8, 1962]

HARALDSON DEPARTURE

People come and people go. They usually leave behind something for us to remember them with. Only some of them leave behind more.

Wesley C. Haraldson is one of them. The Director of the International Development Agency is leaving Free China tomorrow. He will be long remembered as an outspoken friend.

Indeed, no Government official could ever question the views expressed by Mr. Haraldson—that more vitality is need in Taiwan's economy; that private industry should be given the front seat instead of the present secondary role; that consumption, especially Government consumption, should be cut down in favor of useful production; and that Free China must need acquire a new set of values and criteria if Free China wants to be a modern, up-to-date country.

The Government officials here do not question the wisdom of the Haraldson views. But they do not like the blunt way he puts it and says it so often. That is why in the past there have been arguments and discussions.

The arguments and discussions will continue. Mr. Haraldson's departure by no means means that his views have prevailed and that Free China's economy has taken on an abrupt change in favor of his beliefs. It takes time. And we are confident his views will gradually be driven home to all people in Free China, resulting in beneficial modifications.

It takes time. But the changes will come to reside with us.

Mr. Haraldson is therefore leaving with the satisfaction that someday somehow he may see his travails prevail.

We say Mr. Haraldson is an outspoken friend judiciously. Only a genuine friend will care to give us his frank views and criticisms with no malice intended. And Haraldson is such a man. His honesty, integrity, and concern have never been questioned. On the other hand, they will always be remembered.

In this connection, it is time for the free Chinese to sit down and really think of the role American aid has played in the giantish economic reconstruction work here. Mr. Haraldson says in his last press conference in Taipei that he hopes to see free China achieve economic self-sustaining in a few years without having to rely on American aid.

Let's ask ourselves this question: Can we do that? We have been talking about self-sufficiency for years. And all the while we have been depending all the more on foreign aid. As the situation now stands, self-sufficiency is almost beyond our reach.

Something must be done and must be done immediately. No nation in the world can afford to depend on foreign aid forever. West Europe was helped by the Marshall plan but West Europe today is in a position to dole out economic aid to other developing countries.

Of course, West Europe has always been technically and economically ahead of China. But that does not mean we should resign ourselves to the fate of being an international beggar for centuries to come.

During Mr. Haraldson's stay in Taiwan, American aid pattern has changed. There will be further changes. Now, it is the duty of every Chinese, including all those in the Government, to think actively of the future and do something about it.

The Chambers-Roush Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial in the Kokomo, Ind., Tribune, of Sunday, September 23, 1962, concerning the Chambers-Roush race in Indiana's Fifth District and under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix section of the RECORD:

THE CHAMBERS-ROUSH RACE

National political attention will turn on Indiana's Fifth District in the election this November because of the close finish which featured the congressional voting between J. EDWARD ROUSH, Democrat, and George Chambers, Republican, in 1960. The two men are rematched for another test at the polls.

Any contest that was as close as the one 2 years ago is bound to bring differences of opinion as to whether it was decided rightly.

Chambers' friends feel he was counted out in 1960. They point out that he had a slim margin of victory on the basis of returns announced after the votes were counted over the district, and they say that several curious things happened following that announcement.

One of these curious developments was that Chambers was certified by two different Indiana Secretaries of State as having been duly elected. The first Secretary of State to so certify his election was John R. Walsh, a Democrat. When Walsh was succeeded by Charles O. Hendricks, a Republican, the latter also formally certified Chambers as the winner.

Then, of course, ROUSH contested the election and the House of Representatives in Washington decided to count the votes over and named a subcommittee to conduct the recount. Although Republican members of this subcommittee signed its final report declaring ROUSH to be the winner by 99 votes, among several strange things they questioned was the manner in which the investigation of the election returns took place.

Several strange things took place in Washington. One of these was the maneuvering by the Democratic leadership in the House in regard to the Chambers-Roush case. A paper which some Congressmen said was a false certification was circulated among Members of the House by Ralph Roberts, the House Clerk, indicated that ROUSH was the formally certified victor. It was on the basis of this piece of paper that the House, on a straight party line, refused to seat Chambers when he presented himself to be sworn in.

At the same time it was refusing to seat Chambers, in January 1961, the House voted to seat two Congressmen from other States who, like Chambers, had been challenged. They, however, were Democrats and their politics appeared to have made a difference to the Democratic-controlled House.

Chambers believes the Democrats used the power of their majority to put the skids under him and to deny him the seat that he feels he was entitled to occupy. Whether a majority of the voters of the Fifth District agree with him will be indicated, in part, by the vote this coming November.

Chambers has been wondering, too, about the way the House subcommittee ruled on some of the ballots it recounted. He says some of the ballots bore check marks instead of the usual X crossses. Under Indiana law, a ballot must be marked with an X to be considered valid.

Another factor in the 1962 rematch between ROUSH and Chambers will be the general public attitude toward the Kennedy administration. Is this attitude one of enthusiastic endorsement of the administration, or has it turned to skepticism and doubt about the New Frontier?

The Democrats hope the voters will show that they support the New Frontier program as having been in their best interests. The Republicans contend that the administration's attitude toward business, the worrisome slide in the stock market, the President's efforts to obtain unprecedented powers, the socialistic-sounding advice given the President by his close advisers (including Prof. Arthur Schlesinger and Prof. Kenneth Galbraith, of Harvard) are dangerous to the free enterprise system. If a majority of voters feel that way, Chambers will benefit in the voting. If most voters are of a different mood, ROUSH will benefit.

Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, Addresses the National Fraternal Congress of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York, this week addressed the National Fraternal Congress of America at the Hotel Statler Hilton, New York. I include Mayor Wagner's address because of its deep concern with the spirit of fraternalism throughout the United States:

It is a great pleasure for me to bid you welcome to the city of New York. Our municipal tradition of offering hospitality to fraternal societies is nearly two centuries old; fraternal societies, themselves, are in the best and oldest American tradition. Two major fraternal orders grew directly out of the American Revolution. One was the Society of Cincinnati, open to officers of the American Revolutionary Army, and another, the Columbian Order, for the enlisted men of that Army. As a matter of fact, the Order of Cincinnati was originally organized not many miles from here, at Newburgh, N.Y., and that society still exists. It might also be of interest that one of the founders of the Order of Cincinnati was that great fighter for freedom and trainer of our Revolutionary troops, Gen. Wilhelm Frederick von Steuben. In about an hour from now there will be a little ceremony at my office in city hall, proclaiming next Saturady as Steuben Parade Day, in honor and memory of that great hero of American history.

Since those early years of our nationhood, Americans have become known throughout the world as the joiningest people in existence. We have people by the million, and almost as many organizations as we have people.

You here represent more than 103 fraternal benefit societies which stretch across the vastness of our continent. Many of your societies owe their origin and cohesion to a common mother tongue or the common national origin of your members.

Membership in other of your societies reflects a common occupation or a religious affiliation. No two of the many fraternal organizations that comprise your membership are the same; but they are the same in fundamental aim: to give expression to some identity of purpose or interest.

In unity there is, of course, strength and tranquillity of mind, whether for defense, civic cooperation or social harmony. Your adhesion to this congress is a testimonial to the fruit of cooperative undertakings.

Your societies, I understand, currently account for over $13 billion worth of insurance in force for your nearly 10 million members. That is a lot of insurance. And 10 million is a lot of members. I am glad to note that both these figures are continuing to grow.

I believe that your growth reflects our country's need for citizens who care, and for organizations which care.

It excites the imagination to put men into orbit and to plan to put men on the moon. But it hardly makes sense if we haven't learned how to help each other get out of the mire of human suffering on our own planet and, indeed, in our own country.

We probably need an internal Peace Corps to hold out a helping hand to fellow Americans in need of help. In many ways, your societies have helped to fill this function. Your churches and other civic groups have, too. But I am sure all of us are familiar with people who can weep crocodile tears about unfortunates on the other side of the globe but can't quite manage to focus on hungry children across the tracks in their own hometowns.

Your concern for an interest in the social welfare of your membership has been evident throughout the 76 years that this Congress has existed. Statistically, the total insurance benefits paid out by your societies since their beginning is a huge figure. But in terms of compassion and understanding, the value of the involvement of your organizations in the lives of your members is beyond reckoning. It is certainly my hope that no legislative steps be taken at any level of government to hamper the free development of your functions or to make them more difficult.

It is also good to know that no discrimination of any kind has ever characterized any of the benevolent fraternal organizations which comprise this Congress.

In this day and age of high-pressure lobbies and special-interest groups, it is refreshing to encounter organizations dedicated to the social welfare of millions rather than just to the making of millions. Your activity in the fields of civic and social welfare has made each of your groups a valuable and vital force for good in the areas in which you operate.

It is, of course, especially interesting to me as the son of an immigrant that many of your societies have roots in European cultures and linguistic groupings. It is heartening to see that in these fraternal organizations, the members have managed to retain the finest parts of their cultural and social heritage while becoming the most staunchly loyal of Americans. The record of your organizations in terms of effective opposition to communism and other forms of human exploitation and inequality is brilliantly clear.

In almost all northern cities we have been faced with the disruption of many established ethnic and linquistic communities in the wake of slum clearance. Many old neighborhoods have been torn down to make way for hospitals, schools and universities, or for new housing projects or for office buildings.

As one who grew up in the famous Yorkville neighborhood of this city with the intermingled sounds of German, Hungarian and Czech echoing in my ears from my earliest days, I must confess that I felt many a pang when I saw many once-familiar shops, restaurants and homes coming down to make way for progress. Of course many, if not most of these still remain and will remain as long as I have anything to say about it.

Some city beautifiers and even some sociologists maintain that the breaking up of these cultural islands is all to the good.

I do not feel that way. And it is more than sentiment or nostalgia which inclines me to this view. Of course, I am not in favor of social or economic ghettos of any kind; but there is a great—and irreplaceable—value in the cultural heritage which each group has brought to America and has preserved in such neighborhoods as Yorkville, the lower East Side, Williamsburg, and Greenwich Village.

These values must not be lost. They must be preserved, in one way or another.

Sometimes, for the sake of the good of the whole city, there must be some yielding of the interests of one group or another. In this city, we constantly face the problem of finding additional space for public and semipublic institutions and to construct higher buildings to house more people, in better conditions, with more light and more air than old buildings afford.

And so, mindful of the sacrifice that has been made by some for the common good, the New York City government has sought to cooperate with groups and organizations which have been displaced from their original haunts, in helping them to find space and to build appropriate facilities on new sites.

One of your organizations has provided a prime example of enterprise and initiative in working with the city in such an undertaking. I refer to the Sokol Organization. This organization has been granted the sponsorship of a $26 million housing project on the outer limits of Yorkville. This development will overlook the East River. It will consist of 6 modern buildings, each 20 stories high and housing 1,100 families.

These facilities will not just be for Czechoslovaks. They will be for all New Yorkers, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. But first priority will be given to New Yorkers of Czechoslovak origin who were forced to move out of their old homes in Yorkville.

When this project has been completed, it will be the first of its kind in the country. We, of the New York City government, are very proud of this undertaking. We are proud to have worked with the Sokol Organization, which is one of the members of this congress.

This is one example of what New York City is doing and what New Yorkers are doing to promote and advance the welfare of the city, of its people, and of the cultural heritage of those people.

I am sure that all your members are vitally concerned with this problem, in general, and with the problems of housing in particular, no matter what city or part of the country you come from.

I am sure that this isn't the only problem with which you and your organizations are concerned. I know you are concerned with social security, with old-age assistance, and specifically with the problem of medical care, under Federal social security, for senior citizens, and with the problem of discrimination in employment and in all other vital aspects of our lives.

Your organization is one whose constituent organizations are alike in their deep concern for the social problems which affect most Americans, and for the solutions to these problems.

All of you are fraternally united in these concerns; indeed in this you are united with the overwhelming majority of the American people.

All Americans are different; yet we are all the same. Ours is a country of great natural resources and great accumulations of wealth. But I believe that our greatest natural resource and our greatest wealth lies in our variety of people and in our variety of cultural riches from every corner of the globe. From the variety of the voices of all these Americans, there has emerged a united chorus of determination to achieve ever greater progress for all our citizens, in ways of freedom, and to share these blessings, in every practical way, with all the like-minded peoples of the earth.

A Record of Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, legislative bodies rarely complete their deliberations and produce results until the session is ready to end. Emergency periods have produced legislation to cope with the acute conditions. The usual practice, however, is to wind up a session with action in the last weeks.

The 2d session of the 87th Congress is nearing its termination and action has been taken on many important issues. Some have been favorable and some have been rejected. The voting record of the Members on the issues which were considered will be examined by the people in the coming election on November 6 and the attitude of the voters will be expressed in their approval or disapproval of the action taken by the Congressmen of both parties.

The following bills represent the major accomplishments in this session:

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

H.R. 11737 authorizes $3.81 billion for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1963, including $263 million for planetary and lunar exploration—Public Law 87–584.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The Trade Expansion Act has been passed by the House and Senate and will be recorded as the outstanding accomplishment of this Congress. President Kennedy called this bill the strongest trade bill since Congress first delegated tariff negotating power to the President in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

H.R. 11970 empowers the President, subject to safeguard provisions, to cut duties on imports by agreements with other nations, particularly the European Economic Community, for concessions to the U.S.-exported products; provides aid to domestic workers and industries adversely affected.

S. 2996 authorizes $4.6 billion foreign assistance program for 1963, including military support funds, development loans and grants, and program for Latin America at $600 million a year through 1966—Public Law 87–565.

S. 2768 extends and expands Peace Corps, authorizes $63.7 million for fiscal 1963—Public Law 87–442.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

S. 1991 authorizes $435 million, 3-year program of training of unemployed in vocational schools, or on-the-job retraining, to develop new skills; first 2 years' cost to be paid by Federal Government; third year 50–50 with States—Public Law 87–415.

S. 2965 authorizes and appropriates $900 million to undertake and accelerate Federal public works and for matching grants to local projects in communities with excess unemployment—Public Law 87–658.

H.R. 11040 authorizes creation of a commercial corporation, owned 50–50 by the public and the communications industry, to establish and operate a communications satellite system under regulation of the FCC, in cooperation with NASA; three members of the board of directors to be appointed by the President—Public Law 87–624.

S. 2970 increases lending authority of Small Business Administration for business loans and disaster loans to a combined total of $1.109 billion; investment company loans from $325 million limit to $341 million; authorizes loans to firms in need of assistance under Trade Expansion Act; establishes combined revolving fund—Public Law 87–550.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

H.R. 8723 amends Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 by providing Secretary of Labor with powers of enforcement, to establish regulations and interpret the statutes; fixes penalties for violations—Public Law 87–420.

H.R. 10606 amends Social Security Act, to reduce public assistance rolls by: Providing grants to States that establish work programs for needy; increasing U.S. share of administrative costs; extending for 5 years payments to families of unemployed father and other needy children; raising by $4 per month ceiling on Federal matching grants for aged, blind, and disabled; and increasing grants for child welfare services—Public Law 87–543.

H.R. 12628 provides for low- and moderate-cost housing for elderly in urban and rural areas; authorizes $200 million for loan funds for new construction and other programs.

S. 205 authorizes matching Federal grants up to $1 million for any State to purchase TV transmission equipment for educational purposes, providing the State or sponsoring agency furnish the land, building, and guarantee to operate and maintain the channel—Public Law 87–447.

H.R. 10 encourages self-employed and professional to establish individual pensions plans by granting income-tax deduction for funds set aside up to $2,500 per year.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

Senate Joint Resolution 29 proposes constitutional amendment to prohibit poll taxes—adopted.

Legislative action is still expected in the Food and Drug Administration field on H.R. 11581, drug and factory inspection, amendments of 1962. A report was filed September 25, 1962, for consideration of a commitee substitute amendment to this bill which is proposed to assure the safety, efficacy, and reliability of drugs—House Report 2467. The Senate bill on this subject is S. 1552.

The Kennedy administration's efforts to produce new laws providing medical care for the aged under social security, broad Federal aid to education, Urban Affairs Department in the Cabinet, Youth Conservation Corps, and wilderness-recreation service did not succeed in the 87th Congress. I supported all these measures and the chances of passage will be enhanced in the 88th Congress, which will be elected on November 6, if public support for President Kennedy's program is reflected in the new Congress.

Frustrating HHFA Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the bureaucratic redtape which one of the local communities of Minnesota's Third Congressional District recently encountered. I think the conduct of the Chicago office of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, as reported below, was most unworthy of this vital arm of our Government.

The city of Crystal is a rapidly growing community of almost 30,000 people in north Hennepin County. It is experiencing the "growth pains" so common to suburban municipalities throughout this Nation's metropolitan areas. Facilities which have been sufficient to fulfill the needs of past years are today found to be inadequate. It was to assist cities like Crystal through these difficult stages that HHFA was given jurisdiction by the Congress over Federal loans for community facilities and public works planning, and the city of Crystal accordingly applied for such a loan.

The report below is self-explanatory of the complete frustration experienced by those dealing with the HHFA bureaucracy. I am cognizant of similarly frustrating experiences of other Minnesota municipalities when attempting to deal with this seemingly distant and unresponsive Federal bureau. We should be thankful that America's municipalities are still free to solve their problems through local action, as Crystal did in this instance, through the adoption of a September 11 municipal referendum. Certainly the following letter is ample

testimony to the wisdom of Congress' earlier action of rejecting a new Federal Department of Urban Affairs. Once again its has been demonstrated that problems can most effectively be solved within the community rather than by transferring the required power and funds to a distant Federal bureau.

The letter follows:

CRYSTAL, MINN.,
September 20, 1962.

Attention: Mr. J. P. Harris.
Subject: P-Minn.-3039—Water facilities, Crystal, Minn.
Mr. JOHN P. MCCOLLUM,
Regional Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIRS: My first inclination upon reading your letter of September 17 was to reply with angry vehemence. Fortunately, I have a self-imposed rule never to write while angry, and if I do, never to mail the same day such a letter. Consequently I have discarded the next day several of the letters so written. However, even with a reasonable cooling-off period accomplished in this case, I feel I must register a strong protest.

One objection you register is the form of the resolution of the Crystal City Council accepting the engineer's study and report. You also object to the form of the certificate of the recording officer. Your letter states "they do not comply with the suggested forms." The word "suggested" does not convey to me the thought of strict compliance. If these forms are strictly required, why don't you say so?

I wrote your office on April 23, 1962, and said in part "would you please advise as to steps now necessary to complete the process for the $18,500 loan * * *. If there are forms necessary for completion, would you please send them along with the necessary information?" On May 22, 1 month later, I had no reply from your office. I wrote you again on May 22, again asking for the information. On May 23, 1962, correspondence between your office and this office crossed in the mail. On that date I forwarded to you three copies of the study and three certified copies of the resolution accepting the report. On June 28, I returned to your office the forms you sent on May 23, and in that letter I said "if further information is needed please advise." On July 2 you did request State health department comments, but did not mention the resolution or certification. From May 23 until September 17 no word from you stating that your resolution form must be used. Finally, on the resolution and certification, there is not an ounce of difference in the basic content of the certified resolution we sent and the one you suggest. Forty-seven percent of the private wells in this city of 27,000 people are contaminated, and you choose to quibble about the verbal composition of a resolution and certification.

It would appear that your Agency is not functioning as advertised. We are not getting assistance but are being met at every turn by inaction, redtape, and hairsplitting. The city of Crystal is not an adversary of your Agency. It is a city of the second class, governed by intelligent, honest people, and staffed with professional and semiprofessional personnel.

The city asked for a loan. We expected to comply with the agreement and repay it. Our city engineer (a registered civil engineer) evaluated the study and report and stated it was complete. If your agency intended to do the engineering perhaps it would have been better to have your engineers on the site.

The report, which you apparently object to, at least in part, will serve our needs. The people of this city voted by a 57-percent majority on September 11 to establish a municipal water system based on facts in the report. We will start construction early in 1963.

We cannot be delayed any longer waiting for your agency to justify its existence. The city council has authorized me to ask that you cancel our application for public works planning funds, and mark our file closed.

Sincerely,

F. A. ALLBEE,
City Manager.

Valiant U–2 Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the continuous Soviet objection to the effective work of the U–2 is truly a testimony to the effective use of that plane over the years.

Since this issue has been beclouded from time to time by the forces of appeasement who look upon an effective surveillance of the Soviet Union as a bad policy, I was especially pleased to note the editorial of Tuesday, September 18, in the Chicago Daily Calumet, Chicago, Ill., which provides its readers with a forceful commentary on the value of the U–2. Under unanimous consent, I insert the editorial entitled "Valiant U–2 Work" into the RECORD at this point:

VALIANT U–2 WORK

It was May 1, 1960, that the American people first learned of a secret and highly effective reconnaissance plan that had been flying over the Soviet Union for 4 years and keeping that vast land mass under close surveillance without hindrance from 100,000 feet up in the skies. Then one of these craft came within range of a ground-to-air missile that brought it down with its pilot, Francis Gary Powers, and revealed to the world the long and highly successful career of the breed.

In the last week, the U–2 again was in the news. The Soviet Union complained that an American-piloted U–2 craft violated the airspace over Sakhalin Island, and the United States promptly acknowledged that a patrol plane blown off course by high winds might have been driven over Soviet territory accidentally, but recovered and returned safely. A few days later, Communist China announced that one of its air force units had shot down a Nationalist Chinese-piloted U–2 over its eastern border.

Each of these three incidents was made the basis for a big propaganda blast. After the Powers flight, Premier Khrushchev torpedoed the Paris summit meeting and withdrew the invitation to President Eisenhower to return his official visit. Moscow refused to accept the State Department explanation of last week's flight over Sakhalin Island and its propaganda tried to drum it up into a big international incident. And the Communist Chinese insist that the plane they brought down was spying for the United States.

President Eisenhower called off the U–2 flights over the Soviet Union and President Kennedy reaffirmed his decision. But Moscow ignores these assurances for its own propaganda purposes. Similarly, the U.S. protestations that it has had no U–2 planes based in Japan for reconnaissance flights over mainland China have been rejected by Peiping.

The fact is that first Moscow and now Peiping have been frustrated by these high altitude flights. Moscow knew about them for 4 years but could not prevent them. Peiping has known for 2 years that the Chinese Nationalists have been flying over the China mainland to sight conditions there firsthand. It was these flights, for instance, that detected the new arms buildup opposite Quemoy and Matsu.

The U–2's are doing a valiant work. Their very effectiveness is what stirs their almost helpless Communist victims to anger.

Summary of 2d Session of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, each year at the close of Congress, I submit a report to the residents of my district. The following is a summary of the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

A significant feature of this session has been the failure of the administration in its effort to gain support for New Frontier legislation in a Congress controlled by the same party. Federal aid to education, medicare, withholding of interest and dividends, a mandatory farm bill, and other similar-type bills were defeated by a Congress composed of 329 Democratic Senators and Representatives and 210 Republican Senators and Representatives.

As in the first session of this Congress, the international situation was the biggest concern to Members of Congress. Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, the wall in Berlin, together have served as the basis for congressional approval of the largest peacetime budget in history and the Presidential authority to call the National Guard and Reserves to active duty in 1961. Increasing international tension was responsible for the House and Senate approval of another resolution in September 1962, authorizing the President to call up 150,000 reservists and to extend the terms of service to those on active duty up to 12 months. A resolution was also passed intended to reassert the principle of the Monroe Doctrine in regard to the establishment of any foreign control or influence in the Western Hemisphere. The resolution further stated that the United States would use force to restrain such penetration, if necessary. The worsening Cuban situation was, of course, the reason for this action. In this area, there has been a bipartisan effort to give the President every opportunity to cope with the international crisis.

Of necessity, I am compiling this report while Congress is still in session. It now appears this session will be one of the longest, if not the longest, in recent times, with only a nominal amount of legislative activity. To date, over 20,000 bills and measures have been introduced in the House and Senate. It has taken some 26,942 pages in the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD to record the proceedings and debates of the Congress, while 20,244 pages were amassed during the first session. Only 552 bills, including private bills, have been enacted into law thus far, 685 bills became law in the 1961 session.

During this session, your Congressman had a 100 percent attendance record for the meetings and conferences of the Small Business Committee. For the Rules and Private Calendar Committees, a 99 percent attendance record was recorded. As ranking minority member of the Private Calendar Committee, I had the responsibility of making certain before final passage that some 400 private bills were in the public interest and did not undermine our internal security. In this connection, it was necessary to personally research and study almost one-half of the bills which came before the three-man committee.

It was my honor to become the second Kansan in history to serve on the important House Rules Committee. Only 5 of the 175 Republicans in the House serve on this committee. Generally, the memebrship of the committee is chosen to represent all areas of the country. The Rules Committee must approve legislation before it is considered by the House.

As an indication of the office operation for the period January 1 to September 1, 1962, a total of almost 18,000 pieces of mail was received.. This included over 6,600 first-class letters from the district. The mailout during this period was about 20,000 pieces, of which 14,450 were first-class letters. In addition, we subscribe to almost 150 newspapers per week from the district to keep informed on Kansas news, and 15 per week from elsewhere. During this Congress, a record number of visitors signed the guest book in room 250 of the Old House Office Building, which is your office in Washington. The guest book in the office shows some 1,285 signatures of Kansans and their friends who stopped to visit or for assistance. We appreciate having visitors and we hope you and your friends will stop by when in Washington.

The following is a brief summary of appropriations and some Federal activity for our district: civil works projects—flood control activity—$24,141,000; soil conservation and ACP work, $2,631,337; military construction, $7,332,000.

One of the most significant activities of your office in Washington is the "Week in Washington," a nonpartisan, educational project for college juniors to learn government firsthand. The program has been in existence for over 3 years, with 24 students participating, from Kansas University, Kansas State University, Washburn University, St. Benedict's College, Mount St. Scholastica College, and St. Mary College. While in Washington, the students visit Congress, committee hearings, both national party headquarters, and historic sites. Appointments are arranged with Members of both political parties. In general, it is our desire to have the students attempt to obtain a broad idea of practical legislative procedure and politics at the national level. Some students who participated were later awarded a Rhodes or Fulbright scholarship, and others Woodrow Wilson fellowships. The total of honor and academic achievements amassed by students at their respective schools is a credit to Kansas institutions. It is gratifying to note that the majority of these students have indicated a desire to continue their education in graduate work in preparation for a teaching career.

During the past year, over 50 young men have competed for appointment to the service academies. Each is given an equal opportunity to compete. The Academic Board at each Academy chooses the best qualified individual. This impartial process of selection is not used by all Members. The young men presently at the Academies, or just graduated, from our district include: West Point, Richard Goldsmith, Topeka; John Byrns, Leavenworth; Peter Linn, Manhattan; John Kozak, Leavenworth. Naval Academy, Edwin Rector, Topeka; William Benson, Topeka; Elroy McAlexander, Mayetta; James Moyer, Hamlin. Air Force Academy, Michael Blaisdell, Topeka; David Roe, Topeka; George Barnes, Corning; Loren Steinbrink, Hiawatha; Leroy Stutz, Effingham; David Nolting, Nortonville; Edward Petersen, Topeka; and Lewis Moore, Wakarusa.

Your Congressman personally reads and answers mail from constituents. A weekly news report is sent to all newspapers in the district. In an effort to learn the opinions of constituents, over 100,000 legislative questionnaires were sent out. A weekly taped radio report is prepared as a public service. A district office in Kansas is maintained while Congress is not in session. An extensive tour of the entire district is made every year, visiting each county at least twice or more depending upon the date of congressional adjournment. Appearances are made before civic and professional organizations to present special legislative reports, when requested.

Here is a listing of some of the bills introduced by your Congressman:

Introduced bill to amend Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax reform for small and independent business—investment credit provision in 1962 tax bill is a partial form of this proposal.

Introduced legislation to extend the conservation reserve of the soil bank for 3 years—incorporated into feed-grain program under name of "diverted acres."

Introduced and testified before Judiciary Committee on a bill to provide for the appointment of a third Federal judge for Kansas—such a provision enacted into public law.

Offered an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act to insure adequacy of the railroad car supply.

Introduced a bill pertaining to the establishment of the Prairie National Park in Kansas. Proposal recommended by National Advisory Committee. Avery's concern is to give Kansas national recognition but to make certain Kansas interests are fully protected.

Proposed amendment to Constitution relative to equal rights for men and women.

Offered an amendment to Packers and Stockyards Act to assist livestock producers for better marketing.

Introduced bill which has passed Congress and enacted into law to assist in sale of surplus property for the benefit of the Potawatomi Indians in Jackson and Brown Counties.

VOTES ON PRINCIPAL BILLS

The following is for your interest and information, showing the votes cast by your Congressman on major legislation considered by the House of Representatives during the second session:

Spoke for and voted for Cuban resolution which warns Russia that the United States will use force if necessary to prevent Communist penetration in Western Hemisphere.

Voted for authorization for procurement of missiles, naval vessels, and aircraft including RS–70 big bombers.

Voted against Kennedy proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Opposed New Frontier version of New Deal WPA, by voting against the $900 million accelerated public works bill which was not in the budget recommendation.

Opposed Kennedy-Freeman farm bill designed to impose rigid controls and assess undue penalties on the farmer.

Opposed backdoor spending provisions for foreign aid program.

Voted against tax bill providing withholding of interest and dividends.

Opposed broad Federal aid to education program providing funds for teachers' salaries and construction of facilities to public, private, and parochial elementary schools.

Supported passage of funds in sum of $1.45 billion for construction and improvement of Army, Navy, and Air Force bases and installations, including family housing units.

Voted for foreign assistance program for Latin America.

Voted against expanding $63.7 million Peace Corps.

Voted for proposal to prohibit in interstate or foreign commerce commodities imported to the United States from Cuba.

Voted in favor of payment of war damage awards to the Philippine Republic.

Supported resolution expressing sense of Congress that Organization of American States reevaluate role of Cuba in inter-American affairs and take such steps necessary for sanctions.

Voted for provision to permit taxpayers who suffered property damage in storm disaster areas to deduct noninsured losses from their income tax.

Supported a bill to permit for 1 year granting of GI insurance to veterans with service-connected disabilities who heretofore failed to exercise eligibility.

Opposed $170 million Fryingpan-Arkansas reclamation project and other projects costing $406 million that will increase agricultural surplus.

Voted for a program of vocational rehabilitation for veterans with service-connected disability serving between World War II and Korean conflict and thereafter.

Supported extension of corporate tax and current schedule of excise taxes on liquor, cigarettes, and so forth, and repeals 10 percent levy on rail and bus fares.

Supported proposal raising temporary debt limit to accommodate defense cost.

Voted for increase on postal rates to achieve sound Post Office Department fiscal operations.

Supported increased lending authority of Small Business Administration for business and disaster loans.

Voted for bill requiring public disclosure of identical bids on Government contracts.

Voted for bill to make permanent a provision of the Soil Bank Act permitting harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage under disaster conditions.

Supported increase in rates of compensation for service-connected disabled veterans.

Supported proposal to curb the usage of the mails for the distribution of Communist propaganda.

Voted against taxpayer funds being spent for subsidized electric power for preferential areas—Hanford project.

Voted for extension of direct housing loan program for veterans.

During adjournment, I will be traveling in all the counties that make up the new Second District. The new area contains the following counties: Atchison, Brown, Clay, Doniphan, Geary, Jackson, Leavenworth, Marshall, Nemaha, Pottawatomie, Riley, Shawnee, Wabaunsee, Washington, and the County of Wyandotte outside of city limits of Kansas City, Kan.

My aim will be to meet with as many people as possible in each county. While your office in Washington will be open as usual to take care of your inquiries and requests, in adidtion for your service, we will have a district office in the Hotel Jayhawk in Topeka. I hope you will contact me at any time if you feel we can be of assistance. It is no imposition or bother; our office is organized with the aim of serving and working for you.

Commonsense Approach to Cuba and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the editorial section of last night's Washington Evening Star contained two such thoughtful treatments of the Cuban situation that I am moved to include both for the RECORD. These articles, I believe, summarize a growing call for a commonsense approach to not only Cuba, but our foreign aid program and our relations with those nations which call themselves our allies.

The editorials follow:

"CUBA IS AN AMERICAN PROBLEM"—NATIONS' ARGUMENT AGAINST BLOCKADE CRITICIZED AS FAULTY NEUTRALISM

(By David Lawrence)

Maybe it will be a little easier now for President Kennedy to understand why there's so much opposition in Congress to the foreign-aid bill.

Maybe it will be easier for the British Government to understand a demand that may come some day from the American people that American troops and also financial aid be withdrawn from Europe.

For no less a person than the member of the British Cabinet who heads up the Treasury Department in London has just told an American audience on television that Cuba is "essentially an American problem," and hence Britain couldn't pledge support for an economic blockade. The Foreign Minister of Norway also told Secretary of State Rusk that Cuba is "an American problem."

But supposing the United States had said to the world that Vietnam was "essentially an Asian problem?" Supposing that President Eisenhower, instead of landing marines in Lebanon, had said the Soviet aggression in that area was "essentially a Middle East problem?" And supposing President Kennedy had said in recent months that the fate of Berlin was "essentially a European problem?" What would have been the reaction then in London and in other European capitals?

Cuba is not "an American problem." It is a world problem, because Soviet aggression recognizes no geographical limits. The military and economic sinews of Castro's government are being provided today by the Soviet Union. The United States rightly seeks to impose an economic blockade on Cuba. Secretary Rusk is meeting with Foreign Ministers of various countries this week to persuade them to help by requiring their ships not to cary cargoes to Cuba. But even Canada—our next-door neighbor—has been hesitant to go along.

Naturally, the businessmen in these countries are opposed to any embargo on trade with Cuba. Will material interests and selfishness, however, prevail against a policy of checkmating the Soviet Union's aggression? Failure of the Western countries to work together in the 1930's caused the collapse of the economic blockade against Mussolini imposed by the League of Nations. World War II came as a result of the Nazi belief in the apparent disunity on our side.

It already is being argued by some governments that their ships are under long-term charter and can't be persuaded to withhold their transportation facilities. But in a matter of preserving the peace of the world, the larger interest should, of course, prevail. If it doesn't, will not public opinion in the United States tend to be less concerned about threats by the Soviet Union to European countries?

The whole future of foreign aid, moreover, will be dealt a body blow if the principal nations of the world continue to evade their own obligation to help carry the financial burden of America's troops in Europe and in other countries. The taxpayers of the United States will not long support such a one-sided arrangement. Representative OTTO PASSMAN, of Louisiana, Democrat, who has led the fight against the foreign-aid bill and succeeded in lopping off a sizable amount from it in the House at this session, will gain many more supporters next year if the European governments ignore Soviet military aggression in this hemisphere and continue to insist that the United States should pay most of the cost of its military forces assembled to check Soviet aggression in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Also, the U.S. Government has just dramatically come to the rescue of the United Nations by voting a $100-million purchase of bonds to pay the expenses of U.N. armies in Africa. The President of the United States didn't say that the Congo mess was essentially an African problem.

Maybe the charitable explanation of all this is that neither the newspapers of Europe nor the American Ambassadors there have conveyed the whole story of how the people of this country really feel about the Soviet infiltration and military buildup in Cuba. One reason for this may be because President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk have maintained a mistaken policy of silence. They haven't said a word publicly to the Government of the Soviet Union to protest what it has done in Cuba. The reported explanation is that the advisers of Messrs. Kennedy and Rusk have insisted that to do so would "increase tensions" over Berlin. But tensions have increased now not only over Berlin but over Cuba. The West gives the impression of disunity, and the U.S. Government gives the impression of timidity if not of fear to notify the Soviet Union that it has deliberately interfered in the Western Hemisphere and has assisted a dictatorship to continue to deprive the Cuban people of their sovereign rights.

A real opportunity has been missed by the Kennedy administration to make it clear everywhere that what has happened in Cuba in the last 2 years is a world problem, and that the aggression by the Soviets must be checked by the free world.

For this is no time for neutralism either by the smaller countries or by the larger nations that regularly receive financial or economic or military aid from the taxpayers of the United States.

ALLIES ISOLATING UNITED STATES OVER CUBA: AMERICA'S EUROPEAN AND LATIN FRIENDS ARE EXPECTED TO BE HURT MOST BY IT

(By William S. White)

A new and involuntary form of creeping isolationism is arising in the free world. This is a gathering spiritual isolation of the United States from most of its Western Allies and most of Latin America in the matter of Castro Cuba.

This country, in effect is not only being forced to stand substantially alone in dealing with the Soviet Union's military penetration of this hemisphere in Cuba. We are also being lectured in a rather superior tone by our Allies about the foolishness of becoming "too excited" about Cuba. Much of Western Europe thinks it knows more than we do about the degree of danger in our own area.

Much of Latin America will not see the danger at all—not yet. It is in the comfortable position of being able to refuse any real cooperation with us in full awareness that when attempts are made to export a bit of Sovietization to its own soil we shall move in as protectors.

The plain truth is that the United States has never been put in a more galling position. And even some of our good friends, human nature being what it is, are not too unhappy at seeing the powerful American eagle's tail feathers being pulled. We are not, however, the ones who will be most hurt in the end by this, our involuntary isolation. We can take care of ourselves in this hemisphere. Indeed, long since we could have done so. We would have tossed Castroism out of Cuba as a tin of annoying rubbish from our backyard but for our desire to avoid Allied criticism and anguished howls of "intervention" from the same Latin American nations we are safeguarding from the very real "intervention" of the Soviet Union.

The true sufferers, unless soon our Western Allied friends and our Latin neighbors decide to give us at least a minimum cooperation,

will be those very Western Allies, those very Latin neighbors.

The British, the Norwegians and others; who thus far refuse the patiently determined appeals of Secretary of State Rusk to halt shipping to Cuba, are giving many fine legalisms for withholding even this tepid act of support. After all, they say, nobody is at war with Cuba; free trade is free trade, and so on. But they can awake one day to find that in maintaining their right to this tinpot trade with Castro they have, so to speak, lost a much bigger customer, the basic goodwill of the people of the United States.

The Latin Americans, in hanging back from any joint plan genuinely to seal off Cuba in this hemisphere, can awake and find they cannot forever play both sides. The multi-billion-dollar American aid in the Alliance for Progress does not come from the pockets of the reformist types who are so oddly understanding of Latin-American hemming and hawing. It comes from the American people, through the American Congress. And the American Congress already is dangerously fed up with the elegant sophistries of can't-do Allies and Latin neighbors. Already, foreign aid in any and every form is in trouble at the Capitol. The time may come when it is in deep and irreparable trouble.

What profit to our Allies and Latin neighbors if they win their little argument about precedents and all that, but really do force us really to go it alone?

They would all be wise to make some effort better to understand the actual mood of Congress and country. Cuba may be trivial to them. But to Congress and country it is far from that; and the present mood of bewildered anger can, without much more provocation, become ugly indeed, from their viewpoint.

USO Squadron Adoption Program, Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRAHAM PURCELL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, Sheppard Air Force Base is located in my congressional district at Wichita Falls, Tex., and I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress and to the citizens of the United States an interesting program which has been developed by the squadron adoption plan. I particularly bring this to your attention because of the unusual relationship that exists between the military citizens of Sheppard Air Force Base and the civilian citizens of our community. Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Moore, commander, at Sheppard Air Force Base, has found that through the combined effort of the civic organizations and the military personnel of the Wichita Falls area, it has enhanced the desirability of being connected with that particular base and is thus reflected in the high morale of the Air Force personnel.

The USO squadron adoption program is as follows:

USO SQUADRON ADOPTION PROGRAM, WICHITA FALLS, TEX., SERVING SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE

In August 1962, the 26th Sheppard Air Force Base Squadron was adopted by the Hub, S. & Q. Clothiers, of Wichita Falls, Tex. This squadron was the newly organized 3775th School Squadron.

Since its inception in 1959, 26 Wichita Falls business and civic organizations have become sponsors for Sheppard squadrons ranging from a small weather detachment group adopted by the First State Bank to the entire SAC wing, adopted by the four ranchers: W. T. Waggoner Ranch, Bridwell Hereford Ranch, T-Bone Ranch and Lake Creek Ranch.

In April of 1959, the Wichita Falls Rotary Club extended a friendly hand to one of the squadrons at Sheppard Air Force Base in the first of a series of efforts to bring Sheppard airmen more into the life of the community of Wichita Falls, and to acquaint the citizens of the city with their military neighbors. The program, sparked by the Wichita Falls USO, was conceived and promoted by Col. Floyd Taylor, retired, past chairman of the area USO Committee and still active in USO programs. Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Moore, then brigadier general, commanding officer at Sheppard Air Force Base was most cooperative on behalf of the squadron adoption concept and recognized it as an excellent means to promote good public relations between the community and the base. On numerous occasions General Moore and his staff have cited the squadron adoption program for its favorable impact upon the personnel at the base.

Colonel Taylor's plan is this: Find the right business or civic group in the community for the right squadron on base. In adopting a squadron, leaders of the sponsoring organization and the squadron exchange visits to determine the nature of the squadron and of the organization. The visits are in themselves a type of indoctrination for members of each group since they take place both in town and on base. These informal meetings, where military leaders explain the mission of the squadron and the business people tell of their group and of the community, usually reveal many common interests.

These exchanges soon result in the development and promotion of such activities as sightseeing trips, concerts, rodeos, football games, golf and bowling tournaments, special social and holiday events, personal remembrances of birthdays, sickness, weddings, and even death.

An interesting development to come out of the squadron adoption plan is the "Plant a tree at SAFB." Nearly 1,000 trees have been contributed by civilian and military donors in this plan developed by a former promotion manager of the Wichita Falls Times Publishing Co. which sponsors the 3770th School Squadron. The campaign was conducted in 1961 and 1962.

Other sponsors of squadrons than those previously mentioned are: The Optimist Club, Lions Club, Parker Square State Bank, First Wichita National Bank, University Kiwanis Club, Wichita Falls Kiwanis Club, City National Bank, junior chamber of commerce, Perkins-Timberlake Co., Wichita County Bar Association, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Whites Stores, Inc., Southwest Rotary Club, Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., Texas Electric Service Co., McClurkan's Department Store, Business and Professional Women's Club (adopted the WAF squadron), Fedway Department Store, KSYD-TV channel 6, Marchman Hotel, and Robert Seabury Homes.

Out of the squadron adoption plan has developed a community-base relationship without equal. The base is a positive and obvious part of the Wichita Falls community. There was a need to find a means for linking these two separates together and Colonel Taylor's plan and diligent supervision brought it about.

The success of the program, according to General Moore, has made Sheppard Air Base one of the most desired duty posts as determined by Air Force personnel.

Needless War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a hurried trip to the Eighth District of Indiana, where I had the privilege of meeting with many of my constituents. One of the matters uppermost in many of their minds is that of Cuba.

I believe that this administration and the President of the United States are following the right course in dealing with Castro and his brand of communism. There are some who advocate invasion of the island. They are making irresponsible statements and would not be the ones who would have to be in the landing parties crossing the Cuban beaches. The United States is attempting to isolate Cuba from the rest of the free world. The passage of the Cuban resolution by the Congress strengthens the position of the President and shows the world that we, as a nation, are solidly behind him. Force should be the last resort. There are other means which can be and are being used by the United States.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the September 23 issue of the Evansville Sunday Courier & Press. It is right to the point and deserving of attention:

NEEDLESS WAR

"Do something about Cuba," is an old cry. In 1898 it got us into war with Spain, a war later found to have been totally unnecessary. That episode of history is well worth bearing in mind these days.

Stories of Spanish outrages in her Cuban colony had inflamed Americans. President McKinley demanded that Spain revoke her concentration camps for Cuban rebels. Spain agreed, and was also willing to grant an armistice to the Cubans. Our minister to Spain reported that before August 1 he expected to get Spanish acceptance of any terms the rebels might ask, even independence or the cession of the island to the United States.

What more could we want? Yet "do something" Senators and newspapers had so worked up public opinion and Congress that these wanted war at all costs. President McKinley, who did not want war, could have stood in the way. His rugged predecessor, Grover Cleveland, probably would have done so. McKinley, lacking Cleveland's iron, gave way and the clamorous had their war.

The war was costly in money and in lives, the latter mostly by disease in unsanitary

camps. We also got the Philippines, which we did not want, and which immediately engaged us in a 3-year guerrilla war. Our possession of the Philippines was one reason for Pearl Harbor.

The lesson of 1898 is pertinent in 1962. "Do something" can be a costly cry, when those who utter it have no responsibility for what happens afterward.

Amendment to the Foreign Aid Bill That Would Deny U.S. Aid to Any Country Whose Ships Have Carried Arms or Strategic Materials to Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the President of the United States by Mr. J. M. Calhoon, secretary-treasurer of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association:

NATIONAL MARINE ENGINEERS' BENEFICIAL ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., September 24, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: According to press reports, the House of Representatives has approved an amendment to the foreign aid bill that would deny U.S. aid to any country whose ships have carried arms or strategic materials to Cuba. We endorse Representative PELLY'S amendment and urge the administration to support it in the Senate.

We also endorse the amendment submitted by Representative BONNER that would ban any ship carrying war supplies or economic goods to Cuba from entering a U.S. port to pick up foreign aid cargo.

Mr. Speaker, the correct amendment to section 107 is as follows: On page 6, after the comma in line 17, insert the following: "or for any expenses of transportation, directly or indirectly, by merchant marine ships of any nation whose ships are used to transport any military or economic supplies to that regime,".

We believe that permitting these ships to carry our aid cargo represents the use of American foreign aid dollars to subsidize Communist shipping, and that the use of foreign ships in the carriage of Communist cargo releases Russian ships and permits them to concentrate on more strategic objectives. We can't understand why foreign ships that transport cargo for our enemies and jeopardize our security and the stability of Latin America should be rewarded by the U.S. Government with cargoes financed by American taxpayers.

We also urge you to support the investigation of shipping to Cuba that was launched over the past weekend by Senator MAGNUSON. We believe it is vital to ascertain which ships have been trading with Cuba and to reevaluate our unhealthy dependence on vessels sailing under runaway flags that are presumably under "effective American control." We hope that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Maritime Administration will give Senator MAGNUSON their fullest cooperation.

Even if the Bonner amendment should be removed from the foreign aid bill in conference, we urge you to enforce the principle by Presidential directive. According to press reports, between 50 and 60 ships, including vessels flying the British, West German, Italian, Greek, Yugoslav, and Liberian flags have traded with Cuba recently, and at least one Yugoslav ship, the *M. V. Drzic*, is scheduled to load Government-financed foreign aid cargo in Houston on September 28. An unidentified German ship that was in Cuba recently also is bound for Corpus Christi to load aid cargo. We urge you to direct the Department of Agriculture to disapprove these charters, and any future charters for ships that carry military supplies or economic goods, other than drugs or medicines, to Cuba.

We understand documented information has been sent to you identifying the Yugoslav ship SS *Mjlet*, the Greek ship SS *Paean* and the Liberian-flag ship SS *Galicia* as recipients of American aid cargo despite the fact that they have been trading with Cuba, and the Greek ship SS *Pegasus* as another despite the fact that it has been trading with Communist China. Since the Department of Agriculture admittedly does not check to see whether foreign ships have been trading with Cuba or other Communist enemies of the United States when it assigns lucrative aid cargo to them, it is quite certain that other ships that have taken part in the Communist buildup in Cuba will be approved for American aid cargo unless a specific directive is issued banning them from our aid program.

While there is justifiable concern now over the use of NATO and runaway-flag ships in the Cuban trade, we should not overlook the extensive use of vessels registered under these flags in the Communist oil trade, a practice that has contributed to the Soviet economic offensive against the free world. The names and flags of registry of 145 ships that have sailed alternately in the Communist and the American oil import trades was reported to the President's Petroleum Study Committee by the American Maritime Association last April, along with the suggestion that these ships should be barred from carrying American oil imports. Nothing has been done yet to implement this proposal.

Since petroleum is a strategic commodity, it would seem to be in our interest to deny the Communists the use of free world tankers to carry oil, where possible. We suggest that a big step toward accomplishing this objective can be taken by blacklisting from the carriage of American oil imports all foreign tankers that have participated in the Communist oil trade.

The ships used in the oil import program are chartered by American oil companies with import rights. These include companies that have lost their holdings in Cuba and others whose rates and sales are threatened by Communist price cutting. Interestingly enough, though, the owners of some of the runaway-flag ships, like *Niarchos*, are operators who have built their vessels because they have been guaranteed import cargo by American oil companies.

We also wish to call your attention to the fact that countries receiving the U.S. aid, as well as several NATO countries, are building ships for the Soviet Union, thereby freeing Russian shipyards to construct submarines and other warships. According to the reliable maritime industry publication Marine Engineering/Log, 27 tankers, 4 freighters, and 6 miscellaneous vessels were being built or were on order for Russia on March 1, 1962. Of these, Yugoslavia had contracted to build 14 tankers, Japan 6, Italy 6, and Sweden 1; Denmark had contracted to build 3 freighters and Japan 1; Denmark had contracted to build 4 miscellaneous vessels and West Germany 2. Since the Marine Engineering/Log survey appeared, the Soviet news agency Tass reported that Russia has signed a contract to build nine more tankers and five freighters in Yugoslav yards. According to recent press reports, Japan has signed a contract to construct another $96 million worth of Soviet vessels—five 12,000-deadweight-ton freighters and twelve 35,000-deadweight-ton tankers.

The United States wisely prohibits the export of strategic materials to the Communist bloc. Many of our NATO allies observe a similar policy. Tanker tonnage, in our opinion, is as important strategically as many items on the prohibited list. In light of the danger to our security resulting from the construction of Soviet tankers in free world yards, we urge you to apply economic pressure on any country that accepts contracts to build Soviet merchant ships, including the suspension of U.S. economic aid, if necessary, to enforce this program.

The betrayal of our interests in Cuba by foreign shipowners casts new doubt on the wisdom of depending on runaway-flag ships for our security. While our military planners undoubtedly feel that if they can't have American-manned tonnage, they'll have to make do with American-owned runaway ships, there is reason to believe that some of those advising our Government to rely on flag-of-convenience vessels may have been motivated by the desire for personal profit, rather than by the best interests of the United States.

In this connection, we believe that a careful review of the past associations of some persons now holding high Government office will show active participation in runaway-flag operations, a fact that we believe to constitute a serious conflict of interest.

The use of NATO and runaway-flag ships for the Communist buildup in Cuba, the failure of our foreign allies and friends to stop this trade, and the construction in Italian and Japanese yards of Communist merchant ships, reinforces our conviction that when the chips are down, the only shipping the United States can depend on is the American merchant marine.

Policies that encourage the development of foreign fleets while restricting the development of American shipping is not, in our opinion, in the interest of the United States.

We therefore urge you to review our unfortunate dependence on runaway-flag shipping, the misadministration of the cargo preference laws, and the State Department's apparent partiality to foreign shipping at the expense of American-flag operations, and to order changes in existing policies that will guarantee the development of a strong American-flag merchant fleet.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. CALHOON,
Secretary-Treasurer, National MEBA.

NOTE.—The context of the legislation amended by Mr. BONNER in section 107 is as follows: "None of the funds in this title shall be available for assistance to any country, the government of which sells arms, ammunition, or implements of war to the Castro regime, or which furnishes, by grant or loan, any military or economic aid to that regime, or for any expenses of transportation directly or indirectly by merchant ships of any nation whose ships are used to transport any military or economic supplies to that regime.

Alliance for Progress Is On the Move in Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call to the attention of my colleagues an article from the Miami Herald under the date of September 8, 1962, which describes the soundly conceived and well-coordinated efforts of a group of Miamians to get the Alliance for Progress program underway in Panama.

The article follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Sept. 8, 1962]

IT TAKES PEOPLE, NOT JUST DOLLARS—MIAMI TEAMWORK GIVES ALIANZA A PUSH

(By Bert Collier)

The Alliance for Progress is not merely dollars; it is people.

This is the proposition that guides a team of North Americans, nearly all of them Miamians, in getting the Alliance on the road to enthusiastic acceptance in Panama.

The team is headed by Norman Giller, Miami Beach architect appointed by the State Department last February, to direct a large segment of the Alliance program in Panama—the construction of schools, medical clinics and two major hospitals.

In Mr. Giller's mind, this was not to be a question of finding sites, drawing plans, letting contracts and making sure that specifications were met. The Alliance has a broader perspective than blueprints.

"We felt that perhaps our services might provide a little light in the guidance and development of the people of this country," he says.

"The schools and hospitals we had been commissioned to design and supervise were something that was going to represent the people. We were not building them as monuments of brick and mortar. To build a building that doesnt' live is useless and a waste of money."

Before a plan was made or a drawing board bought, Mr. Giller and his 25 bilingual associates set out to know Panama and Panamanians. They have traveled hundreds of miles over some of the roughest country on earth—by jeep, horseback, motorboat, Indian canoe and on foot through the jungles. They have talked to hundreds from President Roberto Chiari to simple peasants and Indians in remote villages.

The Alliance program that is taking shape is a synthesis of the needs discovered in these intimate contacts.

Mr. Giller and the resident project manager, Sven Speyer of Coral Gables, visited one village in western Panama. "Word had gotten around that the Alliance people were coming," said Giller, "and it wasn't the written word. An Indian teacher had come down from the hills, a 2-day walk. He had heard we had something to do with helping the schools.

"He said the people had builit a hut for a school and he was trying to teach the children, but had no books, no paper, no pencils."

Fortunately the Alliance had contributed 200,000 schoolbooks to Panama and a supply was on hand in the office of the district school superintendent. The Indian departed with a knapsack full of supplies.

The Miamians inspected a proposed school site 100 miles outside Panama City. "For the last 40 miles the jungle was so thick we went by horseback," said Giller. "When we arrived, we were greeted by a large group of townspeople. They had formed an 'Asociacion de Padres de Familias,' a sort of jungle PTA. They had recruited volunteers to cut down trees so that trucks could bring building materials to the site."

At another village where the Alliance people arrived on July 3, they found the teacher displaying the American flag and instructing her small charges in the meaning of July Fourth in the United States.

In yet another the townspeople declared a holiday and halted all activity so they could properly welcome "Los hombres de Alianza Para El-Progreso."

As a result of all this grassroots preparation, the program is rapidly taking form. Alliance funds will build about 60 schools, Panama furnishing the land, preliminary site preparation and some materials.

There soon will be medical facilities, ranging from small clinics where a nurse or medical aid can "live in" and supervise patients in a few beds, to large regional hospitals and health centers specializing in maternal and child care. (Some parts of Panama have infant mortality rates as high as 50 percent.)

There will be agricultural institutes where peasants may learn improved farming methods.

There are blueprints for these buildings now, and architectural renderings. The trucks are beginning to roll and the sound of the bulldozer is heard in the Panama back country. In the minds of the people it is associated with the Alianza, a means of helping them to a better life. The progress in Panama is making this a pilot program for other Latin countries.

"This project is so vast," says Mr. Giller, "that it takes a large amount of planning before it can be pulled together and work can begin.

"But in Panama it is beginning to move so that the ordinary citizen can see things happening in his village and on his street.

"This is when the Alliance will begin to bear fruit, when people can visualize its meaning in terms of what is happening to them."

Arab League Discriminates Against American Entertainer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the September 26 issue of Variety contains an article relating to the Arab League's ban on the records and films of Frank Sinatra. I am compelled to protest the completely unwarranted action of the League in singling out for abuse and damage a prominent American citizen whose only objective was to help needy children.

The news article follows:

[From Variety, Sept. 26, 1962]

SINATRA DISAPPOINTED HE MIGHT BE PENALIZED FOR AIDING CHILDREN

Following a report that the Arab League has banned Frank Sinatra's films and disks in Arab countries because of his activities in Israel during a recent world tour, Sinatra yesterday issued the following statement.

"If it is true, I am deeply disappointed that statesmen anywhere would condemn anyone for aiding children of whatever faith or origin.

"In Israel, my recent tour there was to raise money for an interfaith youth center in Nazareth, a primarily Arab center, where the recipients will be primarily Arab children.

"My world tour, which included Israel, was dedicated to benefiting children of all faiths. I had hoped that adults everywhere had one thing in common—a love for all children."

Sinatra visited Israel during April, May, and June of the tour last year at his own expense. He raised more than $2 million in benefit performances.

Scholarly Findings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the House Armed Services Subcommittee No. 3 headed by the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT rendered a report on its study of the military Reserve posture. This outstanding work was prepared after lengthy and detailed hearings which uncovered deficiencies in the Reserve program. Instead of agreeing to a reduction in strength of the Reserves, as the Pentagon recommended, the subcommittee urged in the national interest that the Department of Defense correct the deficiencies in the program. I believe with the members of the committee that the Reserves should be kept at full strength because of the critical world situation which finds Berlin a powder keg and the Communists in Cuba only 90 miles from my home State. In connection with the Hébert study, the Reserve Officers Association, the No. 1 supporter of the Reserves, carries in its monthly magazine, The Officer, for October the following editorial which praises the honesty and intelligence of the report:

SCHOLARLY FINDINGS

Several rather shrill editorials indorsing the Reserve cutback program offered by Secretary McNamara strengthen us in our conviction that the scholarly and fully documented report of the Hébert committee is a national defense epic.

From the beginning we were convinced that Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, whose record reveals him as a legislator equipped by nature, training and inclination to be fully objective and independent, would produce a factual study.

Mr. HÉBERT represents an intelligent constituency and he has so well established himself politically that he needed to court or appease neither voters nor the party leaders. He had experience on his side, and his long service as a newspaperman equipped him peculiarly to cope with the propaganda with which every critic of the great and would-be great in Washintgon is usually deluged.

Furthermore, Mr. HÉBERT had available to him for sage counsel the House's one real expert in military legislation, Representative CARL VINSON who for 48 years has sat on the committees dealing with the military and who, it is said, "has forgotten more about the military than most people learn in a lifetime." Of course, Mr. VINSON has not forgotten what he has learned; his remarkable memory is favorably comparable

to Secretary McNamara's ability to memorize the military dictionary which has enabled him to be so glib before congressional committees.

So, the 40-page report made excellent reading, not only because of its polished phrases but also because it packed in a few words a storehouse of information and wise counsel.

Elsewhere in this issue of The Officer is a fairly complete summary of this report. We have made copies of it available to key ROA officers, we have quoted generously from it in the newsletter.

We would not say the report is perfect. What we do believe is that it is thoroughly honest, its aim is to serve the national interest, and its findings are based upon careful analysis of many thousands of words of testimony, much of which is conflicting and a considerable portion of which was submitted under duress.

Mr. HÉBERT, all the careful and highly motivated members of his committee, and his talented and conscientious staff have rendered a great public service.

Editorials in a few newspapers attacking the committee and attempting to browbeat the committee for arriving at conclusions which were inescapable reflect upon the newspapers, and not upon Mr. HÉBERT and the committee. We are proud that, as spokesman for the Reserve, we were selected as targets by these editorial distortions along with Mr. VINSON and Mr. HÉBERT. ROA, like these statesmen, is too well known for its 49 years of service to national defense to quail before such would-be poison penmen.

Association for Mentally Ill Children in Manhattan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the distinguished work of the Association for Mentally Ill Children in Manhattan. Since the association's creation in 1961, it has made great strides toward meeting the critical problem of education and therapy services for mentally ill children. I am privileged to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement of purpose by the association.

ASSOCIATION FOR MENTALLY ILL CHILDREN IN MANHATTAN

The Association for Mentally Ill Children in Manhattan (AMIC) was formed in 1961 by a group of parents and concerned citizens. It grew out of an urgent need to furnish educational and therapeutic services for youngsters diagnosed as mentally ill. The public schools offer special classes for the deaf, blind, retarded and crippled but nothing for the seriously disturbed child. Special education is expensive, and there are relatively few teachers trained in this demanding field. Furthermore, the discovery that mentally ill children can be helped to useful lives through education is comparatively recent. Parents, heartbroken at the realization that their child is "different" are reduced to despair when they try to find help for their child and confront only a series of blank walls. Ultimately, they are faced with a cruel decision: to commit their child to a State hospital or to hide him at home where his presence disrupts the life of the family and often, the neighborhood. Wealthy parents have an additional alternative: expensive residential schooling.

The group who founded AMIC hopes to open a wider door. They believe that most mentally ill children can be kept at home in a natural and loving environment if there is a school where the children can spend a large part of each day under trained supervision. The idea is not without solid basis. The league school in Brooklyn, N.Y., under Dr. Carl Fenichel has been operating successfully on this premise for 9 years. They opened their school with 2 children and now have 50.

AMIC further believes that parents need help. When they first hear the discouraging diagnosis, they need to be reassured that they are not alone and that mental illness is not a private shame. They need guidance to the best sources of help for their child. They need the mutual support and helpful perspective that can be gained from other parents with similar problems. They need professional counsel to gain understanding of their child.

In March 1962, the first phase of a constructive program began. Three schizophrenic children were admitted to AMIC's Manhattan school. Housed rent free in the Madison Square Church House at 432 Third Avenue, the school has use of two classrooms, a kitchen-dining room, gymnasium and roof playground. The children are in attendance 5 days a week from 9 to 3. Professional supervision comes from the league school. There is one fully trained teacher for each three children and a skilled volunteer to assist her. In addition to a program of academic subjects, the pupils have art, music and dance. They take field trips, which beyond enlarging their horizons, help them to independence in making their way about the city. Although the program is structured (these children seem most secure when they can count on a certain event taking place at a certain time), it is flexible enough to nurture the individual needs of the child.

Education such as this is expensive: $3,000 a year per child. It is not as costly, however, as institutionalized care, and the prospects for the child one day becoming self-sustaining are greater than if he were uprooted from family and community. Very few families can afford to pay the actual cost of educating their child. Tuition at the Manhattan School is charged on a sliding scale according to ability to pay. The deficit is met by funds raised by AMIC.

AMIC employs no professionals other than the school staff. Volunteers do the fund raising, make classroom equipment, and do the clerical work. Contributions, therefore, go directly to services. The school is prepared to enlarge as quickly as it has funds to do so. The association holds regular meetings where parents and friends can come together and learn from experts in the disciplines of psychiatry and education.

AMIC is confident that eventually the responsibility for educating all its children will be undertaken by the State. In the interim, AMIC wants to fill the gap. Too many young people may be lost if we postpone their schooling any longer. A program such as ours which puts the needs of individual children above the requirements of a specific research project too often holds little appeal for foundations; to date, no substantial grants have come our way. We are convinced, however, that there is much to be learned from and about these children in everyday confrontation. We know that for the families we serve, we are replacing despair with hope. Their children are being given the knowledge and courage to face a world from which they had turned away.

Timely Views and Ideas on Freedom and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert several articles which convey many good thoughts about the American people, their great heritage of freedom, and some ideas about combating communism. These articles were written over the past year by Mr. Fred A. Orleans, of San Antonio, Tex., well-known as an author, international lawyer, and authority on Latin America. While I do not subscribe to all the views expressed by the author, he has a keen perception of the subject matter and his ideas are very timely.

The articles are as follows:

OUR NATIONAL HERITAGE

(By Fred A. Orleans)

For many years the people of the United States have been continuously reminded of their obligations to other people. The majority of the people of our country have developed a guilt complex because our Nation has been more prosperous than many others and because our people live better than those in the underdeveloped nations. We have reached a period in history when the people of the United States must start thinking about the obligations of their Nation to them first and foremost and to the rest of the world only if we are sufficiently prosperous to afford the luxury of helping others. The ever increasing trend toward our Government attempting to take care of everybody is one that must be stopped if our Nation is to survive and continue to grow and prosper.

When we look back to the origin of our country, we find that many of our ancestors left Europe to avoid military conscription; to remove themselves from the threat of debtor's prison; to get away from a continent that was continuously involved in wars and to get away from nations who were more and more becoming entangled in unworkable alliances. Our ancestors came to America seeking freedom and succeeding generations have enjoyed a freedom unmatched in the annals of history. Unfortunately, in this great land of ours, we appear to be reverting to those conditions which originally brought about the departure of our forefathers from Europe.

It must be acknowledged that we in the United States are presently enjoying a much higher standard of living than any people in the history of mankind. This standard of living was not given to us as a gift, but was attained by hard work of those generations who fought and struggled and died to establish and make the system of private enterprise, which we now enjoy, a great success.

Today we are enjoying the fruits of the labor of those who came before us and unless we reassert our support for the economic system which has made our present high standard of living possible, we can lose what we have and what our forefathers struggled so hard to attain and pass on to us.

[From the Past Commander]

YOUR OPINION MUST COUNT

(By Fred A. Orleans)

When the United States was still a very young country, it possessed a vigor which

is lacking today and that vigor stemmed from the active participation of the average citizen in the affairs of government through standing up at a town hall meeting and expressing his point of view.

This viewpoint, if it represented that of the majority, would influence local affairs and if expressed by enough people would influence national and international policies of our country.

Times have changed and too many Americans assume that their views do not count and take the attitude that national and international policy formulation should be left entirely to the experts in Washington.

This is an incorrect assumption since the views of individual Americans, if loudly and forcibly expressed, can still affect the national and international policies of the United States.

Those in public office, whether elected or appointed, cannot arbitrarily on their own dictate the policies of the United States, since the foundation of U.S. Government policies must come from the American people.

PEOPLE SHOULD BE INFORMED

It is against the interest of a dictatorship to keep its people informed, but it is essential for a democratic form of government to keep the people fully informed through adequate understanding of all issues confronting a nation.

Only through widespread, intelligent understanding of the major domestic and foreign policies of the United States can there be solid and continuing support for them by the people of this country.

The lack of interest by many citizens in foreign and domestic policies of the United States is extremely dangerous for the future of our country.

Not only are there those who feel that their opinion does not count since they are not experts, but there are the many who look upon their representatives in Government as being supermen; individuals possessing tremendous ability and understanding, always able to do the right thing.

Too many feel that Government officials are the masters of the people which is a throwback to the divine rule of kings epoch.

As Thomas Jefferson so eloquently stated, "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him?"

OFFICIALS NOT MASTERS

Today the words "kings" can be substituted for "government officials." Too few realize that the government official is not the master of the people, but that the people, in the final analysis are the masters, since it is their informed vote which puts the government official into office or takes him out.

Those in government are supposed to reflect the will of the people and if they do not do so, it is for the people to indicate their displeasure by removing the offending official.

The people cannot afford to be apathetic at this time and must take a dominating interest in the policies of our country, both national and international since the ultimate responsibility of whether the United States of America survives as a democracy is in the people.

In the blind adherence to the dictates of elected government officials, the people of the United States seem to have forgotten that people came first—not governments, and that the rights with which the people are endowed do not originate from government since only the people are endowed with these rights and they, in turn, endow the government with certain rights.

PEOPLE MUST BE ALERT

Thomas Jefferson wisely foresaw the consequences of the people losing interest in their governing processes carried on by those they elect to public office when he stated that if once people became inattentive to the public affairs, all in power would become wolves since experience has shown that even under the best forms of government, those entrusted with power can in time, and by slow operations, pervert it into tyranny.

Jefferson felt deep distrust of any government whatever that attempted to impose itself between men and the management of their own affairs since the freedom of the individual is always a possession wrested from government, but unceasingly threatened by it.

Today, when the utopian idealists, who counsel our Government, dream of the perfect government, it can be stated with great firmness that such a form of government would be a superfluous.

Jefferson believed that the besetting sin of most governments which endeavor to be good is that they attempt too many things the people should do for themselves since the highest duty of government is to keep the road unobstructed so that each man can make his own way for himself.

[From the Past Commander]

THE REALM OF IDEAS

(By Fred A. Orleans)

Perhaps the most potent weapon of all is ideas. It is amazing how the ideas of one man keeps coming back to influence our lives without our being conscious of this phenomena. After 2,000 years, Plato's "Republic" is a potent idea. It is not difficult to draw an analogy between the "Republic" and what is happening in the world today. In his book, Plato sought the principles of social justice and accomplished this by dividing human beings thusly: the workers (masses) who supplied material needs; the guardians or warriors (soldiers) who protected the state; and the rulers, preferably philosophers (intellectuals) who directed political life. Plato sought to promote unity among the rulers and guardians who were a minority in the population, while permitting strife and discord to continue among the lower or working classes (masses) so that they would never be able to unite and overthrow the ruling minority.

The "Republic" has been called the first great utopia in human literature and the social proposals contained therein were reserved for the upper classes of guardians and rulers. Karl Marx, in his equally famous book "The Communist Manifesto" written in 1848, in direct opposition of the "Republic," set up social proposals for the masses (proletariat).

Here, then, are two different philosophies of social justice, both theoretical when written—one shelved as being too advanced; the other put into practice by the Soviet Union. However, in practice, the social principles of communism fall short of the theoretical principles and what is beginning to emerge is Plato's principles. There now appears, with no pretense, the ruling class, in the form of the Politburo in Russia; the various dictators and their underlings in the satellite countries; the armies who are sustaining the rulers; and the masses.

Plato was quite content to let the masses quarrel among themselves, breed promiscuously, and deteriorate physically and mentally. It seems the ruling groups of this era are quite content to go along with this philosophy as opposed to Marx's philosophy of ultimate rule by the people.

To continue using the word "communism" is not only misleading, but ridiculous. As practiced today, there is no such thing as communism. There is only the age-old struggle of the ruling class as opposed to the people. Perhaps this is why communism finds its greatest appeal among the intellectuals and not, as many believe, among the working classes. History has proven that Marxism has never succeeded in attaining what it preaches, since, through revolution, it actually creates what it claims to destroy, which are new classes as the ruling class in Russia today which take over the means of production and exploit the worker even more severely than the class they replaced. Lenin admitted that the working class existed for no other reason than to make available the army needed to carry out the Socialist revolution. Lenin envisioned the workers as those who would make it possible for the new ruling class to emerge and, accordingly, Lenin's "dictatorship of the proletariat" is merely a play on words for what would ultimately be "dictatorship over the proletariat."

In the final analysis, "communism" is meaningless, a word with no significance. It is an attempt to establish Plato's "Republic" from another approach and offers nothing for the welfare of mankind.

[From the Portland (Ind.) Dawn]

THE HIDDEN ALLY

(By Fred Orleans)

The unwillingness of the United States to establish and maintain an economic boycott of Russia and all Communist countries has been the chief force which has sustained communism at the moments when it seemed most apt to falter. An economic boycott of the Communist bloc is far simpler than a military action involving the resultant loss of life and destruction of property. A complete isolation of the Communist bloc through cutting off trade to and from these nations would deprive them of those products they must have from the free world in order to further establish and develop their totalitarian systems. This boycott would not only economically strain the economy of Russia and deprive the people of some of their new-found economic benefits, but would further reduce the living standards behind the Iron Curtain and thereby create unrest and further problems for the Communist overlords. The time has come for businessmen in the United States and the free world to begin thinking of the welfare of their countries and the survival of the capitalist system instead of mere economic gain.

It is alarming to learn that Canada and Australia are selling large quantities of wheat to Red China in order to alleviate the famine in that country. This will enable the Communist regime to placate the growing unrest among the people and alleviate the severe problems of the Chinese government being brought about through the lack of food to feed the people. This lack of food results from deficiencies in the Communist system and these deficiencies will be covered up by the wheat and foodstuffs willingly supplied by nations of the free world. If humanitarian reasoning enters into the matter, some thought should be given to Tibet and countries of southeast Asia being ruthlessly destroyed by Red China.

We would be shocked if our Government were to announce that it was preparing to sell guns and other actual weapons of war to Russia and its satellites, but the people in the United States do not seem to be concerned that their Government is willing to supply these countries with agricultural products which they desperately need. The administration has recently indicated that it was willing for Russia and the Iron Curtain countries to buy rice, flour, wheat and other agricultural products at cut-rate prices from our surplus stocks. The people of the United States are being called upon to pay taxes in order to subsidize communism. As long as we will supply the Communist bloc with the food products it needs, they can concentrate on threatening us militarily.

The makers of policy in the United States seem to have forgotten the lessons of history and the statement made by Napoleon, which is just as applicable today as it was

at the beginning of the 19th century, that an army travels on its stomach.

Through receiving our agricultural products, Russia is then in a position to alleviate the food shortages in China and Cuba. U.S. foreign aid to Communist satellite nations in Europe does not, as intended, alienate them from their Soviet masters, but merely aids and abets the Communist rulers to remain in power.

Closer to home, the United States is still indirectly subsidizing Castro and communism in Cuba. The direct and indirect purchases of molasses, tobacco leaf, cigars, and luxury products has provided Castro with the badly needed dollars to buy directly or indirectly from the United States the heavy machinery, vehicles, and machine parts needed to keep his oil industry and refining plants operating.

Our aid to the Communists is not a matter of recent date. Over 30 years ago, the United States began to supply the engineers and technical knowledge needed to begin the development of Russia to its present highly industrialized level. Over the years the unrestricted entry of Russian observers, engineers, and technicians into U.S. manufacturing plants, has enabled the Russians to quickly and cheaply obtain all the latest industrial methods which were developed in the United States over a period of years and at great cost. Before, during, and after World War II, the United States readily supplied Russia with all the heavy industrial equipment needed to develop its present industrial complex. The Russians acquired from the United States, practically without cost, all the latest methods of mass production.

Despite unlimited assistance from the United States and the provision of all the technical and industrial know-how needed, Russia still remained a relatively industrially backward nation until the conclusion of World War II, when they received as a gift the factories, technological knowledge, skilled workers of Germany, and later Czechoslovakia, and the other nations of Europe which now have satellite status.

The Russians were very pleased when we were not interested in the German scientists, engineers, and technicians and were most willing to transport these men and their most advanced knowledge to Russia to continue their labors for their new master.

Reviewing the past and observing the present, the question remains as to why we, in the United States, both helped to create the frankenstein which is now confronting us and continuously persist in aiding, abetting, and bolstering this shoddy, hypocritical and monstrous system every time it falters or shows signs of weakening.

FREEDOM ACADEMY

(By Fred Allen Orleans)

During the past three sessions of Congress an unpublicized piece of legislation, namely, the freedom academy, has unsuccessfully attempted to come to a vote in the House and Senate. This is the third year that this most important piece of legislation, which is so necessary for the preservation of our way of life, has been pigeonholed without even hearings being held on the bill. It is only through popular support from the people themselves that those in Congress who have been valiantly fighting to enact into law this vital legislation can succeed in their objectives.

The freedom academy represents legislation which should be discused and openly debated throughout our land so that a workable bill is effected and the people of America become fully aware of the fact that there is a great unfilled gap between the weapons available to us in our struggle against world communism. This vast gap is the void that exists between the powerful military apparatus who have developed and the conventional 19th century diplomacy still being employed by the United States. Where our weakness is, the Communists have their greatest strength since they make use of all the techniques passed down by Lenin and developed and refined throughout the years for conducting both open and undercover political warfare in their host countries. It is principally through this means that the Communists have gained control of one-third of the peoples of the world and this, their major weapon to date, is now becoming greatly bolstered by their tremendous military development and their continuously rising capacity for economic, cultural, and technical exports. It is not understood in the United States that the situation that has developed in Cuba, for example, could not be effected neither by the military might of the Communists nor by pure Communist propaganda.

The success of the Communists in Cuba, as the riots in Japan, and activities in many other countries have resulted from long and intensive training of dedicated people in specific techniques, namely, the techniques for the weakening of and eventual takeover of free countries. The Communists use every weapon at their disposal, including blackmail, lies, bribery, threats, and terror. The inability of the free world to cope with the advance of communism can be attributed to complete apathy and great ignorance.

Through the establishment of a freedom academy or similar vehicle, the United States could develop an academy of political warfare which could offer intensive training in communism in action and how to defeat it. This trainng to both Americans as well as nationals of friendly nations, could equip the graduate to meet and beat the Communist on his own home grounds. This is not an academy necessarily dedicated to the training of young people, but would cover businessmen, labor leaders, political leaders, teachers, etc., of the free world.

The big question remains as to how we have been able to watch the steady string of Soviet successes which have resulted from Russia having numerous academies dedicated to political warfare while we have not attempted to establish even one. We intensively train our defenders for combat in a hot war. We must also train them for combat in a cold war.

Actually, the idea for a freedom academy originated close to 10 years ago, and if positive action had been taken before now, it is conceivable that we would have been able to successfully withstand the continuous erosion of the free world by communism and at a relatively small cost to the American taxpayer. A score of freedom academies throughout the United States and the free world would cost a fraction of the money that has been poured down the drain on unproductive giveaway programs.

In our struggle against communism we continuously wait for the Communists to act before preparing a defense and too often, as in Cuba, we are taken completely by surprise. Recent events should finally convince the United States that it cannot secure the free world against communism by the outpouring of tremendous sums of money on aid and armaments, for we are now fighting a completely alien war to any we have ever engaged in in the past. We are struggling for the minds of men and yet America is not using the weapons at its disposal and fails to sell democracy, our economic system and our way of life with the same zealous enthusiasm employed by our enemies in selling their shoddy systems. We in America have one of the finest countries in the history of the world and we assume that everybody, everywhere, is aware of it. This is not true since the campesino in Mexico, the miner in Chile, the sheepherder in Peru, the ranch worker in Argentina, and the worker on the coffee plantation in Brazil are not aware of the excellence of the system that brought our country to its present high economic level. These people must be made aware of the fact that communism merely makes promises, but ultimately robs them of their heritage. These people must also be informed as to the merits of our system and how it can benefit them.

Congressman JUDD, cosponsor of the House version of Freedom Academy bill, summed up the need extremely well when he stated "the amateur will always lose against the professional. I want professionals on our side. We have the better cause, but we are not professional in the presentation and advancement of it."

The Communists have used very unorthodox methods in attaining their objectives. The United States must be prepared to go beyond conventional methods, to bypass politics as usual, and to do everything needed for our national welfare and to preserve our way of life. This is not the time for 19th century thinking in high official places. The United States must think and act in the 20th century to guarantee that a free America will still be here in the 21st century.

General Harkins Praises Plain Dealer Stories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 21, 1962

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on September 12 I had the privilege of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of articles. These articles appeared on pages 18153 to 18160. I thought my colleagues would be interested in knowing what the Nation's top Army leader in southeast Asia thought of this series.

General Harkins' letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 24, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MINSHALL: I deeply appreciate you sending me pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contained articles on the war in South Vietnam by Mr. Phil Goulding. I read Mr. Goulding's articles with interest and do not hesitate to state that they are of the best I have seen on what's going on here to date.

Again with appreciation for your thoughtfulness for sending them to me.

Respectfully,

PAUL D. HARKINS,
General, U.S. Army.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Bottum, Joe H., *S. Dak*
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind* — The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex* — 2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Engle, Clair, *Calif*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Goldwater, Barry, *Ariz*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hickey, J. J., *Wyo* — Room 1251, New Senate Ofc. Bldg.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N.Y* — 1233 31st St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn* — 4929 Hillbrook La.
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn* — 7426 Hampden La., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, Maurice J., Jr., *N.H.*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W.Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Benjamin A., *Mass*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis* — 2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Kerr (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Wiley, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case, Hickenlooper, and Capehart.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan of North Carolina, Young of Ohio, Hart, McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Cooper, and Boggs.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Humphrey, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case, and Javits.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Bush, Beall, Goldwater, and Case.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Tower, and Murphy.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Butler, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Keating, and Prouty.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Hartke, Smith of Massachusetts, Beall, Prouty, and Miller.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Jackson, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Burdick, Metcalf, Hickey, Kuchel, Allott, Miller, Pearson, Bottum, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, Fong, and Scott.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Burdick, Smith of Massachusetts, Pell, Goldwater, Javits, Prouty, Tower, and Jordan of Idaho.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan of North Carolina, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Boggs.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Smith of Massachusetts, Metcalf, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Miller, Murphy, and Pearson.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Mansfield (chairman), Hayden, Jordan of North Carolina, Cannon, Hickey, Pell, Curtis, Dirksen, and Bottum.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice ———. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

General Lemnitzer: Frank Discussion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee, I listened with more than passing interest to an address delivered last night by Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, retiring Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the National Security Industrial Association.

As one who has had an active part in all legislation and amendments affecting the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I had more than a casual reason to pay close attention to his fine address.

His remarks were unusually good. He delivered a frank discussion on the makeup of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and explained both their good and bad points.

It was a very revealing and rewarding address to hear. It was very encouraging to know the intendment of the Congress is exercised by the Joint Chiefs.

General Lemnitzer discussed the question of differences of opinions within this all-important body.

He is to be congratulated on such a frank discussion of a body so vital to the security of the American people. Touching on the trouble spots of the world, he explained in detail how we keep in close touch with those nations with whom we have commitments.

His outstanding speech to this representative group of patriotic Americans deserves to be read by all citizens dedicated to maintaining the security of our country.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed comforting in these times of world tension, when the Communist hordes threaten to plunge the world into the horror of nuclear warfare through their aggressive acts, to know that a man of his wisdom, courage, and capability has been selected to succeed General Norstad in the vital job as supreme Allied commander in Europe—NATO.

In his new command, I am sure General Lemnitzer will ably demonstrate the abilities which led to his selection for this key position.

I extend to him the best wishes of the Congress as he assumes his new duties.

Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert his thought-provoking remarks:

Thank you, Mr. Huggins, for your kind words of introduction. My thanks also to you and to the members of the National Industrial Association for inviting me to address this 1962 annual dinner meeting of the association.

I am genuinely happy to be here. When Mr. Huggins wrote to me some months ago, I replied that I would do my best to attend this dinner because it gives me a chance to thank the National Security Industrial Association for a really valuable and distinguished contribution to the Nation.

In this room tonight, there is a representative sampling of the industrial leadership of the United States. You have been among the first to understand the intricate partnership between the National Defense Establishment and American industry in forging the strength on which every one of our millions of citizens and those of the entire free world must rely. Should that strength falter, our civilization and all that it represents of mankind's greatest achievements and deepest aspirations could go down to extinction.

That it has not faltered, but has instead grown steadily stronger, is in part a tribute to the close partnership of our armed services with the genius of American industry, the skills and resourcefulness of its laboratories, the productiveness and competence of its labor—and the vision of the men who direct all of these aspects of our national life.

This fine association, which grew out of the vision of a great American—James Forrestal—has steadily increased its membership, widened its program, strengthened its influence, all with the purpose of helping our armed services create the military strength which is fundamental to our Nation's existence and to its role as a world power. As the Nation's senior active military officer, I thank you, and wish you well for the future.

As all of you know, on Monday I am relinquishing my duties as Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staffs, to my successor, Gen. Max Taylor, and I will have a very short time to tend to some personal and official business before taking over from General Norstad as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe. This is indeed a great challenge, because in my predecessors as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe—Generals Eisenhower, Ridgway, Gruenther, and now General Norstad—the North Atlantic Alliance has had truly distinguished and dedicated leaders. I hope this is as widely appreciated in this country as it is in Europe.

It is not appropriate for me to talk much tonight about the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, because I have not yet assumed the responsibilities entrusted to me by the North Atlantic Council. I do want to use this occasion, however, to state publicly my keen awareness of the high honor which has been conferred upon me by President Kennedy in nominating me for this important assignment and by the other sovereign nations who appointed me to the position of Supreme Allied Commander of the most remarkable alliance in the history of mankind. This alliance has forged a shield of military security, behind which the stability and prosperity of Europe have been created out of the havoc left by World War II.

As Mr. Huggins stated in his introduction, I have had a long association with NATO. I know its history and its purposes. I believe in it firmly, and now pledge publicly that I accept my obligations to all the nations of this great Alliance with humility, and the determination to be worthy of the great honor they have conferred upon me.

Tonight, however, I am going to talk primarily from the vantage point of the office I now occupy; namely, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, since in my new assignment I will undertake international responsibilities. This is the last public address I shall make strictly in the capacity of an officer of the U.S. Armed Forces.

First, it seems necessary that I give my considered views on a subject which has been very widely discussed, and about which there is a surprising amount of misinformation—the military role in U.S. national security decisions.

Let me take a moment to recall to you the way the present Joint Chiefs of Staff organization evolved from our experience with the strategic direction of World War II which provided overwhelming victory in that greatest of world wars.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, the United States and the United Kingdom agreed to set up the British-American Combined Chiefs of Staff organization. Obviously, it was necessary for the U.S. members to coordinate among themselves prior to their meetings with the British. So our Chiefs of Staff began to meet at regular and frequent intervals, and before long they become known as the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They were at first an informal group, operating under the immediate and personal direction of the President.

This system worked so well for directing global military operations that it clearly deserved to be continued, especially in view of the worldwide military responsibilities which faced the United States after World War II. The result was the National Security Act of 1947, which formalized the Joint Chiefs of Staff, established the Department of Defense and a separate Air Force.

I believe that the National Defense Act of 1947, and its amendments, especially the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 are very sound pieces of legislation. There is now no question whatsoever of the authority of the commanders of unified commands over all elements of their component forces. For example, Admiral Felt in the Pacific, or General Mundy in Alaska have centralized direction over all their forces, and these forces in turn have the authority for decentralized execution. The same thing is true of course of the other unified and specified commands we have worldwide.

The act also set up a direct and I emphasize the word "direct" chain of command from the President and the Secretary of Defense through the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the commanders in chief of unified and specified commands. This provided centralized direction of our military effort worldwide.

The act retained the authority of the various services over such matters as doctrine, training, and equipment. This preserved common doctrine within each of the major functional areas of warfare—land, sea, and air.

Finally, the 1958 Reorganization Act kept the Joint Chiefs of Staff in their advisory role. This insured the preservation of civilian control by retaining the authority for final decision with the President and the Secretary of Defense.

These changes in the command structure resulted in greatly increased activity by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff

which supports them. Previously, their responsibilities had been confined to planning. Under the 1958 act they became concerned with operations as well. The Joint Staff now has authority to take action for the Joint Chiefs, within established guidelines and under circumstances when a decision by the Chiefs themselves is unnecessary or would cause undue delay.

That is the formal organization. You realize, of course, that the way an organization actually functions depends very much on the personalities and relations of the people who comprise it.

I am aware of the differences that personalities make even within identical organizational structures because I have served in close association with every Secretary of Defense to date—Forestal, Johnson, Marshall, Lovett, Wilson, McElroy, Gates, and now McNamara—and every Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—Bradley, Radford, and Twining—since that office was established. Each of these distinguished Americans has tended to operate in his own individual way, partly due to his individual personality and partly due to the relationship of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to each other.

In that connection, I have enjoyed throughout my tenure as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a very close personal and working relationship with the Secretary of Defense and the President. My views and those of the other Chiefs have always been carefully considered. I do not pretend that our recommendations have always been adopted, but all of us who make up the Joint Chiefs of Staff have had ample opportunity to make our views fully known, and I have personal knowledge that those views have always been thoroughly and most carefully considered.

At the seat of Government in Washington there are relatively few decisions which are purely military. On the contrary, they almost invariably involve—in addition to military considerations—national and international political, economic, and psychological considerations which are not the principal concern of military command. The people of this country have repeatedly and properly provided, through the Congress and elsewhere, for civilian control over the Military Establishment. In so doing, our Nation has underlined an awareness that national security decisions involve many considerations beside purely military ones. These considerations touch on the very fabric and pattern of our life as a people. They touch on our homes, our social order, our political forms, our relations with other countries, and—touch is not the proper word—they bear down heavily on our pocketbooks.

I, for one, find it proper that decisions such as these are made by the Secretary of Defense, or in many cases by the President himself, based on their evaluation of all of the factors involved. Indeed, I would be strongly opposed to any other course of procedure. I feel that these decisions are quite properly the responsibility of the Secretary of Defense or the President.

During my long years as association with, and as a member of, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, of all the questions that have been asked me by the Congress, Government officials, the press, and the public at large, two stand out. They pertain to the proposals first, to replace the Joint Chiefs of Staff with a single Chief of Staff, and, second, to separate the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from their respective services. I believe that this time, on the eve of my departure as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it is appropriate that I give you my thoughts on these issues.

The arguments in favor of a single Chief of Staff seem to stem mainly from the criticism that when the Joint Chiefs of Staff do not unanimously agree they have abandoned their responsibilities to the Office of the Secretary of Defense where the matter must be forwarded for final decision. It is argued that the civilian authorities in the Department of Defense, who prepare the staff estimates, analyses, and final decision, may very well not have the military knowledge and experience necessary to evaluate effectively the proposals of the Joint Chiefs of Staff when there is less than unanimous agreement. This view holds that only by creating a single Chief of Staff could we achieve the military agreement necessary for authoritative decisions and forceful action.

I do not agree with this viewpoint. As a matter of fact, the Joint Chiefs of Staff reach agreement on better than 99 percent of the host of questions coming before them. Of course, there is some disagreement. I do not know of any activity that involves such complex problems in which agreement is always unanimous. However, while this is taken for granted in other fields, it seems to be considered inexcusable in the military.

Actually, even in handling the relatively very small percentage of problems where there are disagreements—which, admittedly, often involve fundamental questions—the Joint Chiefs of Staff are providing an essential service to the Secretary of Defense and the President. In such cases, alternate approaches to the issue are prepared. The advantages and disadvantages of each of the courses of action are fully documented by experienced military officers of the services and Joint Staff before being presented personally by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Secretary of Defense, or the President, for decision.

Many of the early difficulties of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system have been ironed out. I have always felt that many of these previous shortcomings in the Joint Chiefs of Staff resulted from issues remaining undecided for longer periods than they should. Secretary Gates initiated the practice, when disagreements occurred, of having them brought to his attention by the Chairman and discussing these differences personally with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. After full consideration and discussion of the issues involved, he promptly made the decisions required. Mr. McNamara is continuing this practice.

Another danger of the single Chief of Staff concept which I would like to highlight, is that of a unilateral approach based on the then-prevailing fad favoring a particular weapons system or strategy. Under this system we could well end up with our services armed only with bombers, battleships, or bolos, depending on the fad of the moment. I feel that the best way of providing balanced military advice to our civilian leaders is by the use of talents and varied and broad experience of the military chiefs of all services—each knows his own service and each is an expert in his field. Our current system with the three military departments—with their departmental secretaries and service chiefs—provides a source of collective wisdom which has served us well in the past, and will, I am confident, in the future.

Another factor which deserves consideration, I feel, is how our present organization provides the checks and balances which moderate extreme views. While some people may criticize this system as unwieldy—I do not. After all, this country of ours is based upon a system of checks and balances—such as we have in our National Government between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. While perhaps not as rapid in response as a monolithic dictatorship, it provides a sound system uniquely fitted to our democracy's mode of operations. I feel that the single Chief of Staff concept is not compatible with our traditional governmental system. There is no room in a democratic form of government, such as ours, for a military autocracy.

I would next like to comment on the proposal, commonly referred to as the ivory tower concept, which would separate the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from their respective services in order to allow them to plan their operations unhampered by the humdrum requirements and pressures of day-to-day service activities. I do not agree with this concept—or any concept—which would separate the responsibility for planning from the responsibility for the execution of plans.

I am sure that in your own organizations you have seen plans made by people who have no responsibility whatsoever for their implementation. I have had personal experience with such a procedure in the past and I regard it as unsound—as well as downright dangerous in the military field. I am also sure that you, as I, have frequently found such plans to be somewhat unrealistic and impractical. When a man knows that the plan he initiates, prepares, and approves is the plan that he will have responsibility for executing, then that plan will make sense. This is in line with the old American commonsense doctrine of joining responsibility and authority.

My experience has convinced me that another valid criticism of the separation of the Chiefs of Staff from their respective services is that an officer removed from his service, even for a relatively short period of time, in this era of rapid technological change loses his intimate knowledge of the performance capabilities and limitations of that service which are so essential if the planning is to be realistic and sound.

Aside from the advisory function of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Secretary and the President, we have other means of presenting our views on the military aspects of a national security matter to other officials who are entitled to have them. As Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, I attend the meetings of the National Security Council as its professional military adviser, representing the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Frequently, all of the Chiefs of Staff attend National Security Council meetings when items of particular military importance are discussed. Equally important, the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 is specific in requiring the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—when appearing before the committees of Congress—to reply fully and frankly to their questions regardless of whether or not these views coincide with the official position of the Department of Defense.

Now, this audience, perhaps better than any other, understands the pressures which occur when we must convert a concept of the strategic or tactical needs of the future into the complicated and very expensive weapons systems necessary to meet those needs at the right time. As you well know, the leadtime, money, and talent involved in bringing such weapons systems into being have enormous significance to the country as a whole as well as to specific geographical areas. All of these considerations and many others beside, make up the totality of national security decisions. I believe firmly that our present system places the final authority and responsibility where they belong—that is, on the elected or duly appointed civilian leadership of the country, and yet gives due consideration to experienced military judgment in the formulation of these decisions.

However, I want to emphasize the words "elected or duly appointed" civilian leadership. Obviously, it would be most undesirable to have the professional judgments of the Joint Chiefs of Staff overruled at any of the innumerable lower levels of government.

This brings me to my next and last topic—a public report on the state of our Armed

Forces tonight. During the last 2 years, since I entered on my present responsibilities, we have gone through a prolonged period of tension highlighted by several extremely critical periods.

Today, once again, we are faced with communism testing our strength and determination around the world—the continuing struggle in Vietnam, ever-present tension over Berlin, and the Communist buildup in Cuba. It is a dangerous era in which we live. But Americans have always faced danger resolutely and with determination in the past and will continue to do so in the future.

The United States and its allies are tonight much stronger in military power than the Soviet Union and its satellites. I know this, and so do the Communists.

The future of our civilization requires that we maintain the clear superiority we now enjoy in almost every field of technological achievement which gives substance to our military power. In this essential task, the American industries which you represent have a key role to play.

Our strategic nuclear delivery capability is rapidly increasing. Our Atlas and an increasing number of Titan ICBM squadrons have now reached operational readiness. The solid-fueled Minuteman program is well underway. The remarkable Polaris submarines are joining the fleet in steadily increasing numbers. Our Strategic Air Command is at the highest state of readiness that remarkable organization has ever known. Our nuclear stockpile is overwhelming in size and diversity, and we are going ahead with the program of tests necessary to keep it fully modern.

Beyond our tremendous nuclear delivery capability, we have strengthened both our tactical nuclear capability and the ability to employ conventional forces wherever they may be needed. Our strategic mobility and logistic capability—areas in which we have always excelled—have been significantly improved over the past 2 years and that improvement is continuing.

In addition, with the firm backing of our national leadership, all of our armed services have made great progress in the development of doctrine, tactics, equipment, and general know-how to combat Communist-sponsored insurgency and the techniques of protracted war. Incidentally, the Communists refer to such conflict as wars of liberation which they announced that they will pursue and strongly support. They are, in fact, wars of Communist subversion.

Our progress in the area of counterguerrilla operations is not as clearly identifiable as our progress in the other aspects of our military power. This is a long, slow, and, at times, tedious business. Nevertheless, I am convinced that we are making real headway in creating, for ourselves and for our threatened allies who need our help, the capability to win in this form of conflict.

I have visited southeast Asia on several occasions during the past 2 years. From what I have seen and from the detailed information I get, I am convinced that slowly but steadily the mounting weight of U.S. assistance is beginning to tip the scales in favor of the free world.

This Nation will not diminish its efforts or its determination to stay ahead of the gigantic conspiracy which has declared war on our civilization, our way of life, our social forms, our moral and ethical values. The emptiness and the brutality of communism is best summed up, for the whole world to see, by the wall in Berlin. No space spectaculars, however shrewdly exploited, should be allowed to obscure this stark testimony of the failure of communism or of the barrenness of its promises.

I cannot conclude my tenure in the Nation's highest military office without paying tribute where tribute is most due, and yet is all too often overlooked—to the men and women of our armed services—in uniform and out—in both the Active and the Reserve Forces of this country. Never in our history have we been served with more devotion or with greater skill than by those who make up our Armed Forces today. These American citizens are showing the rest of us daily by their dedication—their professional competence—their uncomplaining courage in the face of danger, hardship, and personal sacrifice, that they have faith in the destiny of the United States and the cause of freedom which it champions. We are a fortunate Nation to have men and women such as these. It is on them, their skills, their high resolve and devotion to duty, that our survival ultimately depends—not on any weapon or machine, no matter how ingenious or how complex. Only men and women who believe as they do in freedom can preserve its blessings for us and for all mankind.

The least that we owe them is respect and consideration, because money cannot buy such men and women as it buys machines or weapons. We must develop them—slowly, carefully, patiently, often with sacrifice and heartache, more often with pride—from our American homes and families. That is now, and it will remain, the biggest and most crucial job for all Americans.

Once again, I extend my thanks through you to all the men and women of American industry, and to patriotic Americans everywhere, for their understanding and support of the needs of our armed services.

Modern Metro Government Evolving in Nashville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 28, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on last Sunday, September 23, the Washington Post published a most illuminating article about the impending transition to metropolitan government for Nashville and Davidson County, Tenn.

The article was written by William Keel, of the Nashville Tennessean. Modestly, Mr. Keel's article is silent as to the fine work which he and this great newspaper did to help bring about the decisively favorable referendum vote for metropolitan government in June. They did this by forthrightly defending metro against every false attack and pointing out its advantages for city and county residents alike.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MODERN METRO GOVERNMENT EVOLVING IN NASHVILLE

(By William Keel)

NASHVILE, TENN.—Nashville and Davidson County, identified nationally for years as the home of the "Grand Ole Opry," are preparing to shuck this provincial image and don a modern look under a metropolitan government.

Last June 28, voters approved the streamlined government with balanced representation and a framework for providing municipal services to a mushrooming septic tank suburbia under an equitable tax structure.

Candidates are now in the initial stages of campaigning for offices in the new government which will embrace a population of 415,000. There may be as many as 300 candidates for the 40 seats on the county council. Thirty-five districts will elect one councilman each. Five councilmen will be elected at-large, or countywide.

A county mayor and vice mayor also will be elected in the November 6 election. They and the councilmen will serve 4-year terms.

The new government has one more hurdle to clear before it goes into effect next April. This is a ruling by the State supreme court on the constitutionality of the charter which came under attack before the vote last June 28.

Chancellor Glenn W. Woodlee has upheld its constitutionality and his ruling is being appealed. The new government is grounded on constitutional amendments enacted in 1953 providing for home rule and consolidation of functions of city and county governments.

Key issues in the dispute are whether enabling legislation exceeded the scope of the amendments and whether preparations of the charter itself by a 10-member citizens' commission amounted to unlawful delegation of legislative authority.

If the new charter for a consolidated government is upheld, the present county and city governments will be abolished. The new government will eliminate the duplication between the existing governments and create a single "strong mayor" form of government.

Its head will be the metropolitan county mayor, a $25,000 job. He will appoint his department heads. He also will appoint boards and commissions, but the county council will have the power of confirmation—in some instances by a three-fourths vote—over such appointees.

The single executive will replace a county judge who has faced the difficult task of administering an archaic framework shot through with diffused responsibility keyed to government by commissions, committees and boards. It also will replace the present city mayor, Ben West, who fought the charter bitterly on grounds it will produce "fragmented" government.

One of the major arguments for metro was that it would end annexation and taxation by the city without representation.

The new council will replace a 30-member city council and, ultimately, a 56-member county court. The present court will be continued until 1966 to skirt a constitutional snag.

The Tennessee Taxpayers Association, an organization of 1,000 businessmen who want to reduce costs and hold down taxes, has estimated that consolidated government will save $1 million a year. It is in the consolidation of departments and the elimination of duplication that the bulk of this saving is expected to come.

For example, take the tax assessors offices. The office of the county tax assessor is directly above that of the city tax assessor in the courthouse. A major annexation of 50 square miles means that these two offices do exactly the same thing in the most populous areas of the county.

Under metro, one tax assessor and one staff would do the job.

This situation is paralleled in a number of departments and functions.

But perhaps the major selling point of the charter in 1962 involved the suburban areas and a matter of equity. A similar charter was defeated in 1958 by a scare campaign that screamed a theme of skyrocketing

taxes. The same type of campaign was waged last June but it fell flat.

In the interim, two things happened to give residents outside the city a different perspective. One was an apparently innocuous $10 auto sticker required of all motorists who use city streets. However, the city chose to arrest and toss into paddy wagons citizens who didn't buy it and—rightly or wrongly—it became a symbol of oppression. County residents outside the city had no voice in the body that enacted the tax.

The other development was an annexation program by the city. The major phase of the program was annexation of 43 square miles of residential area including 80,000 residents.

Again, this was done by the city council with those being annexed having no voice. Critics of the annexation charged that the city had bitten off too much, that property owners in the annexed areas would be paying taxes long before they got such basic services as sewers.

Within months, mortgage companies began increasing the monthly payments on house notes, anticipating the city tax rate.

Annexation threw the school systems—city and county—into a snarl and resulted in a heavier tax load in annexed areas without a proportionate increase in services. At the time metro was approved, the city and county were locked in a lawsuit over which system would operate the 22 annexed schools and how much the city would pay for the physical plants.

This goes to the heart of one of the primary selling points of metro—its pay-for-what-you-get taxing plan.

The heart of this plan entails two taxing districts. In one district, the general services, all property owners in the county pay for the basic functions of government that serve everybody. This district is county-wide.

The other, the urban services district, is levied only in the area that receives the more sophisticated urban services—sewers, street lights, more intensified police protection, fire protection, water, street cleaning, and refuse collection.

The general services include general administration, police courts, jails, assessment, health, welfare, housing for the aged, streets and roads, traffic, schools, parks and recreation, and other general functions.

The county has two taxing districts now—the city district and the county district. But there are no safeguards against the vast areas of suburbia being added to the city and being forced to pay taxes without getting services.

The metro charter contains built-in protection. For example, there is a provision that the urban district can expand only as it becomes able to provide services to the newly annexed area within 1 year after the first urban taxes become due in that area.

And the conflicts brought on by annexation could not occur under the charter which does away with the two-government conflict that created them.

Representation is more equitable under the charter. There are vast differences now in the population of city wards and county districts.

Under metro, there are 35 districts and each has between 10,000 and 12,000 people. And the charter requires reapportionment every 10 years. If the councilmen balk, their salaries cease.

The proportionate representation of Negroes is increased, although voting strength in municipal elections will be diluted from 23 to 15 percent.

Now they have 3 legislators out of 86—30 councilmen and 56 county court members. There are three Negro councilmen, no county court members.

Under metro, Negroes are expected to elect 6 of 40 councilmen.

Negroes now have one member on the city school board, none on the county board. They are expected to have two of the nine school board members on the single board under metro. They outnumber whites in two of the nine districts.

The Nashville plan is pure city-county consolidation. Nashville has only seven small satellite cities and these are primarily for zoning protection. About the only governmental function they perform is road upkeep.

Miami has four times this number of smaller cities and they have retained much of their autonomy. Miami was forced to superimpose a government in a federation-type of metropolitan framework fashioned roughly after the Toronto plan. All the elements are drawn together in a federation, with each retaining certain autonomous functions.

Denver has a simple city-county consolidation, enacted in 1902. Baton Rouge, La., has a consolidation similar to that approved here although the constitutional limitations there forced a stricter adherence to the old city and county formalities. For example, the mayor acts as both the chief executive of the parish (county) and the city.

Nashville's satellite cities will be a part of the general services district and will pay for those services like any other county resident. If the citizens of the smaller cities want to become a part of the urban services district, they must surrender their charter.

Agricultural Act of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 28, 1962

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, an excellent analysis of the farm bill was prepared by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association and given over the GTA "Daily Radio Roundup" on September 26. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The farm bill, the Agricultural Act of 1962, is now history. Actually, the final victory in the U.S. Senate was an anticlimax. The 11-vote margin was expected. The solid Republican resistance was unbroken. But the real opposition—strong, well-organized and confident—was dealt its death blow in the "battle of the bulge" that went on in the House of Representatives last week.

There Secretary Freeman's generalship and guts turned the tide. That doesn't mean, however, that the wrangling, hassling, and arguments are all over. Nor does it smooth over the sometimes bitter partisan political differences that have flared up. Some still say farmers are better off with no legislation. Others say that farmers must do their own bargaining through their own associations and their own organizations. And others insist that this is impossible without education and information work to get the kind of laws needed for farmers to bargain for price protection and production quotas.

Here at GTA we had hoped strongly that there might be a bipartisan effort made to expand farm income and rural prosperity. No doubt, however, Republican candidates will have a hard time ducking the charges of Democrats this fall that Republicans are in league with the big business CED, that many farmers have branded the "Committee for Economic Destruction," which recommends wiping out price protection legislation, letting farm prices drop as much as by one-third on the free market, and shifting 2 million farm families off the land and into the cities.

Unfortunately, too few people still do not understand the farm bill. Minnesota's Senator HUMPHREY stated the case in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 25: "There has been so much confusion, so much emotionalism, so much misinformation (either deliberately or innocently created) concerning the Agricultural Act of 1962 that it would be a good thing if everyone took a few minutes to find out factually what is and is not in the bill. What the bill will and will not do." Senator HUMPHREY frankly stated that "This is not a perfect bill by any means * * * but it is a good farm bill * * * a giant step forward from what we would have if Congress had passed no farm bill.

"The farm problem has begged solution for many years * * * but solution is possible only if there is cooperation among us.

"The bill provides for a 1-year extension of the voluntary feed-grain and wheat program—which have been successful in reducing surpluses—raising farm income and reducing the tax burden. The 1961 feed-grain program alone reduced Government stocks of corn 400 million bushels, saved taxpayers $213 million in storage and interest charges and farm income went up more than $1 billion, the first rise since 1953." Under the feed-grain program, as farmers know, there will be a base support price of $1.02 a bushel plus a bonus of 18 cents a bushel for farmers who take part in the program and divert corn acres from production. And wheat farmers under this program would be able in 1964 to grow wheat as a feed grain over and above their bread-wheat certificate quotas. They would be guaranteed approximately the world price or around $1.30 to $1.40 a bushel for this amount and $2 a bushel for certificate wheat.

That is a start toward encouraging quality wheat production and lays the foundation for greater demand for the desirable spring and winter wheat varieties millers want. For next year wheat farmers would get $1.82 a bushel (based on the two-thirds approval of wheat quotas by farmers last August) but those that divert acres would be paid a bonus of 18 cents a bushel. It is estimated this would increase income of wheat producers by 5 to 8 percent.

Fears, some of them deliberately provoked, that under this program wheat would go to less than $1 a bushel are emphatically denied by the Department of Agriculture.

Senator HUMPHREY added these words: "Secretary Freeman will not permit programs which will place our farmers in a position worse than they are in now. He will come to Congress next year with a permanent feed-grain program * * * and I am confident the Congress will accept it.

"And there are other important features, often overlooked, that will provide new opportunities for rural America through the rural area development program. All rural America will be affected * * * by this bill. Not only farmers or small towns will be affected, the entire economy of the Nation will be helped. Sixteen million off-farm jobs depend in large measure on what happens to agriculture."

Let us not forget that agriculture—farming and the people who raise the food and fiber so efficiently, cheaply, and abundantly

that we have almost forgotten what the word "scarcity" means—is no two-bit operation. Farm people have $200 billion invested in agriculture, more than the entire assets of three-fourths of all our corporations.

But the real test of what was done this week on farm legislation, of course, will be what improvements it makes possible for farm people in the years ahead. That will be decided by the efforts of farm people themselves and the men who represent them in Congress.

In Recognition of Public Service Rendered by Pan American World Airways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1962

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent strike affecting flight operations of Eastern Airlines, Pan American World Airways, by increasing its service to Puerto Rico, made it possible to continue transportation between Puerto Rico and the mainland as to passengers, cargo, and mail, so that very little inconvenience to Puerto Rico resulted from the strike. This was an important contribution by Pan American World Airways and is an indication of the efficiency with which Pan American is managed and operated. The strike could have been crucial to Puerto Rico's economy, but the stepup in Pan American World Airways service prevented this and all except occasional and minor inconveniences to passengers. We greatly appreciate this expanded operation, and it is my desire to call attention to the Congress of a resolution approved on September 4, 1962, by the Municipal Assembly of San Juan in recognition of this public service by Pan American World Airways.

The resolution follows:

"RESOLUTION NO. 5, MUNICIPALITY OF SAN JUAN, SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO, SERIES 1962–63, TO RENDER PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS FOR ITS STEADFAST HELP IN DIMINISHING THE ADVERSE IMPACT TO THE ECONOMY OF THE ISLAND, CREATED BY THE ABNORMAL SITUATION IN AERIAL TRANSPORTATION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

"Whereas Puerto Rico was faced with an acute transportation crisis arising from the recent Eastern Air Lines strike;

"Whereas Pan American World Airways expanded its services overwhelmingly to the extent that passenger and freight moved without interruption during the 60-day strike period, operating a total of 460 flights during the month of July 1962;

"Whereas Pan American World Airways, fully aware of the vital role of air transportation to the island, made tremendous efforts in the protection of Puerto Rican economy, handling practically all of the passengers, cargo, and mail during the month of July 1962, alone; therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Municipal Assembly of San Juan, Puerto Rico,

"Section 1. That this assembly on behalf of the city of San Juan, and the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, express to the president, the board of directors, and to Mr. Harold Swift, the local director of Pan American World Airways, its appreciation and congratulations on the great public service it has so successfully rendered thereby.

"Section 2. That this expression of the Assembly of the City of San Juan be made a part of the permanent records of this assembly, be engrossed, and copies of same be sent forthwith to the president of Pan American World Airways, its board of directors, and local directors, in acknowledgment of this splendid public service.

"Section 3. Any ordinance, resolution, or agreement which in all or in part may be in conflict with the provisions of this resolution, is hereby repealed.

Section 4. This resolution being of an urgent character, will be in force immediately after its approval."

I, Elizabeth Ambrosiani, acting secretary of the municipality of San Juan, Puerto Rico, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolution No. 5, series 1962–63, approved by the Municipal Assembly of San Juan, at regular meeting held on the 4th day of September 1962, with the affirmative votes of Mrs. Josefina O. de Batlle, Messrs. Jenaro Caparrós, Luis M. Díaz, Pedro Díaz Viera, Richard C. Durham, Juan Pérez Roa, Vincente A. Pérez, Emiliano Pol, Jr., Pedro E. Purcell, Modesto Rivera, Miguel Torres Melendez, Eduardo Umpierre, and the chairman, Mr. Francisco A. Arrillaga; having been absent Mrs. Monina Mendoza de González, Messrs. Félix A. Bello, and Luis Esteban Julià. This resolution was approved by the honorable major of the municipality of San Juan on the 5th day of September 1962.

Exist a vacancy pending for the appointment by the Honorable Governor of Puerto Rico.

I further certify, that according to the minutes under my custody, all assemblymen were duly notified of the regular meeting in the manner provided by law.

In witness whereof, and for the proper proceedings, I hereby issue this certificate, and the seal of the municipality of San Juan is hereto affixed, at San Juan, Puerto Rico, on this 6th day of September 1962.

ELIZABETH AMBROSIANI,
Acting Secretary of the Municipality of San Juan.

Russia's Hydroelectric Power Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 28, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a member of the Federal Power Commission, Mr. Howard Morgan, has returned from a trip to Russia where he accompanied the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, on a factfinding trip.

Mr. Morgan has written a series of articles for Oregon papers reporting on his experiences. From his background as former utilities commissioner for the State of Oregon, he is able to have unusual perceptiveness regarding utilities in the Soviet Union. A portion of his report summarizes the rapid progress Russia has made in developing her hydroelectric production.

I ask unanimous consent that this portion of Mr. Morgan's report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman, Sept. 24, 1962]

(NOTE.—Portion of fifth article in a series by Howard Morgan.)

I have tried to present a realistic and balanced account of my observations, within the very narrow limits of those observations, avoiding all comment on the emotion-charged questions of international and internal politics.

I am sure this has satisfied neither the many who insist upon predictions of failure for everything in Russia, no matter what the facts may be, nor the few who, equally undisturbed by facts, insist that the Soviet Union is already the workers' paradise that the more realistic Russians hope it may someday become.

SOME FACTS JOLTING

But in discussing the electric programs we went there to see, it should be possible to get away from impressions and to get down to facts.

We had at least a half-dozen highly qualified engineers in our party whose evaluations I shall rely on. Some of the facts and figures will jolt the complacent, but when has that not been the fate of the complacent?

First, one should understand that, although at the time of the revolution Russia was the most backward European nation in the development of electric power, the total electrification of Russia was at once made the goal, the center and the heart of the industrialization plans laid down then, over 40 years ago.

Every plan launched since then has had this same central feature. During the twenties and thirties American engineers and contracting firms, as well as American generator and turbine manufacturers, worked with the Russians to develop both hydro and steam generation, as well as high-voltage transmission.

CONSTRUCTION RAPID

Lend-lease assistance helped rebuild war-damaged plants and lines, and even built a few new ones for war production during the forties. Since shortly after World War II the Russians have been self-sufficient, and have carried on an increasingly large and rapid construction program unaided, even developing enough capacity to export skilled engineers, technicians and first-rate electric equipment abroad to newly developing areas.

Today, in the generation of electric power, Russia has outstripped not only every nation in Europe by very wide margins, but every other nation in the world as well, except for the United States.

Some comparative figures are interesting. In 1927, the earliest year for which the FPC has statistics, Russia had 1,905,000 kilowatts of installed generating capacity. The United States had passed that figure in 1900. By 1946 Russia had 12,338,000 kilowatts. The United States had passed that figure exactly 30 years before in 1916. But by 1961 Russia had 74 million kilowatts, a figure equaled in the United States only 12 years earlier, in 1949.

AHEAD BUT GAP NARROWS

The United States is still ahead of Russia by a wide margin, wide enough to give rise to a good deal of self-congratulation in our electric industry. In 1961 we had nearly 200 million kilowatts of capacity; the Russians only 74 million kilowatts. But a closer

look at the figures is disturbing, even without going into the matter of the uses to which they put their power in contrast to the uses we select.

In 1932 we had almost 10 times as much capacity as they; about 43 million compared to 4,675,000. By 1961 this margin had shrunk to less than three times. There are two ways to look at this. Notice that the absolute margin had widened, while the percentage of margin had shrunk. Naturally, a popular way to look at these facts is to emphasize the widening gap in absolute terms.

But what gives rise to concern among Americans who have studied these figures carefully, and who have gone to Russia for a look around, is the accelerating pace of the construction the Russians have recently built and the even faster acceleration of their plans for future construction.

CURVES RISE STEEPLY

Both countries are planning and building on curves which rise more steeply each year, but the Russians' curve of actual construction is rising a little faster now than ours was 12 years ago, when we had the same capacity they presently have. What is more important, they plan to steepen their construction curve more drastically in the years ahead than some people think would be justified in the United States by the demands of our own economy. If this happens, the curves will inevitably converge, intersect, and cross.

Whatever we—or they—actually do in the years to come, I can report that they have not the slightest intention of slowing down. The following is one of the closing paragraphs from what seemed—at least in its other portions—to be a moderate and factual report covering the history of Soviet power development, given to our party by N. M. Chuprakov, chief engineer in charge of design, Ministry of Power Station Construction. Like the whole of his report it was not delivered in a boastful or a challenging manner, but in a matter-of-fact way.

TWO GOALS ARE SET

"We set our goal to reach and then overtake the United States of America during the second half of the above period (that is, in 1970-80) at first with respect to the consumption of electric power in industry, then with respect to total power generation and finally with respect to the power generated per capita."

I should add that Mr. Chuprakov, who traveled with us throughout our trip and was a most agreeable traveling companion though he speaks no English, has 20,000 design engineers working under his direction.

Realtor of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 28, 1962

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, having been associated for many years with the real estate business, I have a firsthand knowledge of its difficulties, and consequently, I have been especially interested in superior work in the field.

One example of a man who has excelled in this profession is Mr. C. Robert Gray, a Silver Spring, Md., realtor. Recently recognition was given to Mr. Gray's achievements when he was selected as our State's Realtor of the Year. A newspaper article concerning this honor appeared in the September 22 issue of the Washington Evening Star, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAY CHOSEN MARYLAND'S REALTOR OF YEAR

C. Robert Gray, a past president of the Montgomery County Board of Realtors, has been selected as Maryland's Realtor of the Year.

Mr. Gray has served on many key committees of the Montgomery board and is active in its multiple listing system and investment property division. He also is presently a director of the Maryland Association of Real Estate Boards, is active in the National Institute of Real Estate Brokers, the International Traders Club and the Maryland Traders Club.

Outside of his real estate interests he is a past exalted ruler of the Silver Springs Elks Club and a past president of the Silver Spring Lions Club.

He is president of Gray-Kessinger & Co., Inc., and of Gray & Martin Insurance Agency, Inc.

In winning the State title, Mr. Gray topped Carl Albert Heider who was selected by the Prince Georges County Board of Realtors as its Realtor of the Year.

The Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 28, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the House during the past week on the situation in Cuba.

The International Services of Information Foundation, Inc., of Baltimore, issues a report which they call "Inform" and the September 25, 1962, edition has the following to say about Cuba, and I believe their information is authentic, as they have sources which have been proven very reliable:

[From Inform, Sept. 25, 1962]

PLANS FOR A RED GUANTANAMO

Here is the outlook for Cuba: The present phase, landing of Soviet troops, has been largely completed. Within about a year, depending on Moscow's estimate of Washington's probable reaction, another phase will begin.

That will be the establishment of an official Soviet military base in Cuba, probably in Pinar del Rio Province, the western end of the island. Terms will be similar or identical to the 60-year-old agreement by which the United States acquired the right to build a naval base on Guantanamo Bay in eastern Cuba.

The Communists feel that the recent transition, the landing of Soviet troops, was the most dangerous. They believe that the United States will be even less inclined to act when Cuba's status as a Soviet garrison state is formalized.

DEADLY PARALLEL

"There is a sizable concentration of Communist armor and artillery echeloned in depth around the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay. Known as Division 50, the force is equipped as follows: 45 to 50 medium tanks, 40 to 45 light tanks, 80 6-wheeled trucks, 60 10-wheeled trucks, plus large quantities of small arms and Belgian FAL rifles. Huge reserves of gasoline and munitions are cached in caves and on small farms in the Division 50 area. Personnel is estimated at 3,500 to 5,000, including two separate contingents of Soviet troops attached to Division 50, and a small number of Russian officers serving as advisers."

The above report, compiled by a Cuban liberation unit and turned over to International Services of Information, brought down angry U.S. agents on the exiles. The Washington agents demanded that all such information be suppressed. The validity of the report was not questioned.

For well over a month, the State Department attempted to discount and suppress reports of the Soviet military influx into Cuba. As late as August 30 the State Department still insisted that: "We have no information that any Soviet-bloc troops have landed in Cuba."

What makes this situation intensely grave is that it is precisely this policy which results—and in previous intsances has already resulted—in the very situation which it is intended to avoid: war. Statements such as that made by Adlai Stevenson before the United Nations on September 21. "We are not taking and will not take offensive action in this hemisphere" actually enhance the danger that the United States will be forced to fight.

In order to help inform readers evaluate official U.S. reaction to the present Cuban crisis, we give below an International Services of Information analyst's appraisal of how, in the past, appeasement tactics and suppression of facts led to war—a war in which Americans are even now losing their lives:

As early as 1955, U.S. officers in South Vietnam warned Washington that major Communist guerrilla operations would undoubtedly precede any conventional military offensive against South Vietnam. This prediction was ignored.

Communist North Vietnam was permitted blatantly to violate the Geneva accords of 1954 which limited the size of the military forces in North and South Vietnam. The massive Red buildup was neither heeded or reported by the International Control Commission. Washington, eager to reduce tensions, remained passive.

Meanwhile, however, State Department strictures paralyzed the development of the South Vietnam armed forces. The U.S. Embassy in Saigon insisted that, despite the Communist disregard of the Geneva agreement, strength of the U.S. military mission and Vietnamese forces remain at the 1954 level.

The U.S. military mission to South Vietnam was not permitted to exceed 341 persons. Red Chinese and Soviet military personnel in North Vietnam numbered in the thousands.

The Vietnam Army, Navy, and Air Force was held, by State Department order, to no more than 165,000 men. The Communist forces, meanwhile, grew to several times that number.

The Vietnamese Civil Guard was not permitted to be transferred to the Department of Defense so that it could be adequately trained, equipped, and organized. Thus, when the Communist Viet Cong did attack in force, civil guard units were decimated. This enormously enhanced Viet Cong prestige and huge rural areas were lost which never have been recovered.

Aware of the mounting guerrilla threat, U.S. officers sought to secure special forces troops to train the Vietnamese. The State

Department insisted that there was no guerrilla threat and no need for special forces personnel since they would swell the size of the U.S. military mission.

Eventually the State Department relented to the point of permitting a few special forces troops to be hastily rotated in and out of South Vietnam. U.S. officers on the scene state that this unique rotation system was a total failure since, in the 3 months allotted to each guerilla expert, nothing substantial could be accomplished.

Reports of growing Viet Cong terrorism and mounting Vietnamese casualties were systematically downgraded or suppressed by the U.S. Embassy in Saigon.

"It is probable," states a top U.S. officer, "that during 1958, Ho Chi Minh (dictator of North Vietnam) finally came to the conclusion that the United States was not too seriously interested in South Vietnam • • • that by stepped-up guerrilla activity he could overthrow the Vietnam Government and unite the country under Communist control." He also noted that a similar situation had prevailed in Korea before 1950, leading to a similar miscalculation—and war.

By mid-1959, it was clear to American military personnel that the Reds had decided to conquer South Vietnam by guerrilla warfare. This estimate was flatly rejected by the State Department.

The U.S. Embassy in Saigon was infuriated by the briefings given visiting U.S. Congressmen and other VIP's by officers of the military mission. The briefings warned of the expanding Red offensive.

Military mission officers were ordered to submit all future briefing papers to the Embassy for editing. All alarmist information was carefully removed. The military advisory group was bluntly ordered to minimize the Viet Cong threat.

Friction mounted between the U.S. Embassy and the U.S. military mission. Top Embassy officials made it plain that they were at least as hostile to the mission officers as to the Viet Cong.

By mid-1960, open civil war was raging throughout South Vietnam. Late in 1960, the Embassy was still insisting that action reports were wildly exaggerated. The suppression policy was enforced until the Vietnamese inferno exploded into public view, only then was it reversed.

The end result was, of course, that thousands of U.S. troops had to be rushed to South Vietnam in a bloody 11-hour effort to stem the Red tide. The end result of appeasement and suppression of ugly facts was not peace. It was war.

Independence Day of the Federation of Nigeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 28, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the Governor General of the Federation of Nigeria, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe; and His Excellency the Ambassador of the Federation of Nigeria to the United States, Mr. Julius M. Udochi, on the occasion of the second anniversary of Nigeria's independence.

THE FEDERATION OF NIGERIA—ITS INDEPENDENCE DAY

The Federation of Nigeria is the most populous State in Africa and one of the largest on that continent. Its teeming population is well over 35 million and its area is 340,000 square miles. The Federation of Nigeria is also one of the best governed and administered countries on that continent. The Federation consists of three distinct regions, constituting three separate administrative units: Eastern Nigeria, Western Nigeria, and Northern Nigeria. For more than a half century all of Nigeria was under British rule. Thus British traditions of law and administration prevail today. The Federation was formed in 1954, but the Federation of Nigeria, as a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and as an independent and sovereign member of the world community of nations, came into existence only 2 years ago.

In October of 1958, Britain's offer of independence to the Federation, within the British Commonwealth, was accepted, and on October 1, 1960, the consummation of this pledge was proclaimed. On that day and for the first time the people of Nigeria became the real masters of their own destiny. In the course of their very brief history as a nation, the people of the Federation of Nigeria have clearly proved to the world that they were fully prepared for the independence they had attained. Under their dynamic leader Sir Abubakar Balewa, and his able assistants, the Government of the Federation has been administering its affairs most efficiently and effectively. Nigerian leaders have proved real champions and true upholders of democratic principles, and they have demonstrated this in their maintenance of free elections, both in the Federation and in the self-governing regions, as provided in the Federal Constitution. In many matters, economic, social, cultural, and particularly in politics and administration the Government of the Federation of Nigeria has been a shining success of democracy at work. On the anniversary of their independence day we wish the people of Nigeria and their patriotic leaders peace and prosperity.

Northwest Lumber Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 28, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many words have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding the plight of the lumber industry of the Northwest. Although some progress has been made in alleviating the situation, much remains to be done.

Recently, Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, visited the Northwest and met with lumbermen in that area for an exchange of ideas which seems to have been profitable to both sides.

An editorial from the Pendleton East Oregonian comments succinctly on Secretary Freeman's meeting with the industry.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pendleton (Oreg.) East Oregonian, Sept. 24, 1962]

FREEMAN GOT IT FROM THEM

The lumber industry has been giving the Kennedy administration rough treatment. The President has been blamed by the industry for its troubles and he has been criticized for not solving those troubles immediately.

The lumbermen know that their problems were gathering long before John F. Kennedy got to the White House, but this is an election year and the truth gets some severe battering in an election year.

Up in Idaho the Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate declaimed the other day that "administration leaders ignore the fact that if they had tried to help our people several years ago, our lumbermen would not be facing ruin today." It probably didn't occur to this man who is so intent upon getting the problems of the lumbermen into politics that the Kennedy administration wasn't around several years ago when the lumbermen needed help.

President Kennedy's program for the lumber industry seeks to restrict Canadian imports, to expand access roads into new stands of timber, to furnish credit for upgrading the efficiency of mills, directs all Federal agencies to observe a "buy America" policy in the purchase of lumber products, and suggests amendment of the Jones Act which requires shipment of the American lumber in American ships.

This seems to many to be a sound beginning. It isn't something that will erase the lumber industry's problems but given time it can do much to help.

However, so many lumbermen have been clamoring for immediate results that it became necessary for somebody in the Kennedy administration to speak bluntly to them. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, in whose Department the U.S. Forest Service operates, was chosen for the task. He spoke to Western Pine Association executives in Portland September 14 and he laid it on the line. When he got through almost everybody who had heard him agreed that they liked what he had said.

Secretary Freeman hit one point that needed hitting. He told the lumbermen "you have not given due credit to the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture for a lot of hard work done in your behalf." He then listed some of the things the Forest Service has been doing: (1) Planning to develop national forests over the next 40 years to increase the annual harvest at a rate of 13 billion board feet of timber by 1972; (2) establishing higher standards of revegetation salvage, and erosion control on sales acres; (3) reforestation of more than 3 million acres of land; (4) building up the productive capacity of more than 11 million acres of less than saw-log stands through timber stand improvement; (5) intensifying fire protection programs; (6) expanding forestry research; (7) enlarging forest access road programs.

Mr. Freeman noted that the allowable cut on national forests is being increased annually and added that the administration is determined to protect the public interest

against any abuses by the lumber industry. He also argued that a method suggested by the industry for appraising national forest timber would fail to develop a reasonable estimate of fair market value—"a responsibility which I have to the American public."

The lumbermen like this plain talk and they praised Freeman for his knowledge of the technical aspects of some of their problems. A little praise for the administration was long overdue. The lumbermen dumped in the administration's lap some problems that have been developing for a long time and demanded immediate solution of them. The administration wants to assist the lumbermen and is developing plans as fast as possible to do it.

Some praise instead of condemnation has been due from the lumbermen and we were pleased to see Orville Freeman extract it from them.

HHFA and Crystal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 28, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contained some information about the frustrating difficulties recently encountered by the city of Crystal, Minn., in its dealings with the Chicago office of the Housing and Home Financing Agency. So that the record may be more complete I am pleased to have the unanimous consent of my colleagues to insert the following letter of September 17, 1962, from that office to Mr. F. A. Allbee, city manager of Crystal, Minn.:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE REGIONAL ADMINISTRATION,
Chicago, Ill., September 17, 1962.

Subjects: P–Minn.–3039, water facilities, Crystal, Minn.

Mr. F. A. ALLBEE,
City Manager, City of Crystal, Minn.

DEAR MR. ALLBEE: We have begun our review of the documents submitted in support of the city's request for the disbursement of planning funds for the above project. Before our review can be completed some of the material submitted will have to be augmented or revised to meet the requirements of the program of advances for public works planning.

The resolution, dated May 1, 1962, of the Council of the City of Crystal and the certificate of the recording officer for that resolution do not comply with the suggested forms for those documents which were attached for your convenience to the official request for the review and approval of planning documents. We are enclosing a copy of these suggested forms which should be adopted and executed by the city officials and submitted to this office. If there is some reason why the suggested complete documents cannot be used, please submit a full explanation.

Under date of May 9, 1962, the Director of the Division of Environmental Sanitation, Minnesota Department of Health, indicated approval of a proposed site for water storage in the city of Crystal. Since the storage facilities are only a part of the proposed project, it is suggested that the department of health be requested to comment upon the whole projected study and report submitted by the city of Crystal's consultants dated March 20, 1962.

It is also noted that the consultant recommends construction of a combined system comprising the city of Crystal and the villages of Golden Valley and New Hope with purchase of water supply from the city of Minneapolis. Since the application for planning funds contemplated only a water supply for the city of Crystal, it appears that it would be necessary to form a water district comprising the city of Crystal and the villages of Golden Valley and New Hope in order to follow the consultant's recommendations. In these circumstances, an application should have been made by the water district. We call the city's attention to the probability that prior consideration should have been given to a water district. Feasibility studies are not eligible under the program of advances for public works planning. The city officials are requested to state officially their position concerning the consultant's comments on this subject and on the project which is to be constructed.

Although the cost estimates appear realistic, we cannot reconcile the construction and project costs indicated in item 7 of form CFA–430, since such costs apparently are based upon a combined system for Crystal, Golden Valley, and New Hope. Costs for the city of Crystal only, would be in excess of the construction and project costs indicated in item 7 of form CFA–430, according to the projected study and report dated March 20, 1962, submitted for the city of Crystal.

The estimated cost of a water system using wells as a source of supply will be $3,591,100, according to an estimate appearing at the top of page 26 of the preliminary report dated March 20, 1962. The estimated project cost appearing on the original application was indicated as $2,333,750.

The report indicates that the city of Crystal's share of the combined system is estimated at $2,450,000. Refer to article D on page 25 of the report. Also, if a connection to the Minneapolis water system is contemplated, it is estimated that project costs will total $2,582,600. Refer to tabulations at the top of page 26 of the report. From a review of the report we have been unable to verify these project costs.

The city is requested to furnish a breakdown of the estimated costs for a water system complete with storage reservoir and/or elevated storage tanks together with pumping station and/or pumping stations as may be required for the city of Crystal independent of the combined systems. With such information at hand, we will be in a position to determine whether the report dated March 20, 1962, complies with the terms of the advance planning agreement within the city's ability to construct a complete and independent water facility for the city.

It is required that these matters be further clarified by the city officials prior to acceptance of the report and payment of the planning advance. It appears that it will be necessary for the city officials to decide which of the consultant's recommendations will be followed for construction before a definite project can be established. The report as submitted appears to be too general in character for this office to come to a definite conclusion relative to the project.

The city officials should submit the above documentation at their earliest convenience in order that we may continue with our review of the city's request for planning funds under the program of advances for public works planning.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN P. MCCOLLUM,
Regional Administrator.

The Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 28, 1962

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the editor of the Carroll County Times, published at Westminster, Md., a good friend of long standing, Mr. Charles Mooshian, has written an editorial which I consider worthy of special attention. It appears in the issue of September 20, 1962. Its title "The Constitution of the United States: The Same Yesterday, Today, and Forever," suggests the theme of the editorial. The piece is thought provoking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES: THE SAME YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND FOREVER

This is U.S. Constitution Week—September 17–22.

During this special week we observe the 175th anniversary of the drafting of the world's greatest document—the Constitution of the United States.

It behooves us all as citizens of this great Nation to read and reread this outstanding of all documents. As we read it we should support constitutional groups, who want the Constitution interpreted to the "letter of the law" and not through sociological and modern thinking.

We believe that the Constitution of the United States, which contains the basic principles of law of our great Nation, never changes (except by amendment)—it is the same yesterday, today, and forever.

It is ironic, however, that Supreme Courts of the United States up until the Roosevelt era, agreed on all points of law in the Constitution. But with the Roosevelt era of welfare and social administration, in which F.D.R. tried to pack the High Court, things have changed.

Of course, F.D.R. did not succeed in packing the Court through legal means but he did, through his right of appointment of Justices to the High Court. He eventually named a majority of the Judges on the Court, who approved his program.

President Kennedy has the same "F.D.R. philosophy" in regards to the Constitution. The President says he conceives of the U.S. Constitution as a document that can be changed at the will of the men (Supreme Court) who interpret it.

The President further says that the Constitution can be changed arbitrarily to fit the needs of a changing age and changing times. The President says nothing about amendments, which the Constitution specifies for alterations—he just stresses interpretation. As times change, Kennedy says, so can principles.

The present Supreme Court, dominated by Liberal Earl Warren, has taken many liberties with its interpretations of the Constitution, not to "the letter of the law" but through sociological and modern thinking.

But just as in the law of God, so in the Constitution, the principles of right and wrong have nothing to do with a changing age and modern times.

It is just as wrong to steal and kill today

as it was when the law of God was given to Moses almost 4,000 years ago.

The rights of individuals and of the several States are the same today as they were first written September 17, 1787. But to read the interpretations of the present Supreme Court, you would think that James Madison and his associates did not know what they were doing.

But regardless of the present Court's interpretations, the principles of law in the Constitution do not change—only the circumstances of their application change.

In addressing a group of students recently, President Kennedy had this to say:

"The American Constitution is an extraordinary document, and it is certainly the most extraordinary written Constitution in the history of the world, but has required men to make it work, and it still does today.

"After all, the Constitution was written under entirely different conditions. It was written during a period of isolation. It was written at a time when there were 13 different units which had to be joined together and which, of course, were extremely desirous of limiting the central power of government."

We believe the Central Government should be limited today. The Federal Government has become too powerful at the expense of the States in direct conflict to the Constitution.

Realizing that ages and times do change, the framers of the Constitution provided ways and means by which the document could be amended.

But both Presidents Roosevelt and Kennedy believe this method to be "cumbersome" as Roosevelt so aptly put it.

So with a majority of liberals on the Supreme Court, President Kennedy gets his changes made through interpretation—through sociology—rather than through the legal process of amendment.

Recently the Council of State Governments in a resolution advocated the "separation of powers" and asked the Supreme and Federal Courts to exercise judicial restraint and noted: "These recent decisions overturn numerous court decisions to the contrary, which have been decided over scores of years and which represented the best legal thinking of many generations of great judicial minds, dedicated to the preservation of the Federal system; that these decisions in areas of Federal-State relations enunciate an entirely new and strange doctrine which says that the courts not only can interpret the law but also can legislate and administer the law by judicial fiat."

We believe it's time we sought the help of our Representatives in Congress to return our great Nation to constitutional government.

And, the time to do it is now—during Constitution Week.

President Kennedy Comes Back to West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 28, 1962

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, last night Senator RANDOLPH, Senator BYRD, of West Virginia, Congressman BAILEY, Congressman STAGGERS, Congressman SLACK, Congressman WAYNE HAYS, of Ohio, and I had the honor of accompanying President Kennedy to Wheeling, W. Va. The President opened his remarks by stating: "When I come back to West Virginia, I feel as if I was coming home."

The friendly people of West Virginia, despite the cold and rain, lined the streets from the airport to the football stadium, where the President spoke.

The following is the text of his remarks:

Governor Barron, Senator Randolph, Senator Byrd, Congressman Cleveland Bailey, Congressman Slack, Congressman Hechler, Congressman Staggers, Congressman Wayne Hays, from the neighboring State of Ohio, ladies and gentlemen, when I come back to West Virginia, I feel as if I was coming home. This, after all, is the State which sent me out into the world, and you are the people who made me the Democratic candidate for the President of the United States.

Sometimes when Senator HUMPHREY and I get together to discuss the crises which pile up on the President's desk, we may wonder which of us you did the greater favor for. But nevertheless, for better of for worse, I know that if it had not been for Wheeling, and a score of other West Virginia cities and towns, 2½ years ago, I would not be here tonight. This is the place where the Democratic victory of 1960 had its start, and I can assure you that this is also the place where the Democratic congressional victory of 1962 will have its start.

The campaign of 1960 was important, and that included especially the primary campaign, because it provided an education, not just for the candidates who were involved, but also for the people of the United States. It reminded this Nation that even in America people through no fault of their own have had to live lives of hardship and want, and that even in America communities, through no fault of their own, have suffered from stagnation and age, and it reminded this Nation that an affirmative and progressive government could do something about it.

To do something about it, that has always been the faith of the Democratic Party, and it is the issue in the 1962 election. For not everyone, even in America, welcomes change. Throughout our entire history there have always been people, and they are excellent people, who preferred to hold things as they were, who wanted to go back to some golden age which never was, and if change is inevitable, they want as little of it as possible. I do not agree. This has never been the view of the Democratic Party.

We believe that if men have the talent to invent new machines that put men out of work, they have the talent to put those men back to work, and that is the issue in this campaign.

The fact of the matter is that this State has a very clear contrast between these two points of view, because in the 1950's, West Virginia was left on the beach, to decline, to rot. Then in January of 1961 a Government of veto and obstruction and do-nothingism was thrown out of office, and a government here in this State of West Virginia, under your Governor, and a Government in Washington, committed to progress, began to work together for the State of West Virginia, and the result in that brief period has been a marked improvement in the economic climate of this State.

I do not claim for a moment that the problems of West Virginia are solved, but I say they have begun to be solved. I know that troubles and difficulties remain. I know that much more needs to be done, and that is the purpose of this meeting tonight, because we want your help in doing it, and that is why this election of November 1962 is so important.

Look at West Virginia today. Only 2 weeks ago the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce, not an organization which is an arm of the Democratic Party, announced that in 1961 the economy of West Virginia had recovered from a recession to have the second best year in the history of West Virginia, and if progress continues, 1962 would be the best year in the history of this State. There has been in the last 20 months a decline of 37 percent in the number of unemployed in this State, and there are still too many, but at least we have begun, and I come here tonight to ask your help in finishing this job.

Why has it come about? Why have we been able to make this progress? It is because we have attempted in this State and in this country a comprehensive attack on the problems that face this State and Nation. West Virginia has been fortunate to have enjoyed the strong and progressive leadership of your Governor, and it has come about because a progressive Democratic administration in Washington, and a Democratic Congress, has worked to provide the people of West Virginia with the tools to do this job.

It is the people themselves who must do it, but it is the State government and the National Government that can help provide an atmosphere that will make it possible to do the work. I am proud that the first thing I did on the Saturday morning after assuming the responsibility of President of the United States was to sit down at my desk and sign an Executive order doubling the amount of surplus food that could be distributed to the needy people of this State and other States.

But the job has only begun. In the fiscal year of 1960, the total of military contracts placed in West Virginia was $36 million, but since January of 1960 things have changed. The total in 1962 was 4 times as much as in 1960, and twice as much as in 1961. The increase from 1960 to 1962 has been 272 percent, and I might add that the neighboring States of Ohio and Pennsylvania, since January 1961, defense contracts have totaled $1.5 billion in each of these States, and defense contracts are only a part of the story. A few years ago West Virginia was actually paying more money into the Federal Treasury as a State with most serious economic problems than most of the other States, and a good deal more than it was receiving back from the Federal Government. Your State in those Republican years bore far more than its share of the national burden. We have changed this situation. In the allocation of public works, in road building, especially the North-South highway project, in small business loans, in family farm loans, in the food stamp program, in health, education, and welfare grants, in emergency unemployment compensation, in area redevelopment projects, the Corps of Engineers projects, in flood prevention, watershed protection, forest management, public housing and college housing, West Virginia has received increased grants, and this has stimulated and helps stimulate the West Virginia economy.

I know that there are those who are against this, and I know that there are those who say that people who are out of work should find it. But I believe that the free enterprise system means that there will be an opportunity for all people who want to find a job, and it is to that credo that this Government of ours is committed.

Two years ago I said that it was time to get this country moving again. In the last 2 years, we have made a start, but just a start. But we have begun to act, for no Congress in a generation has passed as much

affirmative and constructive legislation as the present Congress. This Congress under Democratic leadership has passed a widespread housing bill, an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25, an area redevelopment act for depressed areas, a manpower retraining act to make it possible for those who are out of work to find a new training and a new job, a bill preventing the distribution of harmful drugs, a farm act, relief for children of unemployed workers, and a trade bill, and these other bills which are important. But this is a beginning, and a beginning only. And that is why this election is important.

We have won fights by three or four votes in the House of Representatives, and we have lost fights by three or four votes. This is not a matter of personalities or merely parties. It is a question of whether the people of this District, rain or shine, will support people who believe in progress.

A few days ago we lost a bill for aid for higher education. We lost it by 32 votes; three-fourths of the Republicans voted against it. Last year 84 percent of the Republicans voted in the Senate against nationwide financing of unemployment compensation. Last month, 9 out of 10 Republicans on the House Ways and Means Committee voted against a bill to provide temporary relief for those who have exhausted their unemployment compensation. Eighty-one percent of the Republicans in the House voted against the area redevelopment bill. Ninety-five percent of the Republicans in the House voted against the Housing Act. Eighty percent voted against the minimum wage of $1.25—80 percent of the Republican Members of the House of Representatives voted against giving a man $1.25 for a 40-hour week, an hour.

This is the issue in this campaign. We want to finish the job that we have started here in West Virginia and in Ohio and Pennsylvania, because a good deal more needs to be done. But I can assure you that so closely divided is the House and Senate that we cannot do the job without assistance of forward-looking Members of the House and Senate. And this State of West Virginia has them. I am confident that Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY, with whom I served in the House of Representatives a decade ago, and your other Congressmen, KEN HECHLER, Mrs. KEE, Congressman—Well, they are all here—Stand up, gentlemen—HARLEY STAGGERS, WAYNE HAYS, of Ohio—with your two distinguished Senators—Gentlemen, stand up—that they are going to be back. These men and others like them, and women, have stood for the passage of the kind of legislation which means so much to the State of West Virginia.

I have too high regard for this State to have the rain fall upon all of you, but I want you to know how much I appreciate your coming here tonight in a cold, rainy night. You believe and I believe that it is the function of National and State Government to permit the people to develop their own resources. I can assure you that in January 1963 we shall send a program to the Congress of the United States which will continue the progress that we have begun to make. That program will be enacted into legislation only if we have Members of the House and Senate who share this same view of the future which the people of West Virginia have shared. This State, which for 10 years lay in the backwash, now knows that this State and others can move forward, and I come to West Virginia tonight for the purpose of asking your help in giving us the men and women who, joining together in Washington, can help West Virginia and the country move forward.

Thank you very much.

A Plea for Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 28, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the address given by New York City Council President Paul R. Screvane before the Queens Division of President Kennedy's Committee for Medicare for the Aged, on September 13, 1962.

As a member of that committee, and as an ardent supporter of legislation which will provide hospital and nursing care for our elderly citizens through social security, I want to endorse wholeheartedly Mr. Screvane's eloquent plea for medicare.

Perhaps next year we will once again have an opportunity to consider this measure, and to put into effect an adequate and long-needed program of medical care for the aged.

The speech follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, when a cause is as progressive, as right, and as necessary to the Nation's well-being as the cause we are gathered here tonight to support, we have the certainty that we will eventually be on the winning side. We will—sooner or later—see Congres pass a bill to provide medicare for the aged under social security. The question is, what can we do to make it sooner, rather than later?

Our problem is no longer one of convincing the public; it is a problem of translating the public will into legislative action. As more and more Americans reach the age of 65; as more and more senior citizens see their life's savings dwindle to pay hospital bills; as more and more middle-income families see their savings used to support their aged parents; as the financial hazards of old age spread until they affect virtually every family in our Nation; the call for a medicare program will become overwhelming and irresistible.

We are gathered in a section of the country and in a city where impressive public support for medicare is already evident, thanks largely to the volunteer efforts of people such as yourselves.

Mayor Wagner, whose father sponsored a medicare bill in the Senate as far back as 1940, has taken the lead in organizing popular support on a nationwide basis. Hundreds of mayors throughout the Nation are working together in their cities with groups such as these to keep medicare alive.

Whether medicare passes Congress next year will depend on this year's elections. A single issue often gets lost in the turbulence of a national campaign, but medicare is too important to be swept out of sight.

Perhaps the most important items in President Kennedy's domestic program can be better considered one by one.

Let's make medicare the single domestic issue by which to sift out the candidates for the 88th Congress. Let's make medicare a political litmus test for all aspirants, Democratic and Republican alike. Every candidate should have to stand up and be counted on this great social issue.

In every district in the Nation, let us organize to elect a majority pledged to enact the King-Anderson bill.

This is an issue which cuts across geographical and political borders. If any of you have friends and relatives in other areas of the United States, I would strongly urge you to communicate this need to them. They must join their voices to ours in a great chorus for medicare. Convince them of the almost tragic need for this measure. And once you have convinced them, you must make sure they let their candidates and elected representatives know their views.

When I was younger, the chain letter was a fad. It was built on the idea of a mathematical progression. Each one would write to two and each two would now write to four. Perhaps this fad of years ago can be resurrected into something more than a fad. It can be a means to tell our medicare story.

Even though we must press actively for Federal enactment of an adequate medical care program, we must not neglect our own State of New York. Unfortunately, our State administration has long clouded over this issue of medical care to the aged. It has not been accidental.

Of course, in New York State there is a law involving medical care for the aged which implements the Federal Kerr-Mills Act, but this New York State law gives the distorted illusion of help to the aged. It takes care only of the indigent. To be helped, you must undergo what is known as a means test.

Governor Rockefeller is wedded to the debasing and unrealistic standard of a strict means test. In his approval message for the State law, he promised that his program would help the medical needy without loss of their possessions or dignity. But, this law was so limited that even the Governor had to concede that amendments were needed. An amendment was added in 1962.

However, did this amendment lessen the requirements of the means test? No, it did not. Did it cut out the specific monetary requirements for eligibility within the law? No, it did not. Did it return this standard-setting function to the State board of social welfare as the now dead Ohrenstein-Lentol bill proposed? No, it did not.

It is hard to believe, but there are proud parents who would prefer to die of untreated diseases rather than subject their children to the shame of an inquiry.

Did this 1962 amendment eliminate the responsibility of relatives for the payment of bills incurred by the aged; and as a concomitant, the investigation of these relatives' financial resources? No, it did not.

What it did was to interchange the words of the old song, "it accentuates the negative and eliminates the positive."

Is this a law today which preserves the dignity of the individual? The answer is obvious. No, it is not.

There are other parts of the State law in which medical services could be expanded to helped the aged. Our State should be a pioneer in social legislation. Yet, there are States which have far better implemented the Kerr-Mills Act than New York State.

The Ohrenstein-Lentol bill, which the city administration supported, proposed that State services include diagnostic screening, preventive services, private duty nursing services, as well as home health care. This bill reflected the need of the State department of social welfare to establish adequate medical care and service standards.

The setting of these standards would have been done in consultation with a committee of qualified members of the various health professions. But this bill is dead. And we must look to the present and the future.

Today, medical care for the aged has become an all-inclusive issue at the local, State, and national levels of Government. We must build a national roof of health protection over our elder citizens through the King-Anderson bill. Too long have our aged

endured the symptoms of illness because they cannot afford treatment or because they are too proud to accept charity. Many postpone hospitalization until it is too late to do anything about their illnesses. Any government that permits this to happen can properly be accused of inhumanity. It is inconceivable that the United States with its vast wealth, cannot see to it that its aged can meet their medical needs with dignity and independence.

Every show of public sentiment of this long-overdue and desperately needed piece of legislation will have its effect in demonstrating to the Congress that the American people, rich and poor, young and old, sick and well, demand a realistic and humanely adjusted program of medical care for the aged.

We have the justice of our cause and the massed millions of medicare's adherents to assist us. If we organize, we shall win. And, we will win.

Thank you.

Who's in Charge Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson, Mich., Citizen Patriot of September 24, 1962:

WHO'S IN CHARGE HERE?

We doubt very much that the New Frontiersmen planned it that way, but Saturday's new budget prompted a question: "Who's in charge here?"

The first item on the front pages on that day told of President Kennedy's telephoned message to the Ohio Democratic State Convention in Columbus.

The President told the assembled Democrats, in effect, that the tide of communism had been reversed in the 20 months he had been in office.

When his administration took over on January 6, 1961, he said:

"Khrushchev was on the move in the Congo, Gizenga was on the move in the Congo, Castro was on the move in the Caribbean, and the Communists were on the move in Laos and Vietnam.

"In the months since, the tide has been reversed. We have taken the initiative in aid, trade, and diplomacy. We have stopped the Communists in Laos and in South Vietnam and in Berlin.

"Gizenga is a forgotten figure, Castro reduced to a state of desperation, and has thereby sealed his own doom in South America and Cuba."

The President's remarks sounded fine except that they landed on the front page in an unfortunate juxtaposition with a report on testimony by Secretary of Defense McNamara before the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. McNamara, generally pictured as the "least political" member of the Cabinet, told the House group that the present world crisis is the worst in years. He said, specifically: "I would say that the crisis today in terms of military requirements and potential military operations is more severe than at any time since the Korean war."

His testimony was given in connection with the President's request for standby authority to call up 150,000 Ready Reserves in the case of some flareup while Congress is not in session.

Now to go back for a moment to the President's remarks:

"Khrushchev was on the move in Berlin." Since 1961, Khrushchev has built the wall and is pushing harder than ever in that trouble spot.

"Gizenga was on the move in the Congo." The Congo still is one of the worst problems facing the world.

"Castro was on the move in the Caribbean."

"Castro, personally, may not be moving very far or fast today, but he is responsible for the creation of a Soviet military base 90 miles from American shores; for the flagrant violation of the Monroe Doctrine and the conversion of Cuba into a Russian satellite. Not bad for a man who isn't moving. He may have sealed his personal doom, but the danger to the hemisphere is incalculable and can't be wished away. The Alliance for Progress is making little progress.

"We have stopped the Communists in Laos." Have we, really? There is growing evidence every day that the troika government there will lead to a complete takeover by the Reds. They are not living up to their agreements and there is precious little the United States can do about it.

"And South Vietnam" * * * The issue there is cloudy, at best. Certainly it is nothing for the President to brag about at this time.

The answer to this little riddle, of course, is that a political speech to a State convention often bears little relation to the facts which must be presented to a congressional committee.

Still, the people have the right to know which appraisal of the world situation is correct.

Commentary on the Economics of Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I invite the Members' attention to the following article from Insight, a publication of the Council of California Growers. This article, which details the success story of Sterling Grant, is also a good commentary on the economics of farming:

[From Insight, Sept. 17, 1962]

AGRICULTURE: CALIFORNIA'S MOST IMPORTANT INDUSTRY

WASCO.—Sterling Grant is a sharecropper. But not the kind you probably have seen pictured: That hang-dog fellow behind a mule and plow, and living in an unpainted shack.

To find out how the modern tenant farmer lives in California these days, the Council of California Growers sent a reporter to Grant's farm near Wasco in the San Joaquin Valley, approximately 25 miles northwest of Bakersfield.

What the reporter found, instead of a mule and plow, were more than a dozen tractors and numerous pieces of other farm equipment. Instead of a shack, the reporter found an attractive yet modest modern ranch home, surrounded by green lawns, shrubs, flowers, and trees, and well-tended fields. He also found a happy, busy family—each one doing chores ranging from feeding 4–H Club project calves to painting a cotton trailer. There are two boys and two girls.

When Sterling arrived at the ranch for the interview he was in a hurry—as usual.

"I just got word that one of my irrigators has a lame leg," he said as he whirled into the yard in his car. "So hop in and we'll talk while I drive out to see how he is."

The irrigator had gone home. Sterling was relieved.

"He's a good man," Sterling said, speaking of the irrigator. "I certainly didn't want him working with a sore leg."

Upon returning to the ranch, a perky red barn caught the reporter's eye and prompted an admiring comment.

"My wife built that a couple of summers ago. Used old railroad ties and planks from an abandoned oil-well derrick, together with lumber from some nondescript buildings around here."

Ssventeen-year-old Joe is using one-half of the downstairs of the barn as a shop. Parts of an ancient auto were being cleaned. The other half is home for the 4–H Club beef animals.

Upstairs is a children's playroom, which can be quickly converted into a dance parlor or game room for the parents. In the corner sits an upright piano. It's used when Sterling, his brother Loran, the latter's wife and a couple of neighbors get together to play music. Sterling plays the trumpet.

"We play mostly for fun," says Sterling. "My brother Loran really is a fine musician. Before he joined me in farming, he played in a movie studio orchestra. He arranges the music."

Today, the Grants farm approximately 1,500 acres, of which 1,160 is leased on a share-of-the-crop basis from Kern County Land Co.

"If we hadn't been able to lease this land, under the terms given, I'm doubtful whether we could have made a go of it," says Sterling. "My father owned 70 acres of land in this area, but that just isn't enough in this high-cost era of farming to get the yield for success. For the fellow getting started, land is too costly—running up to $1,000 and $1,200 per acre in this area. Leasing on a share basis permits a young farmer to put all of his capital into operations instead of into land."

With a capital of only $4,300, the 27-year-old Sterling plunged deep into farming almost as quickly as he had shucked his World War II uniform.

His other assets were a long-nurtured desire to be a farmer, 4 years of high school and 2 years in the agricultural college at the University of California in Davis, plus a couple of years in prewar farming. And a good credit rating.

Grant is only one of 350 farmers, large and small, who lease a total of 115,000 acres from Kern County Land. The company, itself, farms 11,000 acres.

To help these farmers get started, Kern County Land gave many of them 5 years' rent free in exchange for their leveling and otherwise improving the once raw land.

Says Grant: "You often hear how these large landholders are squeezing out the independent farmers and making it impossible for young farmers to get started. Examination of the facts reveals just the opposite; hundreds of farmers with small capital got their start by leasing from larger holders."

Although his gross income often runs into six or more figures, Grant is by no means a wealthy farmer. His costs are enormous. For example, this year his production costs on just one 160-acre garlic crop will be around $128,000—about $800 an acre—before he gets a cent in return.

But there is no guarantee he will make a cent of profit. There is always the danger of a crop failure for one reason or another.

To lessen his risks, Grant diversifies. Black-eyed peas, onions, potatoes, alfalfa,

cotton, barley, sugarbeets, watermelons, cattle.

If one crop fails, or if the bottom drops out of the market for others, Grant hopes to cover his losses with the remaining crops.

Sometimes he doesn't cover all of the losses. Then he does custom harvesting for other farmers.

In most years Grant borrows heavily to cover production costs.

At the office of the Bakersfield Production Credit Association in Bakersfield, the Council reporter talked to James Beagle, the manager, and learned why Grant is considered a good credit risk.

"Sterling Grant is, first of all, one of the best farm operators in the lower San Joaquin Valley. He's extremely honest. Likes to do things right, and keeps an accurate set of records. And he tends to business."

But, to Grant, business and profits aren't everything in life. They're means to ends. They mean the time to join his family on pack trips. Fishing and hunting. To serve as president of the Wasco Union High School board of trustees, and push through his pet project: a high school farm and agricultural laboratory. To serve as chairman of the Methodist Church lay board. To help 4-H Club boys and girls to get started on projects.

And to play trumpet in a five-piece jazz band.

Expressing the Determination of the United States With Respect to the Situation in Cuba

SPEECH
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 230, expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my personal opinion on this Cuban situation.

Like every other red-blooded American, I resent the Cuban importation of so-called technicians from Russia and I like many others—wish we could go back to the days of "waving the big stick" and sending the Navy around the world to impress our adversaries.

However, times have changed considerably since those days, for then the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with our well-manned and well-equipped Navy were not only our first line of defense, but were great natural obstacles for any ambitious invader to conquer.

Today, with the atomic-powered submarines that are capable of releasing missiles from submerged positions, with jet fighter planes capable of carrying and accurately firing missiles, with missile bases on both continents equipped and ready to fire at ranges 5,000 miles away, we must admit the world has radically changed.

As it has grown in knowledge and sophistication, through science and technological innovations, it has shrunk in size and you know as well as I that in minutes Europe, Asia and the Americas—North, South, and Latin—could be rendered desolate.

Under such circumstances, it is necessary for the people of the world to become full-grown adults and mature—and face facts as they are, not as we wished they might be.

Just as the world has changed, as our way of life has changed, as our mode of living has changed in the last 100 years, or even in the last 20 years, so must our policies change and our means of handling impudent challenges to our leadership of the world.

No longer can we say "If you won't play my way, you can't play."

No longer is American a young struggling nation—we have become the leader of the free world and with it comes responsibiilties to maintain stability in this troubled universe.

As a veteran of World War I, having served in France with the AEF, and of World War II, where I served in the European theater of operations, I subscribe to President Kennedy's views that "this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies * * * however, I hope that the American people will, in the nuclear age, as they have in the past, keep both their nerve and their head."

Some wires and letters I have received have stated "Now is the time to send troops into Cuba," "It's now or never to fight Cuba," "Let's get over there to Cuba and show them up," go, go, go. I should like to write these people "Are you going to enlist and volunteer your services for this encounter?" but few include their addresses and the majority of them are not from my district.

In view of the President's suggestions I was pleased to read in the Daily Messenger, a newspaper from Homestead, Pa.—a community in my congressional district—an excellent editorial on the present "hot" cold-war situation and I would like to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that many of my colleagues have the opportunity of reading it. It is good to know that we have responsible and levelheaded publishers and editors throughout the Nation who are dedicated to reporting the facts—and not just publishing scare headlines to sell their paper:

MONROE: OBSOLETE DOCTRINE

The establishment of a Russian outpost on Cuba, 90 miles from Florida, has sent newspapermen and politicians scurrying to their history books for a brushup on the Monroe Doctrine.

In blowing the dust away, some have interpreted the 139-year-old document as a clarion call to send the marines to Cuba.

Unfortunately, they are invoking a dead doctrine.

The Monroe Doctrine is dead simply because the era of gunboat diplomacy has vanished.

The threat of nuclear holocaust has rendered obsolete former ideas of American might and right.

The United States cannot, as some of the "war hawks" suggest, throw a blockade around Cuba and risk igniting World War III.

At the same time the Nation's responsible leaders have made it plain that this country will draw a fight-if-we-must line.

Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said Monday that the United States is ready to take military action against Cuba if necessary.

"If our naval base at Guantanamo is threatened; if the Panama Canal is threatened; if Cape Canaveral is threatened in any way; if American lives are threatened; or if Cuba should in any way attempt to export its aggressive military purposes by force against any nation in this hemisphere; or if Cuba should become an offensive military base then we will take whatever military action is warranted by the facts," Mr. VINSON said.

In support of his statement, Congress this week forged two weapons:

1. A declaration to use all means needed to block communism from endangering the Western Hemisphere.

2. A bill authorizing the President to call up 150,000 combat-ready Reserves if conditions in Cuba—or Berlin—warrant them.

While taking a firm stand, Mr. VINSON took the same tack as President Kennedy in urging restraint.

"We must be careful," Mr. VINSON said, "that we do not permit our emotions and national pride to overcome sound judgment."

President Kennedy at a recent press conference noted: "This country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies."

But he expressed the hope that the American people will "in the nuclear age, as they have in the past, keep both their nerve and their head."

The doctrine promulgated by President Monroe in 1823 said: "We should consider any attempt * * * to extend their [European powers] system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

It was easy in the 1860's to dissuade Louis Napoleon's dream of empire in Mexico.

Under the Roosevelt corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, it was easy to send marines all over the Caribbean to protect economically troubled countries.

But changing times compel modifications of sacred political doctrines.

We do not like the Soviet presence in Cuba any more than we liked the transformation of Dr. Castro from a revolutionary hero and liberator to a paranoiac dictator.

But the day is past when the mere presence of undesirables is excuse for easy war.

Cries of Munich-like appeasement are not apropos to 1962.

Expressing the Determination of the United States With Respect to the Situation in Cuba

SPEECH
OF
HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 230, expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice to those of my distinguished colleagues who have spoken in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 230, which expresses the firm support of the Congress for the President in the present Cuban crisis.

I am heartily in accord with the resolution, in view of the critical state of our relations with Cuba at this time, when the Soviet Union is getting bolder and bolder in its contributions to the military strength of the Cuban Government, as well as in advancing its own espionage activities in this hemisphere, for instance, through the fishing port which has just been announced.

Communism cannot be allowed to spread in our Western Hemisphere, and I feel that we are absolutely right in declaring to all the world that we are willing to support whatever means may be necessary to ensure that it does not spread. Our President has made it known that the United States will take action if the buildup in Cuba reaches such proportions as to present a threat to this country or its Latin American neighbors. I heartily endorse the expression by Congress of our willingness to support him in this action, whatever form it may have to take.

We all acknowledge that the President alone can have access to all the information necessary, and alone can be aware of all the considerations which must go into the formulation of foreign policy decisions. Senate Joint Resolution 230 also acknowledges this reality of the operation of our Government, and makes known to all the world, and most particularly to the Soviet Union, that the President has the unanimous support of the American people and their elected representatives in Congress in whatever actions he may take to keep this hemisphere free of the tyranny of communism. I, therefore, wholeheartedly support it.

On Mail Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Era, Bradford, Pa., issue of September 21, 1962:

ON MAIL RATES

In the address to the Nation in which he discussed the state of the economy, President Kennedy said: "I am urging the Congress * * * to end the postal deficit of $600 million a year."

All of us can agree with that purpose. But the rub comes in how to do it.

The bill now before Congress, which has passed the House but so far has not been given Senate consideration, contains provisions which almost all authorities regard as extreme.

For one thing, the mail rate increases proposed for the Nation's smaller publications—newspapers and magazines—would in many cases be almost literally insupportable. Example: The rate increase on a country weekly newspaper mailed to a subscriber a few miles away would be as great as on a huge New York Sunday daily going across the continent. The magazine business is deep in the doldrums now and the proposed increases in rates would actually, in a number of instances, be greater than profits.

Ever since the post office was founded its basic services—carrying of mails and publications—have been regarded as an essential contribution to public education, enlightenment and entertainment. They are thus a legitimate governmental expenditure and they should not necessarily be required to pay their way in entirety.

Awards to California Contractor Spread Far Afield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, so often the public gets the impression that if a California firm is awarded a Government contract, the amount of money announced for the contract will all be used and spent in California. This is not at all true. I recently had occasion to look into this with one of the companies in my district, and I believe some of my colleagues will be interested in just exactly what happens to amounts awarded to a large and prominent company in California.

Hughes Aircraft Co. awarded subcontracts to 5,632 companies in 35 States during the first 8 months of 1962 for subassemblies, components and services needed for the company's space, defense, and civilian programs. Hughes subcontract allocations for the first 8 months of 1962 totaled $87 million, of which 48 percent went to small business concerns. Hughes has been very active in small business participation in support of their prime contracts and has participated in Government-industry small business ad hoc committee work to afford small business the greatest possible opportunity to assist in defense and space work.

On November 10, 1961, the Hughes Aircraft Co. was host to 45 representatives of the defense industry and Government in reviewing the role of small business in modern procurement. Participating were representatives of the SBA, DOD, NASA, AEC, Navy, Air Force, Army, General Services Administration, with participants of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Security Industrial Association, Aerospace Industries Association, Electronic Industries Association, Machine and Applied Products Institute and American Gear Manufacturing Association. The meeting at Hughes followed a similar meeting held at Martin and North American, and the purpose was to acquaint all participants with typical prime contractor procurement complexities and to encourage the pursuit of all possible avenues to strengthen major defense industries small business programs.

With one eye on the long-term future growth and the other on the constant need to develop improved suppliers to meet the new technological requirements required by defense and space programs, Hughes Aircraft Co. opened a Midwest procurement office in Chicago to evaluate the potential of subcontractors in that area. The approach being taken by this office is to make a full determination of what Chicago and the Midwest States can do to help Hughes on its key space and defense programs. It is believed by Hughes that it can obtain more support from its existing subcontractors in the area, and it is Hughes' belief that there are still more manufacturers in the Midwest region who cannot only help the company, but the national defense effort in general.

Hughes spent 13 percent of its subcontract money in the Midwest last year, mostly with manufacturers with which it had been doing business for some time.

Resolution by Mills College Alumnae Club of Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a formal resolution from the Washington Chapter of the Mills College Alumnae Association urging that heavy trucks be banned from the new MacArthur Freeway in Oakland, Calif. In support of this resolution, I wish to bring certain facts to the attention of the House.

MacArthur Freeway, which is presently under construction, is an important highway link for Oakland, Calif., with the Interstate Highway System, and is being built with the assistance of Federal funds.

Its present route cuts across a section of the campus of Mills College, an outstanding educational institution that has been in existence since 1852. It also cuts through a long-settled, high-class residential section, close not only to Mills College but also five public schools.

No one objects to the use of the freeway for heavy automobile traffic. But the objections raised with regard to the use of the freeway by large trucks are serious and vigorous, not only at the city management level but also in the State executive department and legislature.

I am quite aware that the administrative position of the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce is that all highways built with Federal aid are to be open to all types of traffic. This is based on the premise that trucking companies, just as private citizens and other concerns, are taxpayers and equitably, under normal circumstances, would not be denied the use of the freeway.

My plea here today is for a reasonable solution to the problem raised by the residents of Oakland in objecting strong-

ly to the use of heavy trucks on the MacArthur Freeway. The citizens of Oakland firmly believe the large-volume traffic of heavy trucks would constitute an intolerable disturbance to the academic atmosphere of the college and the five public schools. Furthermore, it could constitute a definite threat and cause possible loss to the owners of property close and adjacent to it.

They offer an alternative route, which is a parallel highway now part of the Interstate System, called the Nimitz Freeway. This highway is presently in use by the heavy trucking concerns, is only three-tenths of a mile longer than the MacArthur Freeway, does not disturb or harass the community, and the grades are much more gentle than those to be encountered on the new road.

All in all, only a few miles of travel are involved. I think it entirely reasonable for the citizens of Oakland to appeal to all responsible agencies concerned that the heavy truck traffic be banned from this short span of the MacArthur Freeway, in view of the fact that no unusual hardship will be imposed upon the trucking concerns if the alternate and existing routes continue to be used.

I should point out to the House that there is considerable precedent for such action. Other roads have been built with Federal assistance and have been blocked to heavy trucking. In fact, the Baltimore-Washington Freeway, for a considerable portion of its extent is free of trucking, and it runs through completely open country.

I strongly believe that the present atmosphere existing in the MacArthur Freeway area should be preserved to the greatest extent possible. I also believe that the citizens of Oakland have absolutely no desire to be obstructive or obdurate purely for unenlightened self-interest. I also strongly believe that the solution they offer, the use of the Nimitz Freeway rather than the MacArthur Freeway for large trucks, is reasonable and equitable. Therefore, I urgently seek the support of the House for this resolution.

The resolution follows:

To: Representative GEORGE P. MILLER.
From: The Mills College Alumnae Club of Washington, D.C., September 25, 1962.

For some time, the Mills College Alumnae Club of Washington, D.C., has been concerned about the progress of a new freeway (MacArthur Freeway) infringing upon the Mills College Campus in Oakland, Calif.

Our only concern has been for the well-being of a college which has nurtured intellectual curiosity among its alumnae and developed warmth, discipline, and personal commitment into an art of living. Cutting a freeway into one side of the campus, with the attendant noise and lack of privacy has seemed to us to endanger the very atmosphere which has fostered the college's particular interests.

Now, other considerations lead us to speak. We are specifically concerned about truck use of the new freeway which is but a short distance from the parallel Nimitz Freeway, which is itself only three-tenths of a mile longer, has a favorable grade, and has been designated for trucks since 1951. Truck use of the MacArthur Freeway will add considerably to the noise, fumes, and confusion already in store for Mills College and the residential neighborhood adjacent to it. We ask that trucks be excluded from MacArthur Freeway since there will be no hardship in continued use of Nimitz Freeway by them.

We have one other, perhaps even more important, point to make. Mills College is not the only educational institution to be threatened by highway demands. Skidmore, Swarthmore, Goucher and Colby may be in the same position as Mills. To quote the Washington Post of August 25, 1962: "Perhaps we ought to take another look at the purposes of life on this Continent. Is mobility all we seek? Where are we going to find oases where man can be quiet or, indeed, where students can study? All the freeways in the world will profit us nothing if we find only another cloverleaf at the end of our journey."

This statement speaks for itself. Surely every thoughtful person should be aware that inch by inch, mile by mile, only quiet greenswards are giving way to concrete. Is this our contribution to the future?

Mrs. Robert F. Cocklin
RUTH C. COCKLIN,
Regional Governor.
Mrs. Wm. Burdick
SALLY BURDICK,
President.

Group Practice Offers Improved Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 30, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last year, I introduced legislation which would encourage the development and growth of the group practice of medicine and the acquisition of health centers and facilities to meet our growing population.

My bill, H.R. 5887, was designed to assist voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term interest bearing loans. Since that time a more comprehensive bill, H.R. 13081, has been introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

This more comprehensive Harris bill has my full support. It is a measure which I believe deserves earnest and speedy consideration by this body because it will promote a most desirable way of helping to provide adequate medical and dental care for large numbers of our fellow citizens. This proposed legislation would authorize Federal mortgage insurance and loans to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping facilities for the group practice of medicine or dentistry or both.

Last February 27, President Kennedy's message on proposed health programs for the consideration of the 87th Congress emphasized the necessity of securing maximum utilization of the trained professional and technical personnel now available. In that connection, the President's message pointed out:

> Group practice offers great promise of improving the quality of medical care, of achieving significant economies and conveniences to physician and patient alike, and of facilitating a wider and better distribution of the available supply of scarce personnel.

It is quite true, Mr. Speaker, that in both the large urban areas and in smaller rural communities, an increasing number of American citizens—both laymen and leaders of the medical profession—have come to recognize the positive values inherent in group practice. We live in an age of proliferation of factual knowledge and techniques about every phase of medicine and dentistry.

In such an age of specialization, the individual medical physician or dentist has great difficulty in keeping up his practice while at the same time staying abreast of the vast number of new developments in the various medical or dental specialized areas, letting alone being able singly to purchase the equipment, often quite expensive, that is required to give the American citizen that high quality medical care which he has a right both to demand and to expect. Throughout the country, doctors and patients both are finding that group practice plans of various kinds offer a path toward more effective use of trained personnel and better care for the patient.

Three types of group practice units or organizations would be aided under the bill which has now been introduced. The first of these is cooperative or other organizations, including medical or dental groups, which offer comprehensive care on a group practice prepayment basis to their members or subscribers. The second type are public or nonprofit organizations which have been established for the purpose of improving the availability of medical or dental care in the community and which will make group practice facilities available to medical or dental groups for their use; and, lastly, medical or dental groups which meet certain standards of organization, procedure, and performance.

The Harris bill, H.R. 13081, would authorize the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service to insure mortgages securing loans for the construction of group practice facilities, up to a maximum aggregate liability of $200 million outstanding at any one time. Direct loans to the three types of group medical or dental plans would be authorized only if the Surgeon General finds the applicant unable to borrow the amount of the loan from other sources, with or without mortgage insurance, upon terms and conditions generally as favorable as the terms for other forms of insured mortgages.

The bill contemplates an authorization for appropriation of up to $10 million for the fiscal year of 1963 to provide capital for the mortgage insurance and loan funds. In the fifth year of the contemplated program the aggregate

appropriation authorized would be $60 million.

These funds will have a very great degree of effectiveness in making possible a rapid spread of medical and dental facilities throughout the country. The encouragement of voluntary prepaid group health care programs makes sound public policy. It is a healthy alternative to either Government control or socialization of medicine. It is popular and acceptable to many professional people and to patients. It deserves the modest financial encouragement to growth which this legislation envisions.

Africa and Food for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an address by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, before the Michigan Food-for-Peace Council at Detroit, Mich., on September 1, 1962. The address follows:

AFRICA AND FOOD FOR PEACE

(Address by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, before the Michigan Food-for-Peace Council, Michigan State Fairgrounds, Detroit, Mich., Saturday, September 1, 1962)

It is always a great pleasure for me to return to Michigan and be among old friends. But when I have an opportunity to return here for the Michigan State Fair and speak on both agriculture and Africa, such pleasure is heightened many times.

Let me begin by congratulating Sandy Brown and his associates on the Michigan Food-for-Peace Council, as well as those of you who represent the other States in regional committee No. 2. I commend you for your public-spirited and selfless cooperation in this vital task of developing public understanding and support for the food-for-peace program.

The importance of this program has been made abundantly clear by President Kennedy. One of his first acts after taking office—in fact, his second Executive order dated January 24, 1961—established a Food for Peace office in the White House. At that time the President said:

"American agricultural abundance offers a great opportunity for the United States to promote the interests of peace in a significant way and to play an important role in helping to provide a more adequate diet for peoples all around the world. We must make the most vigorous and constructive use possible of this opportunity."

What is it about our food-for-peace program that makes it so important in the overall scheme of our foreign policy? What are its objectives, and what kind of thinking is there behind the program?

Initially, the food-for-peace program—which operates under Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act—was conceived of as a kind of "surplus disposal" plan. But its objectives have been broadened considerably in the last year and a half. We have come to realize that we can put America's agricultural abundance to work to relieve hunger and improve nutrition throughout the world—and to contribute to world economic growth and security at the same time.

In 1961, exports under the program amounted to some $1.5 billion, or approximately 30 percent of the total U.S. agricultural exports of $5 billion. In volume, this adds up to about 60 billion pounds of U.S. commodities, principally wheat, corn, rice, and fats and oils.

In Michigan, out of total agricultural exports of $94.9 million in fiscal year 1962, almost 30 percent, or $27.4 million, were shipped under the food-for-peace program.

Africa ranks at the bottom among continents receiving food-for-peace assistance, but it has been receiving an increasingly larger share in the last 2 years. In fiscal year 1962, for example, our African food-for-peace program, excluding Egypt, amounted to $163 million, which is almost 10 percent of the total worldwide program. I might point out here that the value of all of the program's commodities are figured at Commodity Credit Corporation prices and do not reflect absolutely equivalent benefits in dollar expenditures.

We now have African programs under all four titles of Public Law 480, and an example or two of each may more meaningfully explain what we are trying to do under the program.

An important segment of the food-for-peace program is contained in title I of Public Law 480. Under this title, we can sell U.S. agricultural commodities abroad and accept payment in the currency of the importing country.

This part of the program also has a second advantage. Much of the money paid to the United States under title I can be returned to the purchasing country in the form of loans or grants for schools, dams, roads, electric power or other projects that can help speed the country's development. In addition, we can use some of this currency to defray the costs of our representatives abroad. Also some currency is used to support joint efforts of government and industry to develop larger commercial markets for U.S. farm products in foreign countries.

At the present time, six African countries are participating in title I programs—Congo (Léopoldville), Egypt, Guinea, Morocco, Sudan, and Tunisia.

Guinea, for example, signed a title I agreement on February 2 of this year. At this time, Guinea agreed to buy $7.5 million worth of U.S. rice, wheat, edible oils, and other agricultural commodities over a 3-year period, in exchange for Guinean francs. Two subsequent amendments raised this agreement to $10.67 million. Seventy-three percent of the proceeds from this sale will be loaned back to the Guinean Government for development of industry, agriculture, education, and public administration—projects agreed upon by both the United States and Guinea.

There are two principal uses to which America's farm abundance is put under title II of the law—(1) emergency relief, and (2) economic development.

In east Africa in the past year, both floods and drought raised havoc with the natural food supply of many thousands of people. You may recall the airdrop of corn and dried milk in Tanganyika in May of this year, in which our Air Force worked around the clock in speeding food to a famine-stricken area of that country. In Kenya, too, more than $5 million worth of corn, dried milk and edible oil was sent into the country in the past year for famine relief. Our Air Force also airdropped supplies in Kenya.

Turning now to that section of title II under which food is used as an instrument of economic development, both Tunisia and Morocco are using U.S.-donated food for partial payment of wages on public works projects. We have a $17.8 million work project agreement with Morocco under which 200,000 tons of U.S. wheat will be used by the Moroccan Government as partial wage payments for 200,000 workers employed in economic development projects. In Tunisia, another 180,000 people employed on roads, irrigation, reforestation and land conservation are being partially paid in U.S. wheat. Both Morocco and Tunisia pay part of the workers' wages in cash. The significant part of this program, however, is that it gives highly useful work to the unemployed—unemployed workers in Africa and unemployed foodstuffs in the United States.

Under title III of Public Law 480, food supplies are made available for distribution abroad through U.S. voluntary agencies. Although the volume of total agricultural exports accounted for by these efforts is relatively small, the benefits from this approach are very great.

On my most recent trip to Africa, in April and May of this year, I had an opportunity to see some of these operations first hand. I was greatly impressed with the effects of these voluntary programs and the dedication of the Americans distributing U.S. food in such places as Upper Volta, Dahomey, Rwanda, Burundi, and the Congo.

One of the most dramatic uses of both titles II and III of the food-for-peace program is taking place in Algeria, where between one-third and one-half of that war-ravaged country's population of 10 million is in need of relief. A new food-for-work project in Algeria announced on Thursday of this week, together with an extension of direct relief, will raise the total value of U.S. food provided to Algerians since 1956 to $73 million.

The new food-for-work project will provide $11.5 million worth of surplus food as partial wages to workers in a reforestation project in northeastern Algeria. It is estimated that this project will provide subsistence to 93,000 persons. The increased relief program of food for direct distribution is valued at $13.7 million.

The costs of the food and transportation under these projects will be paid for by the U.S. Government, but the distribution and handling is the responsibility of voluntary organizations—Church World Service, Catholic Relief Services, and the International Red Cross.

The last-known and thus far least-used part of Public Law 480 is title IV, under which the United States can deliver surplus agricultural commodities over a number of years and be repaid in dollars over an extended period. Last April, the first such agreement in Africa was signed with Liberia, and only 2 weeks ago one was signed with Ethiopia. Under the Liberian agreement, wheat, rice, and mixed livestock feeds valued at $8.64 million will be provided to that country over a 3-year period, and repayment will be made in dollars in 15 equal annual installments.

On balance, then, how effective is America's food-for-peace program? Is it meeting its objectives and doing the job it was designed to do? Is it helping us to fulfill those aspirations of the American people that underlie our national policy—our interest in seeking a stable world, and our deep and sincere concern for the welfare of people throughout the world?

I can see a resounding affirmative in the eyes and actions of an otherwise unemployed North African I met. This man was throwing all his strength and pride into running a pneumatic hammer on a country roadwork project. I can feel it in the lump that came into my throat as I watched central African school children line up to receive their milk, which came from boxes of dried milk proudly bearing the insignia of the United States of America.

Before pointing out positive features, however, let me make clear that we are aware of the genuinely difficult problems related to food for peace. I would be less than frank if I didn't mention some of the program's difficulties.

First, this program is not a cure-all for our agricultural surplus problems.

Secondly, in administering this program abroad there are day-to-day practical problems. Distribution in recipient countries is a particularly thorny one. Furthermore, reasonable precautions must be taken to be sure that these programs do not interfere with normal patterns of commercial trade. We want this program to supplement rather than hinder the development of the world's agricultural countries. And again, traditional eating habits in many countries cannot be changed overnight. Our surpluses may be completely unsatisfactory to people who have never tasted such food.

These are a few of the knotty problems connected with food for peace, and it is clear from them that our use of agricultural surpluses must be approached judiciously. Nevertheless, the stakes are so high—the urgent need to eradicate hunger and malnutrition and to solve some of the pressing difficulties of agriculture—that we must have the vision to accept these problems and try to surmount them.

On the positive side, the program offers constructive outlets for surplus agricultural production without endangering our balance-of-payments position; it lowers the costs of surplus storage; it bolsters farm income; and it is improving business for our railroads, seaports and shipping lines. Furthermore, it is showing the people of the world that farmers in our free democratic system can outproduce regimented Soviet farmworkers by a ratio of 5 to 1. Our food-for-peace program also is raising nutritional levels abroad, developing new markets for American agriculture, and assisting in the vital economic development of many new countries.

Perhaps most importantly of all, food for peace reaches large numbers of individuals in the recipient countries directly. This is one of the most pesronal of all our foreign-aid programs. The African people know where these foodstuffs are coming from, and this is building a broad-based reservoir of good will for the United States.

In terms of how this program is received in Africa, we have evidence that it is widely and gratefully welcomed. On my recent trip, for example, I was personally thanked many times in Coquilhatville, in the Congo's Equateur Province, for the flood relief supplied under Ambassador Gullion's special fund. Following the airdrop in Tanganyika, the appreciation of the Tanganyikan people was widely reported in the press when they presented President Kennedy with a stuffed baby crocodile and a dugout canoe.

In Kenya, Masai tribesmen sent the President a shield and spear, and their spokesman said: "We are an insignificant people, but America is a big nation and probably the richest in the world. If she chose, she could remain unconcerned. We are deeply touched by the generosity of your people. We believe the kindly action has no political bearing, and in it we can learn that even in the world of atomic bombs the simple and natural kindness of man to man still remains."

Now, what of the future of the food-for-peace program?

This is a good program and will be with us for a long time. It is of great interest to the Congress. Based on discussions abroad and evaluations by the Department of Agriculture, we expect the program to expand and become increasingly effective in years ahead. We foresee more long-term arrangements under title IV as these operations become better understood. We see a broader variety of foods made available, and we see greater use of food to pay foreign workers on public works projects.

You on the Michigan Food-for-Peace Council and regional committee No. 2 have a unique opportunity to contribute materially to the program's future. You can give us advice on how to conduct the program and expert technical assistance on problems of production, storage, transportation, and distribution. You can arouse the interest and enthusiasm of civic groups and private citizens alike. You can select specific agricultural problems in particular countries and take on their solution as your personal projects to make the program more effective.

With your help, the future of the food-for-peace program takes on a very optimistic outlook—even though we realize the program in itself will not solve our farm problem, nor will it end the world's hunger and malnutrition. But it can make a major contribution toward an eventual solution of these problems and help speed the development of new and emerging nations—and this is a desirable goal that we can share with all people interested in world peace and stability.

Viewpoint of Youth—National Council, Boy Scouts of America—for Explorers Division of Boy Scouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a communication entitled "1962 National Conference Delegates Daily," issued by the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America. I know that all who read it will be not only richly informed, but also richly inspired by this printed discussion and report. Also I know, Mr. Speaker, every Member of this great legislative body will join with me in complimenting this section of the Boy Scouts of America in their very worthy and patriotic objectives in the best interests of our beloved Nation.

The above-mentioned material follows:

VIEWPOINT OF YOUTH

We, the representatives of the Exporing program of the Boy Scouts of America, in order to give "our best today for a better tomorrow," present this viewpoint of youth, of, by, and for Explorers, as a challenge to renewed and redirected action, starting now and continuing so long as we are Explorers.

Work for a balanced education making full use of our talents, so we may defend, advance, and enjoy, the American way of living.

Learn more about communism and other subversive organizations so we can bury them with the truth about freedom.

Keep informed on public affairs by all means of communication from the printed page to Telstar.

Grasp leadership responsibilities and help other young people do the same in Exploring units and cabinets, in student councils and clubs, and in religious youth groups.

Form our own opinions of today's opportunities and problems and express these in youth conferences and to influential people such as editors and Government representatives.

Urge more young people to join Exploring, school, and religious groups as workers, not watchers.

Seek greater recognition of youth's abilities and achievements which stand in overwhelming contrast to its delinquency.

Make Exploring more useful in community life and in our own lives through our service expe iences.

Promote more school courses and assembly programs on citizenship, American government, and competitive free enterprise.

Be able to explain how competitive free enterprise is related to our form of government, offers freedom of opportunity, and raises our living standards.

Conduct activities that increase our understanding of the principles set forth in the U.S. Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and Bill of Rights.

Learn more about the economic facts of life through vocational exploration, post specialties, and cabinet activities, such as career conferences.

Develop enough money-earning activities to avoid the free-ride attitude in unit programs.

Follow only leaders of character, and ask for technical help from the best qualified adult consultants.

Take the initiative in forming world friendships by welcoming exchange and student Explorers into our homes and meetings, and by corresponding with them.

Learn about and support methods of world friendship such as the Peace Corps, CARE, Red Cross, Radio Free Europe, and student exchanges.

Participate wholeheartedly in Exploring's new fit-for-tomorrow plan.

Help overcome many young people's take-it-or-leave-it attitude on personal fitness by demonstrating that fitness is fun.

Encourage competitive sports for all young people as players, not spectators, with a premium on clean sportsmanship.

Promote more challenging physical education programs with better direction and facilities in many schools, starting in the lower grades.

Conduct unit, district, and council competition in carry-over sports.

Extend more of our wilderness trips beyond reach of the station wagon.

Include more reverent and patriotic observances in our programs.

Encourage more Explorers to qualify for their religious awards.

Hold faithfully to our nonsectarian but reverent policy toward all Explorers' religions.

Discuss more often the application of such standards as the Explorer Code, Scout Oath and Law, Golden Rule, and Ten Commandments to our personal problems—bearing in mind that what we do, tells more about us than what we say.

(Based on discussions and adopted in principle by 3,200 delegates, representing 283,560 Explorers, at the First National Explorer Delegates' Conference at Ann Arbor, Mich., August 29, 1962.)

PUT VIEWPOINT TO WORK

Our viewpoint of youth will do a great job for exploring in your hometown and council when you put it to work. Feature it in your speeches and articles about the conference highlights.

On the way home, organize your delegation to spread the good word about this first conference. Divide the assignments and tackle as many as you can.

WHOM TO REPORT TO

Arrange to appear before such groups as these: All posts, ships, squadrons, especially those without members at the conference; all high school assemblies; Explorer lead-

ers' roundtables; council executive board, Exploring committee, commissioner staffs, and district committees; Explorer parents; chartered institutions; religious youth groups; civic, fraternal, patriotic, and business groups; and local government bodies.

HOW TO REPORT

Give a talk, plus questions and answers.

Be interviewed by a newspaper reporter or feature writer.

Be interviewed on a radio or television program.

Write news or feature stories for school and local papers.

WHEN TO REPORT

Start presenting and explaining the viewpoint of youth as soon as you arrive home and carry on for months—until a new delegation starts reporting the next conference.

National Conference of Christians and Jews Honors Secretary Celebrezze With National Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the fair city of Cleveland, Ohio, was the site of a well-deserved honor paid to the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The honor paid to Secretary Celebrezze was the National Human Relations Award given annually by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. This memorable event took place on Sunday evening, September 23, 1962, when 1,200 leading citizens of Cleveland and the State of Ohio gathered to pay this well deserved tribute to Secretary Celebrezze.

The toastmaster of the evening was Louis B. Seltzer, outstanding, able, and respected leader of the free press, and the editor of the Cleveland Press, who led a brilliant array of speakers including Senators Frank J. Lausche and Stephen M. Young of Ohio, Gov. Michael V. DiSalle, Hon. Frances P. Bolton, Mayor Ralph S. Locher, Thomas F. Patton, president of Republic Steel Corp., and Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, president of NCCJ.

The highlight of the program was a message by President John F. Kennedy, brought to this distinguished gathering through closed-circuit television.

The religious life of Ohio was represented by the Most Reverend John F. Whealon, bishop of the Catholic diocese of Cleveland, Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld, Fairmount Temple, and Dean David Loegler, Episcopal diocese of Ohio.

Organized labor was represented by Sebastian Lupica, executive secretary of the Cleveland AFL–CIO, and Patrick J. O'Malley, United Auto Workers regional director.

Secretary Celebrezze, in his acceptance address before the leaders of every walk of public, civic, and private life in Ohio, made an eloquent and touching plea for this generation of young Americans who, a few short years from now, must assume the responsibilities for the conduct, the preservation, and the extension of our representative form of government. The common responsibilities which all Americans must share in the fulfillment of this task was the underlying theme of his address. Appropriately, Secretary Celebrezze paid a well-deserved tribute to the National Conference of Christians and Jews for the vital role it is playing in meeting this challenge and in finding a dynamic consensus on other human problems related to the common good.

It was my privilege and that of my fellow Congressmen, the Honorable WILLIAM MINSHALL of Cleveland and the Honorable WILLIAM AYRES of Akron, Ohio, to be present at this national award dinner. The Cleveland chapter and the northern Ohio region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews deserve a warm public commendation for the leadership demonstrated in bringing this recognition to a great American in the city where he grew up and where he achieved unique accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the message delivered by President John F. Kennedy and the address delivered by Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze on the occasion of this memorable national award dinner.

PRESIDENT'S TRIBUTE TO CELEBREZZE

I am delighted to joint with the many friends of Secretary Celebrezze in honoring him in his native city tonight. It is a tribute to the spirit of brotherhood that the people of Cleveland would be willing to hear from one who took their mayor from them, but we have taken him from Cleveland in order to serve the people of the United States.

Mayor Celebreeze's life, I think, epitomizes, all the great qualities which we associate with the word "brotherhood"; his desire to serve people, his integrity, honesty, his courage, all these qualities which you in Cleveland know so well, are becoming increasingly well known to the people of Washington and the people of our country.

I salute him tonight as a very worthy recipient of a very great honor, an honor which comes on the hundredth anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, the hundredth anniversary of a great effort by a great American to provide equal rights for all people. This is the essence of brotherhood.

Secretary Celebreeze has lived brotherhood, and therefore I think it is most appropriate that you should honor one who by his efforts has honored the rest of us.

I salute you all, and most especially I salute my friend, Secretary Celebrezze.

ADDRESS BY HON. ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

It is good to be with so many friends who mean so much to me.

To be here—to receive the high honor you have bestowed upon me—these things fill me with a sense of deep gratitude.

I am deeply indebted to this city because Cleveland and the good friends here this evening are so much a part of me.

I have missed Cleveland and my daily contacts with many of you. But the past 8 weeks have brought me new experience. And they have given me new perspective on the community problems—and aspirations—which we have shared.

From a national viewpoint, the achievements of the citizens of Greater Cleveland in the fields of welfare and human relations assume new and larger dimensions. They are achievements of which you can well be proud.

And from a national viewpoint, the challenge of meeting human needs—of realizing the full potential of individual human beings—these also gain in dimension.

It is about this challenge that I would like to speak with you this evening.

This challenge to us as a nation is so great that, to meet it, we need the help of every individual and group—public and private—with a desire for a better world and the willingness to strive for it.

The wide range of activities of the Department I am privileged to head is some measure of the social and economic challenge we face. It touches the American home, hospital, and school. It touches many problems, such as those of water pollution, accident prevention, and health protection which are familiar to a former mayor and are a vital concern to every community.

But the Department does not have to grapple alone with these problems. Even my very brief tenure has given me new insight into a very American partnership, and that is the partnership across the Nation between millions of citizens and thousands of private and public groups and organizations and their Government in seeking solutions to health, education, and welfare problems.

I have been more than pleased to learn of the extent to which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare draws on community leaders throughout the country and the best professional and technical advisers for guidance in carrying out its many varied responsibilities. I shall continue to draw upon this rich reservoir of talent and ideas.

For a basic strength of our free society is this rich diversity of activity—this recognition that there is no single solution or single source of wisdom—this knowledge of the importance of working together—of seeking fresh approaches to old problems—of imaginative planning to meet new needs based upon the evident consensus of American opinion.

This has been the approach of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime—of which I am a member, along with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Labor.

Most of you are familiar with the problem this Committee faces. You know that our child population has been increasing over the past decade—but not as rapidly as the rise in delinquency rates.

If the present delinquency rate holds, then an estimated 3 to 4 million children will come before our courts in this decade—and this does not include youngsters in court for traffic offenses.

Should this happen, the social costs would be staggering. Right now the cost of juvenile delinquency to the Nation's economy is estimated at about $4 billion a year. This is about half of what we invest in operating all the hospitals—including mental hospitals—to serve a country now numbering almost 187 million people. The cost of juvenile delinquency to this country is more than one-seventh of our society's total expenditures for the education of our 51 million students, from kindergarten through college.

Cities, overcrowded with large rootless families whose breadwinners have little education and limited job skills—and frequently little hope for themselves or their children—produce large numbers of school dropouts, school "throwouts"—and juvenile delinquency.

What was needed, President Kennedy felt, was a coordinated approach to the problems of delinquency. What was needed was a great effort equal to the problem itself.

The President's Committee was formed to spearhead such an effort. We are trying to take an overall view—to give the problem the full attention it deserves—to put the best ideas of our most imaginative people to work—to spotlight successful projects in single cities or counties and encourage similar programs elsewhere.

Our philosophy of a massive coordinated basic attack on the problems of deprived youngsters is reflected in the standards we have set up for communities which wish training and demonstration grants. A community must demonstrate a deep commitment to the fight against delinquency. The efforts of all welfare groups—private as well as public—in the community must be welded into a concerted cooperative attack. And the city itself must be willing to demonstrate its participation by providing leadership and by sharing in the cost of the program.

The project's program must be broad in scope, attacking all major sources of delinquency. With the limited funds available, the purpose of the projects is to find and control and develop coordinated, broad-scale methods for the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

Such a project is well underway in Cleveland and shows promise of developing into a most effective program.

A new door has been opened for your constructive effort. It is my hope that you will work with us—to stimulate interest in our endeavor—and to help in preventing blight in young lives.

We will need your help, too, as we move forward in another closely related area of joint endeavor—to meet the Nation's public welfare needs. For, through the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 we have a new, constructive approach to public welfare. The new law incorporates recommendations President Kennedy made to the Congress for substantial revisions in the public welfare provisions of the Social Security Act. The new law provides the means to help our State and local governments, in turn, to help people help themselves.

Our new programs stress services as well as support; they stress rehabilitation instead of relief. Their aim is to help people into useful independent lives and thus—in the long run—to cut relief rolls and aid the taxpayer, too.

The aged, the blind, and the disabled are helped to attain or retain the capacity for self-care.

Dependent families and children are helped and encouraged to strengthen their family life.

These and other goals of these new programs are far from easy of attainment. The problems of the poor and needy in our time are terribly complex. The vast majority of people on the relief rolls are still the very old, the very young, and the disabled—people who have no other means of support. But others are the victims of complicated, disturbing modern problems—of discrimination and automation, of lack of education, of lack of job skills, of mobility and social change.

Tomorrow, we shall be meeting in Washington with the State Public Welfare Administrators to work out the administrative details of these new programs.

I have specifically asked that most careful attention be given to working out specific plans for an effective, cooperative effort to assure that aid to dependent children funds are being spent for the purposes intended by law.

We want to assure that the full benefit of our welfare programs goes to those in genuine need. And in so doing, we do not intend to let children suffer for the sins of their fathers—or mothers.

Community programs differ widely—different actions will be necessary in different places—intelligent leadership in interpreting necessarily technical legislation and policies is mandatory.

This is where we ask your help. We need the understanding, cooperation, and support of leaders like yourselves, who are deeply concerned with human values. For there is still in our land a need for greater public understanding of social welfare and its complexities. As a consequence, people often jump to unwarranted conclusions—and the victims may not be the so-called "chiselers"; they may be the innocent children in need.

Americans are compassionate people. They are realistic—they are fairminded—they are pragmatic. To produce the answers, they need only to understand the facts. The big job now is to give people throughout the land these facts and, hence, this understanding.

We cannot do this job alone. We need your help. For example: Could you not explain and so gain acceptance in your communities for the so-called "unemployed father provision" of the new Public Welfare Amendments? An unemployed able-bodied father and his family can now receive assistance, if the States take advantage of the new Federal legislation (some have already adopted it; others are considering it). People would think this right, if they realized that it holds families together—for under the new provisions families have greater hope of remaining together until fathers can get back to work.

In the same way, could you not help achieve a better understanding of the whole aid to families with dependent children program? In administering our welfare laws, we want to make absolutely certain, as I have said, that we have no freeloaders at the taxpayers' expense. But if we strike blindly forth at errant fathers or mothers, we may deprive their children of wholesome homes. This would not be right. It would not be fair. And, in the end, it would help fill our corrective institutions with the victims of our blunders.

I have mentioned only two of many programs in which this American partnership between public and private agencies and groups—between Federal, State, and local governments—is so vital.

In these and other programs we share a common responsibility—the responsibility of seeking the best possible inevstments in human welfare that we can find with the funds available to us.

For example, providing funds for medical research is a good investment in America's future, but it is a shortsighted investment unless the means are also found to make the fruits of research available to all who need medical care where and when they need it.

Building the classrooms needed to house our growing student population is, by all odds, a sound and necessary investment. But the returns on such an investment will fall far short of our expectations if we fail to make the necessary investment to attract and hold sufficent numbers of high-caliber teachers.

May I mention another area which transcends all others and requires concerted action by everyone—the area of human relations?

This is an area in which the National Conference of Christians and Jews is playing a vital role.

We have made undreamed-of progress in probing the mysteries of the physical universe, in providing an ever-higher standard of living, and in stamping out disease.

We have not been equally successful in solving the problems of living together, in eliminating tensions, and achieving the goals of mutual respect and understanding which are your mission.

As a father, I know that I share with those of you who are parents the hope that is uppermost in every home in this land—that our children may grow up in a world of peace and opportunity—that they may achieve the goals they set for themselves—limited only by their own capacity, free from the obstacles of bigotry, prejudice, and intolerance.

Every home in America, of whatever race or creed, has a right to this hope and to its fulfillment.

Realization of this hope rests upon our willingness to give to others the same opportunities, dignity, and rights we want for our own welfare and happiness. We must generate friendship, compassion, and respect for the rights of others in all our relationships.

We are living in a time of great and rapid change. Change creates problems. But change also offers opportunity for betterment.

What we do now will shape the future for many years to come We are fortunate to be living in a free nation which each of us has an opportunity to help shape the future for ourselves and our children.

By your support of the National Conference of Christians and Jews you are making a very tangible personal contribution to achieving the kind of understanding and mutual respect between people of all races and creeds which must be the foundation of lasting progress in any other field of human endeavor. As President Kennedy has reminded us: "America stands for progress in human rights as well as economic affairs, and a strong America requires the assurance of full and equal rights to all its citizens, of any race or color."

May we all rededicate ourselves to preserving and strengthening the American heritage of freedom and concern for individual human dignity so as to demonstrate for all the world the miracle of America—a nation in which free individuals are enabled to work out their own individual destinies in their own way.

The opportunities to translate this dedication into action are at every hand. May we make the most of them.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs Declares Goal of Full Disarmament Is Realistic and Urgent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 29, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the September 5, 1962, issue of the London, England, Daily Mirror, included an editorial under the headline, "The Name Is Pugwash." It pointed out that—

In London there is now being held an international conference which is significantly different from most other international conferences which tend to end in deadlock, dissolution and despair.

The Daily Mirror further noted that—

There are 200 delegates from 38 countries at the gathering, including 48 delegates from the United States and 23 representatives from the Soviet Union. Their main scientific purpose is concerned with the future of the world which may soon be blown to pieces. The name of this excellent and hopeful assembly is the Pugwash Conference—the name of an obscure place in Nova Scotia where these deliberations first started 10 years ago. The fate of the world has been decided before at crossroads which resounded with heroic names like the battles that have been fought all the way from Thermoylae to Waterloo, from Trafalgar to Alamein. These were the clashes of ignorant armies by night. Maybe the new dawn will come at an enlightened scientific assembly called Pugwash. So be it.

And, Mr. President, our country's Newsweek magazine, issue of September 17, 1962, included a significant synopsis of the Pugwash Conferences, headlined, "East-West: Peace in a Black Box." I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point in my remarks the Newsweek summary, and I emphasize that I subscribe fully to the conferees' closing statement:

We assert our conviction that the goal of full disarmament is realistic and urgent.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Sept. 17, 1962]

EAST-WEST: PEACE IN A BLACK BOX

The Pugwash Conferences, named after the Nova Scotia birthplace of their founder U.S. millionaire Cyrus S. Eaton, are forums where the world's scientists meet to discuss the perils facing mankind in an atmosphere of quiet, scholarly reason. When the 10th Pugwash Conference opened in London last week, drawing more than 200 scientists and philosophers from 38 countries (including such names as Bertrand Russell and Novelist C. P. Snow), it seemed at first that this atmosphere might dissolve into acrimony. In his opening address, Russia's Alexander V. Topchiev of the Soviet Academy of Sciences fired off an angry propaganda blast against the "imperialist groups * * * bellicose reactionaries" in the West whom he alleged were forcing Russia to be "last in the world to end nuclear tests."

But when the Conference got down to business behind closed doors on the key issue of disarmament, the Russians proved far less intransigent. The keynote was set by Britain's P. M. S. Blackett who pointed out that both the current United States and Soviet disarmament plans failed to insure a balance at every stage. "The first stage of disarmament," said Blackett, "should rapidly reduce strategic nuclear forces to the same equal level—a minimum deterrent level. Simultaneously, conventional forces should also be reduced to an equal and low level. In this way, Russia would have to pay a disarmament surtax on her greater manpower and America on her greater nuclear power. Each would sacrifice most where strongest."

From there, the conference broke down into 6 working groups (comprising 65 scientists) who came to some far-reaching conclusions. The main points:

Nuclear arms: Top priority must be given to the elimination, or at least reduction of the means of delivery. Complete data on rockets and aircraft should be supplied to an international disarmament organization. (This was a major step forward by the Russians, but U.S. delegates noted that verification techniques would have "an average uncertainty of 10 percent." Some disarmament would have to be taken on trust.)

Conventional arms: Communist China must be included in any negotiations if they are to be effective. An international organization must also have the right to observe demobilization, destruction of arms, and conversion of weapons plants.

Nuclear tests: Sealed "black boxes," containing delicate seismographs, should be dispersed in all countries. The boxes, still sealed, would be sent to an international commission whenever an underground blast was suspected. Significantly, the Soviet delegates also agreed that a small number of onsite inspections, beyond those carried out by invitation, would be needed in any control system.

Above all, the scientists rammed home the fact that time was running short. Their final communique, in which both Americans and Russians were associated, said: "We are now at the stage in which general statements of principle are not enough; action is needed * * * we reassert our conviction that the goal of full disarmament is realistic and urgent."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, with a letter from the forthright founder of the Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs, Cyrus S. Eaton, Sr., I received a copy of a significant address by Lord Hailsham at the opening session. Lord Hailsham is Britain's Minister for Science and holds the high posts of Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House of Lords.

This speech, opening Pugwash Conference 10, was a lengthy, but enlightening one. Time and space limitations inhibit a request for consent to republish the text but, Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have portions printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, quotations from the speech were ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

I am not prepared to accept as presenting a stark and permanent dilemma the apparent antagonism presented by the alternative systems of socialism and free enterprise. Both systems derive their principal economic and political ideas from traditions and writers whose viewpoints and whose technical language largely antedate Darwin, and whatever of permanent value there may be in either, the greater part of the human race is at present living in conditions to which neither is self-evidently completely relevant.

However this may be I do not regard either the West or communism as having reached a state of perfection which entitles either to adopt a purely negative, patronising or destructive attitude toward the other. The mere pressure upon both of problems like populations and food production will cause each to modify practice, and, one hopes, not too long afterward, to alter political theories. In the meantime, aggressive or even moral talk unaccompanied by achievement in elevating the national and moral condition of mankind is a barrier to further progress which ought to be based on the interchange of technical, cultural, and moral ideas by discussion, and on cooperation on objectives which can offer advantages to each. What the world wants at the present time is less political polemics but deeper study and insight, more cooperation and more discussion, and greater concentration on practical and technical problems.

The need for a central political authority * * * seems to me to be emphasized by two practical considerations. The first is the nature of the nuclear weapon, and the second the magnitude and nature of the claims on resources likely to be made if human life outside the highly industrialized nations (or even including them) is to be substantially improved at an acceptable rate.

Apart from pressing issues of testing verification, and inspection which I do not propose to discuss, the core of the problem of nuclear weapons lies in the fact that they are not very secret, not very difficult to make, and that if nuclear energy for peaceful purposes is developed to anything like the extent we expect and hope, the quantity of plutonium (quite apart from enriched uranium) which will be available in the world will be substantial and widely diffused. The so-called problem of the *n*th power will, therefore, always be with us whether or not the larger powers conclude an effective disarmament agreement. If, therefore, such an agreement is to achieve its purpose, it is plain that some international mechanism armed with effective powers must be created to contain this threat.

The second argument which I use is related to the undoubted need of the so-called underdeveloped countries for aid. I have made no attempt to calculate what this need amounts to since it is pretty obvious to anyone with a nodding acquaintance with the communities and nations concerned that they could absorb without difficulty all the capital resources now being spent on arm-

aments and a great deal more without their needs being met. At present there seems to me to be neither rhyme or reason for much that is being done, and I personally have no doubt that much of the resources at present being devoted by East and West to the provision of aid is either wasted, or even, as in the case of the provision of modern armaments, actually detrimental.

Yet the dilemma presented is a genuine one. New nations prize their independence more than any other asset. It follows that it is difficult to assume any other means for identifying projects worthy of priority than the wishes of the government concerned—which are quite frankly not always very sensible—and there are perhaps few methods open to a developing country to secure favorable treatment other than a rather squalid attempt to offer, in return for aid and some degree of qualified political support, or the reverse, in the struggles for superiority between East and West.

The need for an objective organization with adequate resources capable of selecting types of projects suitable for assistance, with a due regard to priority, and administering them without being drawn into the major ideological struggles would seem to be overwhelming in the interest of East and West alike and, if the proper means were discovered of carrying it out, a fertile field for cooperation would have been opened for cultivation.

There is also clearly an established opportunity for international cooperation in the purely scientific field. By "international cooperation," I do not necessarily mean world cooperation in every part of the field because I myself envisage much more complex and sophisticated pattern in which different groups of nations of different sizes and requirements cooperate for different purposes related to their special needs and responsibilities.

Still less by cooperation do I necessarily mean "centralization" for my own experience has led me to believe that certain types of international scientific cooperation can be achieved between nations supporting national programs of scientific education and research of individual excellence.

But I would identify the following fields in which international cooperation on some scale and with some kind of organization is becoming a practical necessity.

The first of these in the field of the earth sciences—such as oceanography, geography, the study of the earth itself, its mantle, its core, its magnetic field, the ionized belts beyond its atmosphere and so on, where quite apart from the expense involved the observations necessary presuppose a worldwide chain of observers and observations. Clearly optical and radio astronomy are cognate fields in which parallel considerations apply.

The second is where the mere cost of the apparatus necessary to carry out first-class research is such and its life as a research tool so short lived that it is beyond the power of any nation and perhaps of single group of nations to provide a complete range of the facilities required. I would myself list here high-energy physics, nuclear physics, and almost certainly, space research. But as each science and discipline develops there are probably many other fields in which the same conditions will develop.

The third is the whole range of studies connected with health. Experience with our own medical research council has convinced me that in all the more radical aspects of medical research a single nation with exhypothesi, a limited geographical habitat is often too small a unit of study for positive results. It is not simply that certain diseases are prone to attack all humanity wherever they live but also that new light on general problems can often be known only by study of local pecularities. I cite only the effect on the study of human genetics of the discovery of the relationship between sickle cell anemia and a resistance to malaria, or how the very suggestive facts recently come to light about the geographical distribution of a rare form of infantile cancer may throw a light on the general nature of cancer itself.

But, of course, the whole problem of international cooperation comes to a head again on the subject of aid, with which I have already dealt in a slightly different connection. For the greater part, human immunity to disease and want does not require any great advance in scientific knowledge so much as the application of known techniques and adequate resources—water, transport, fertilizer, power, engineering and building construction of all kinds. I have already indicated that I do not myself believe that the use of aid by the two power blocs as a means of pursuing the ideological struggle is not really in the interest of either, or of the recipients of the aid. I therefore identify as my last and most significant field for international technological cooperation, the application of known technology for the development of human happiness and culture throughout the planet by means which will not by itself secure to any power bloc a political advantage over the other.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is my considered conviction that eventually the peoples of the world will learn to live together in understanding and mutual respect. This pursuit of peace and the search for comity between governments goes on. Cyrus Eaton, through the Pugwash Conferences, faces the challenge for a future of faith. This hope, based on calm counsel among enlightened men, has been in evidence as per the London Daily Mirror editorial from which I have quoted. The Associated Press in a feature article published earlier this month, characterized Mr. Eaton as an industry leader who "approaches his 80th year displaying verve and resiliency." It is most encouraging that this gentleman retains his vigor and vision as he provides mankind with the guidelines for peace.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.